

ITEM NO.61

COURT NO.5

SECTION XII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).17844/2024

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 03-07-2024 in WP No. 31281/2019 passed by the High Court Of Judicature At Madras)

JUSTDIAL.COM, JUST DIAL LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

P. N. VIGNESH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 176048/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 14-08-2024 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HRISHIKESH ROY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Ritin Rai, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sharath Sampath, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Udit Singh, AOR
Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Daksh Kadian, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Heard Mr. Ritin Rai, learned Senior Counsel
appearing for the petitioner(s).

2. The senior counsel would firstly point out that the entity he is representing is providing online directory and listing services to facilitate the litigants to connect with the lawyers. The specific contention of the

petitioner is that they are not in the same footing as the other two respondents in the PIL proceeding, before the High Court.

3. The Senior Counsel refers to Rule 36 of the *Bar Council of India Rules, 1975*, to say that an advocate is debarred from soliciting work or advertising their profession either directly or indirectly. Under the proviso to Rule 36 added with effect from 24.03.2008, the advocates are permitted to provide limited information. Those information can pertain to the name, enrollment, membership with the Bar Council of the advocates as also his/her professional and academic qualification and the area of practice such as civil, criminal, taxation, labour etc.

4. Besides the above details, the petitioner is not providing any other information. Accordingly, it is argued by the learned senior counsel that the direction issued by the High Court in the impugned judgment dated 03.07.2024 to the Bar Council to initiate action are not merited.

5. We have considered the above submission and have also noted the direction issued in paragraph 45 to the Bar Council of India/State Bar Council. The direction No.1 is specific to prohibiting advocates from advertising or soliciting work directly or indirectly. This cannot be a matter of concern by the petitioner. Insofar as the direction No.2, to register complaints by

the Bar Council against those who have violated the provisions of Rule 36 of the Bar Council of India Rules, the same cannot be the matter of concern for the entity providing online directory service.

6. Be that as it may, considering the larger issue in the realm of ethical and professional standards which regulate the profession, let notice, returnable in three weeks, be issued.

7. Dasti notice on the Standing Counsel, in addition.

(DEEPAK JOSHI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)