

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

CM(M) No. 37/2026

Lokesh Gupta

.....Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate.

Vs

Rahul Raina

.....Respondent(s)

Through:

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAHUL BHARTI, JUDGE

ORDER
(21.04.2026)

1. Virtual hearing request came to be made from the end of Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate who is an out-stationed lawyer but when this Court came to examine the vakalatnama on record, though mention of name of Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate is there, but the Advocate who has entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner-Lokesh Gupta is only Mr. Ashish Kant Sharma, Advocate meaning thereby the petitioner-Lokesh Gupta has not entrusted his brief to Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate otherwise Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate as a counsel would have also surely subscribed his signatures to the Vakalatnama on record.

2. It is only a Power of Attorney/Vakalatnama which authorizes a lawyer to appear on behalf of a client to argue the case and in absence of that perhaps there is an authority lacking on the part of the given Advocate to appear lest argue a case, as such, this Court calls upon Mr. Ashish Kant Sharma, Advocate engaged by the petitioner to deal with the situation as to whether he intends to argue the case or

Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate. In case, it is Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate who is to argue the case, then let the Power of Attorney from the end of the petitioner in favour of Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate be also placed on record whereupon this Court can surely entertain Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Advocate's appearance, physical or through virtual mode.

3. Let the needful be done by or before the next date of hearing.
4. List this case on **06.05.2026**.

JAMMU
21.04.2026
Shivalee

