

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2025
[@ CIVIL APPEAL Diary No. 36274/2024]**

SAILESH BHANSALI

APPELLANT

VERSUS

ALOK DHIR & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.
2. This civil appeal is directed against the order dated March 30, 2024 passed by the Bar Council of India¹ dismissing the appellant's revision petition, whereby he questioned dismissal of his complaint (alleging professional misconduct committed by the respondent-advocates) by the Bar Council of Delhi² vide order dated October 5, 2015.
3. We have heard learned senior counsel appearing for the parties and perused the impugned revisional order.
4. The said order of the BCI notes the facts giving rise to the revision and the arguments of the parties, spread over six pages. On the seventh page, the noting is completed in four lines whereafter the BCI spares merely six lines for dismissing the revision without recording any reason at all. In fact, the *ipse dixit* of the BCI that the impugned order of the BCD suffers from no infirmity and hence, does not warrant interference, is recorded.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
JATINDER KAUR
Date: 2025.03.03
17:17:36 IST
Reason: 

1 BCI

2 BCD

5. Law is well settled that an order of affirmation may not require elaborate reasons as required in the case of an order of reversal but it does not mean that such order of affirmation need not contain any reason at all. Whether or not there was application of mind can only be disclosed by reason, howsoever briefly alluded to. If any authority is required, one may profitably refer to the decision of this Court in **Rani Lakshmi Bai Kshtriya Gramin Bank v. Jagdish Sharan Varshney**³.

6. What follows from the above is that the 'what', i.e., the conclusion, must have the 'why', i.e., the reasons (at least in brief), to stand on, which is conspicuous by its absence in the impugned order of affirmation. On this short ground, we set aside the revisional order of the BCI.

7. BCI is directed to re-consider the revision petition and pass a fresh order after hearing the parties, in accordance with law, within six months from date.

8. The appeal is, accordingly, disposed of on the aforesaid terms. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

9. We clarify, no opinion is expressed on merits and all points are left open for being agitated by the parties before the BCI.

10. There shall be no order for costs.

.....J.
[DIPANKAR DATTA]

.....J.
[MANMOHAN]

**New Delhi;
February 28, 2025.**

³ (2009) 4 SCC 240

ITEM NO.9

COURT NO.14

SECTION XVII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL Diary No(s). 36274/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 30-03-2024
in RP No. 83/2015 passed by the Bar Council of India]

SAILESH BHANSALI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ALOK DHIR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 282765/2024 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING APPEAL

IA No. 282764/2024 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING /CURING THE DEFECTS

Date : 28-02-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. A. Karthik, AOR
Mr. Aditya N. Mehta, Adv.
Mr. Arsh Khan, Adv.
Ms. Niyomi Jariwala, Adv.
Ms. Smrithi Suresh, Adv.
Mr. Ujjwal Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Sugam Agrawal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Gourab Banerji, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashu Kansal, Adv.
Mr. Dipanshu Krishnan, Adv.
Mr. Karan Batura, AOR

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

1. Delay condoned.
2. The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.
3. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(JATINDER KAUR)
P.S. to REGISTRAR

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)

[Signed order is placed on the file]