

**Court No. - 2**

**Case :-** WRIT - C No. - 2000 of 2025

**Petitioner :-** Ashok Pandey

**Respondent :-** Union Of Bharat Thru. Secy. To The President New Delhi  
And 2 Others

**Counsel for Petitioner :-** In Person

**Counsel for Respondent :-** A.S.G.I.

**Hon'ble Rajan Roy,J.**

**Hon'ble Om Prakash Shukla,J.**

1. Supplementary affidavit has been filed by the petitioner, which is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Ashok Pandey, petitioner in person and Sri Sudhanshu Chauhan, Advocate for the opp. party.
3. By means of this petition the petitioner, Sri Ashok Pandey, who is a practising lawyer of this court has challenged an order dated 26.7.2024 issued by the Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs (Judicial Section), Government of India. A writ of mandamus has also been sought to the concerned opp. parties to pay Rs. 1 Crore as fee and expenses for 6 cases which he has filed details of which have been mentioned in the pleadings.
4. We have perused Annexure-3, which is under challenge.
5. We find that it is a communication by the Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs (Judicial Section), Government of India, dated 20.7.2024, to the petitioner Sri Ashok Pandey, who has appeared in person. This Communication has been issued, as stated therein, with the approval of the competent authority. It refers to an undated letter of the petitioner claiming Rs. 1 Crore as fee. Communication states that the said undated letter was received

from the Department of Justice according to their Office Memorandum dated May 2, 2024, and later through the President's Secretariat as per the letter dated February 28, 2024. Regarding the subject matter of petitioner's letter it has been stated that the Government of India has an extensive panel of advocates at the Supreme Court of India to represent the government's interests and that the petitioner herein is not included on the panel of the department at the Supreme Court of India.

6. The communication further goes on to state that as indicated in petitioner's undated letter, it is clear that the cases for which fee bill amounting to Rs. 1 Crore has been claimed by him, were actually and factually filed on his own volition and, consequently, the Government of India is not liable to defray any expenses incurred by him including fee as claimed. The Communication further goes on to state that the Signatory thereto had been instructed to inform the petitioner that the Department has found his representation bereft of any merit, and thus it has been disregarded being dismissed.

7. In his arguments, Sri Pandey only reiterated the grounds taken in the writ petition, which we have perused carefully.

8. We have gone through the pleadings and the documents annexed with the writ petition.

9. There is nothing on record to indicate that the Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs (Judicial Section), Government of India had ever engaged the petitioner for filing the six cases, referred in the pleadings, therefore, in view of the reasons given in the communication dated 26.7.2024, we find absolutely no reason to grant the reliefs prayed for herein. The

writ petition lacks merits and is **dismissed**.

10. At this stage, Sri Ashok Pandey, appearing in person orally requested for issuance of a certificate under Article 134-A of the Constitution of India. We have perused the provisions of Article 132, 133 as also 134-A of the Constitution of India. We do not find it to be a fit case for issuance of any such certificate, as, in our opinion, the case does not involve any substantial question of law as to interpretation of the Constitution of India nor does it involve any substantial question of law of general importance. This prayer is accordingly **rejected**.

**(Om Prakash Shukla, J.) (Rajan Roy, J.)**

**Order Date :- 6.3.2025**  
A.Nigam