

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: WRIT PETITION No.13352 of 2025

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
10.	11.12.2025	<u>PSK,J & SCR,J</u> Counsel for the petitioner: Mr.Vijay Gopal, party-in-person Counsel for the respondent No.1: Mr. D.Surender Kumar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Law and Legislative Affairs. Counsel for respondent No.2: learned Assistant Government Pleader for Stamps and Registration. Counsel for respondent No.3: Mr. Vivek Jain, learned Standing Counsel for High Court. Counsel for respondent No.4: Mr. S. Ashok Anand Kumar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Mr.J.Manikanta Reddy. Today, when the matter is taken-up for hearing, one Pujari Mani Sahith, an enrolled Advocate has moved an implead application i.e. I.A.No.3 of 2025 objecting the writ petition claiming himself to be a beneficiary and seeking impleadment to contest as respondent in opposing the writ petition. The said implead petition is opposed by the petitioner-in person on the ground that he has already made all the statutory bodies and authorities as party whose action is under challenge and particularly, all the representatives have filed counter and therefore, it should	Transferred to i/o folder, before corrections, if any.

		not be permitted to get individual persons being made respondents in opposing the writ petition. At this juncture, Mr.S.Ashok Anand Kumar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.4-Telangana Advocate Welfare Fund Committee, submits that considering the implead petition moved by Mr.Pujari Mani Sahith, there is likelihood of many such other implead petitions come individually and therefore, he suggests it could be more appropriate, if the Bar Associations are informed about the pendency of the present writ petition and challenge of welfare scheme in the present writ petition and informing them all the next date of hearing, so that, if at all, any of the Bar Associations wants, they may either come in support of the petitioner or oppose the petitioner in a representative capacity rather individual lawyers or individual Advocate Clerks appear and contest the case. The said proposal of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.4 was accepted by learned counsel appearing for all the other respondents, so also, the petitioner-in-person has not raised any strong objection to it accepting the fact that such implead petitions may only further protract the proceedings. Considering the nature of the relief sought for and the beneficiaries from the said Welfare Scheme under challenge, we are of the considered opinion that it could	
--	--	--	--

		be more appropriate, if at least all the Bar Associations and the Advocate Clerks Associations are intimated of such a writ petition being seized by the High Court, so that, if at all anybody wants, they may enter appearance and oppose the same. Accordingly, we direct respondent No.4-Telangana Advocate Welfare Fund Committee, to ensure publication of a general notice at the notice boards of all the Bar Associations duly registered with the Telangana State Bar Council informing about pendency of the writ petition and the next date of hearing of the present writ petition i.e. 05.02.2026. The notice should also contain that if at all anybody wants to enter appearance in the writ petition they may do so in a representative capacity, individual representatives may not be permissible. List this matter on 05.02.2026 along with IA.No.3 of 2025. PSK,J SCR,J <i>nvl</i>	
--	--	---	--

--	--	--	--