



## Bar Council of Maharashtra & Goa

2nd Floor, High Court Extension, Fort, Mumbai - 400 032. ☎ : 2265 6567  
Website : www.barcouncilmahgoa.org • Email : barcouncilmahgoa@gmail.com

**Sharad T. Bagul** B.Com., LL.B.  
Secretary

Ref: DC/ 1171 /2025

Date : 3.5.25

To,

1. Mr. Abhijeet J. Zadokar  
Kalyan (East), Thane.
2. Ms. Ranjeeta R. Vengurlekar, Adv  
Badlapur (East), Thane.

Sub: Disciplinary Committee No.98  
D.C. Case No. 169 of 2024

Mr. Abhijeet J. Zadokar ..... Complainant  
V/s  
Ms. Ranjeeta R. Vengurlekar, Adv. .... Respondent

=====

Sir/Madam,

With reference to the subject noted above, I am enclosing herewith certified copy of the order/ Judgment dated 04<sup>th</sup> April, 2025 in the above matter for your information and record

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,

SECRETARY

Encl: As above





BAR COUNCIL OF MAHARASHTRA & GOA  
BEFORE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE NO.98

D. C. NO.169 OF 2024

MR. ABHIJEET JAGANNATH ZADOKAR ... PETITIONER  
V/S.  
MS. RANJEETA RAMESH VENGURLEKAR, ADV. .... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. UDAY PRAKASH WARUNJIKAR, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE SHRI. SANGRAM D. DESAI, MEMBER  
HON'BLE SHRI. ANIRUDDHA A. GARGE, MEMBER

JUDGEMENT DELIVERED PER :

HON'BLE DR. UDAY PRAKASH WARUNJIKAR

DATE : 04<sup>TH</sup> APRIL, 2025

J U D G E M E N T

- (1) The Complaint is affirmed before Notary Public on 22<sup>nd</sup> April, 2024. He has come with the case that there was a fraud committed by the Respondent who collected Rs.80,000/- for payment of the Court Fee. The total amount which was paid from time to time was Rs.1,50,000/- It was contended that services of the Respondent were engaged in connection with the legal matter. In respect of the same, Rs.80,000/- was collected for Court Fee. According to the Complainant, a fraudulent receipt was produced by the Respondent. According to the Complainant, on account of such act, the Complainant has lost an amount of Rs.21,00,000/- approximately. In support of the said contention, the Complainant met to the police authority, payment details, whatsapp details were produced by the present Complainant.
- (2) Before the Single Member, in response to the notice, Say came to be filed by the Respondent which was affirmed before Notary Public on 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2024. In the said Complaint, she has denied all the





allegations. She came with the case that Complainant had come to her office at Badlapur and had availed consultation. She denied the allegation with reference to loss of Rs.21 Lakhs. She further contended that amount of Rs.80,000/- was towards Court Fees and Rs.50,000/- was her fees only. In support of the contention, she relied upon the draft of the proceedings which was prepared by her, and notice sent by the Complainant and the correspondence between the parties.

- (3) The matter was placed before the Single Member. The Single Member was pleased to pass an order on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2024. Based on the same, the matter was assigned to this committee.
- (4) So far as the proceeding before the committee are concerned, Roznama goes to show that the Respondent was served on multiple occasions. Apart from the postal service, as per the order passed, a messenger had personally gone to serve the notice on the Respondent. As per the order passed in the Roznama, the Complainant was authorised to give intimation about the date and file Affidavit of Service. He has already filed such service Affidavit. Order is passed in the Roznama holding that there is a proper service on the Respondent. In addition to this, on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2025, Respondent filed Vakalatnama of Adv. S.S. Bhatia having office at Ulhasnagar. However, later on neither the Respondent nor Advocate S.S. Bhatia participated in the proceeding.
- (5) Issues were framed on 04/02/2025. The issues are as under :

**ISSUES**

- (A) Whether the Complainant proves that the Respondent has committed guilty of misconduct as contemplated under Section 35 of Advocates Act, 1961 as alleged in the Complaint ?
- (B) What Order ?





- (6) In support of the allegations which were made by the present Complainant, Complainant stepped into the witness box and filed his Affidavit of Evidence. Along with the same, he has produced ample documents and produced 65-B Certificate as well as the electronic evidence. As per the order passed in Roznama, no Cross Order came to be passed on 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2025. Since the evidence of the Complainant was closed, it was adjourned for final hearing. On 03.04.2025, when the matter came to be argued by the present Complainant, even at that time, also, there was nobody present on behalf of the present Respondent. The registry has also produced copy of the email which was sent by the Respondent. This goes to show that the Respondent was intimated as well as the Respondent was having knowledge and the Respondent had engaged a lawyer who also remained absent.
- (7) The evidence produced by the Complainant remains unchallenged. In view of the same, we are constrained to hold that Complainant has proved his case.
- (8) Independently, we have considered the documents produced by the present Complainant and the evidence produced by the Complainant. There is electronic evidence produced by the Complainant and the WhatsApp chat between the parties is produced on record. Bare perusal of the record goes to show that the Complainant has proved his case about misconduct. The receipt with reference to the Court Fee of Rs.80,000/- was bogus according to the Complaint. In respect of the same, he has filed the Complaint and made a specific allegation. Not only that the Complainant has produced Affidavit in support of the same and also 65-B Certificate is also produced by the Complainant. Thus prima-facie receipt of Court Fee Stamp of Rs.80,000/- is bogus. In fact, the Complainant has already made a Complaint to the police





authorities. However, it is for him to take appropriate steps with reference to the fraud if any has been committed, which is punishable under the provisions of law.

- (9) However, in the limited jurisdiction of section 35 of the Advocate Act, we are constrained to hold that the Complainant has proved his case.
- (10) The Complainant has prayed for the cost of the proceedings. However, we are of the view that since Respondent has not contested the matter, it would be appropriate to pay nominal cost in favour of the present Complainant, which is quantified at Rs.25,000/-
- (11) The Respondent filed a reply, however later on he remains absent. The Advocate of the Respondent also remains absent. The postal authorities have served the Respondent. An email from the Respondent goes to show that Respondent is aware about the order and the dates. In view of the same, we are of the view that it would be appropriate to pass an order of suspension for period of two years.
- (12) Accordingly, we pass following order :

**ORDER**

- (a) Complaint is partly allowed ;
- (b) Sanad of the Respondent is suspended for a period of 2 years and cost of Rs.25,000/- is granted in favour of the Complainant and the Respondent is directed to pay the said cost within a period of one month from the date of receipt of this notice.
- (c) No order as to costs on other prayers made by the

Complainant.

DR. UDAY P. MARUNJIKAR  
CHAIRMAN

SANGRAM D. DESAI  
MEMBER

ANIRUDDHA A. GARGE  
MEMBER

True Copy  
*Sagar*  
Registrar

Disciplinary Committee of  
the Bar Council of  
Maharashtra & Goa

