



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 1640 of 1988

Rajvir Singh

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Harish Chandra, Satendra Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	D.G.A.

Court No. - 44

HON'BLE J.J. MUNIR, J.

HON'BLE VINAI KUMAR DWIVEDI, J.

In compliance with the bailable warrants of arrest issued *vide* order dated 30.01.2026, appellant Rajvir Singh has surrendered before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mainpuri and furnished personal bond, sureties etc. and appeared before this Court today.

The appellant was earlier represented by Mr. Satendra Singh, Advocate but, today, he has instructed another learned Counsel, Mr. Abhijeet Mishra.

It is true that a citizen is entitled to be represented by a learned Counsel of his choice as that is a fundamental right inhering in him but that does not mean that he ought behave in an indisciplined manner where he refuses to receive telephone calls from his Counsel when the learned Counsel informs him that the appeal is coming up for hearing. This is precisely what has happened in this case.

When we were informed of this conduct of the appellant, we issued bailable warrants and now he has exercised his choice to engage another learned Counsel. This kind of behaviour of a litigant leads to delays and obstruction in Court and is not appreciable.

There are norms written about fairness expected of members of the Bar but almost nothing is written or said about the unfairness of litigants shown to learned members of the Bar everyday. It is time when we must pay attention to the conduct of the litigants as well *vis-a-vis* the learned

Counsel, who represent them, before we demand nobility of the noble profession.

Rajvir Singh, who is present in Court, has been identified by his learned Counsel Mr. Abhijeet Mishra on the basis of papers that he has produced in Chambers before him.

Mr. Satendra Singh, Advocate is also present and he identifies the appellant from prior acquaintance.

Mr. Satendra Singh, Advocate will continue to appear in the matter as an *Amicus Curiae*.

This is an appeal of the year 1988.

List for **final hearing** on **25.02.2026** at **2:00 p.m.**

It is made clear that on the next date, the appellant shall remain present in-person before this Court.

(Vinai Kumar Dwivedi,J.) (J.J. Munir,J.)

February 10, 2026

Aditya