



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

MONDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF MAY 2026 / 28TH VAISAKHA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 6893 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

T.M. MANJU
GOWREESANKARAM,
UNICHIRA THAIKKAVU ROAD,
CHANGAMPUZHA NAGAR P.O., KALAMASSERY,
ERNAKULAM, PIN - 682033

BY ADVS.
SRI.H.VISHNUDAS
SRI.O.V.RADHAKRISHNAN (SR.)
SRI.GEORGE VARGHESE

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 BAR COUNCIL OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SPECIAL SECRETARY/SECRETARY-IN-
CHARGE, BAR COUNCIL BHAVAN,
HIGH COURT CAMPUS, KOCHI,
KERALA, PIN - 682031
- 2 CHAIRMAN
BAR COUNCIL OF KERALA,
BAR COUNCIL BHAVAN, HIGH COURT CAMPUS,
KOCHI, KERALA, PIN - 682031
- 3 ENROLMENT COMMITTEE
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
BAR COUNCIL OF KERALA, BAR COUNCIL BHAVAN,
HIGH COURT CAMPUS, KOCHI,
KERALA, PIN - 682031



W.P.(C) No.6893/26

2

2026:KER:33781

BY ADVS.
SMT.M.U.VIJAYALAKSHMI
SRI.K.JAJU BABU (SR.)

SRI. MANIKANTAN S.KANDATHIL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
10.04.2026, THE COURT ON 18.05.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**“C.R.”****BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J.****-----
W.P.(C) No.6893 of 2026
-----**Dated this the 18th day of May, 2026**JUDGMENT**

Can a registered medical practitioner of Homoeopathy be denied permission to enrol as an Advocate unless the applicant cancels the registration as a Homoeopath? Is it enough that the licence to practice another profession be cancelled after enrolment as an Advocate? These questions require answers in the instant case. The issues arise for consideration as the petitioner, despite being a registered Homoeopath, seeks to enrol herself as an Advocate without cancelling her registration as a medical practitioner.

2. While practicing as a Homoeopath, petitioner decided to pursue a course in law. After cancelling her licence issued by the local authority to run her Homoeopathic clinic, petitioner underwent a three year Unitary LL.B course during the period from 2022 to 2025. After acquiring a degree in law and after clearing the All India Bar Examination, petitioner applied to the Bar Council of Kerala on 17-11-2025, for enrolment as an Advocate. Petitioner was thereafter directed to appear before the Bar Council on 13-12-2025 for



physical verification of the documents. On noticing that the cancellation certificate as a Homoeo Doctor had not been uploaded, petitioner was informed by email of the same date, to upload the said document. Pursuant to the said communication, an affidavit dated 05.12.2025 was thereafter filed stating that she had cancelled the licence for the clinic issued by the Municipality and that she had not practiced Homoeopathy from the date of such cancellation. Petitioner also submitted an undertaking that she will not engage in the medical profession simultaneously and that if she decides to practice medicine, she will inform the Bar Council and suspend her enrolment.

3. According to the petitioner, when she was given an opportunity for a personal hearing, she submitted Ext.P11 undertaking in Form No.6 as required under Rule 2(h) Chapter V of the Bar Council of Kerala Rules, 1979, stating that, upon her enrolment as an Advocate, she would not practice medicine or engage in the medical profession simultaneously. After the personal hearing, since the petitioner did not receive any reply, she verified the list of candidates to be enrolled and found her name absent in the enrolment list for January 2026. Petitioner alleges that she was arbitrarily denied permission to enrol as an Advocate. As the petitioner learnt that another enrolment is about to take place in March 2026, she filed this writ petition seeking various reliefs, including quashing Ext.P17 proceedings of



the enrolment committee, deciding to consider her enrolment application only after she cancels her registration as a medical practitioner. A declaration is also sought that petitioner shall be deemed to have been enroled as an Advocate on the State rolls from January 2026 onwards, apart from a direction to enrol her as an Advocate at the next enrolment, as well for grant of compensation for the wrongful denial of permission to enrol.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondents 1 to 3, pointing out that, though the petitioner possesses a degree in law, from the documents submitted by her, it was revealed that she had obtained a degree in Bachelor of Homoeopathic Medicine on 07.04.2008, but had not produced any document evidencing the cancellation of her licence as a Homoeo Doctor and hence she was directed to upload the same. It was also revealed that she was practising as a Homoeopathic consultant for a period of five years from 2017 to 2022 in her own building and that she cancelled the licence issued by the local authority for running the clinic. Respondents also pleaded that in the letter dated 03.01.2026, petitioner had specifically stated that cancellation of her registration as a Homoeopath will result in her unable to get back into the medical profession if she decides to do so later, and hence she had expressed her difficulties against cancellation of her medical registration. Though petitioner had submitted an undertaking as per the Rules, according to the respondents, the rules indicate that a person already



engaged in any other profession is not qualified to be admitted as an Advocate. It was also pleaded that as the petitioner's name is included in the list of medical practitioners published in the Gazette as per Section 30 of the Kerala State Medical Practitioners Act, 2021, she cannot practice another profession simultaneously, under Section 31(2) of the Act as well. Respondents also averred that, as long as the petitioner's name is in the register as a medical practitioner, it is evident that she does not want to give up the medical profession, notwithstanding her undertaking before the first respondent. Justifying the rejection of the request for enrolment, it was pointed out that insistence on the cancellation certificate from the other profession is applied uniformly in the case of all professionals and that it was only with the bona fide intention that a person does not pursue two professions simultaneously that the cancellation certificate is insisted.

5. In the reply affidavit, petitioner pointed out that in her affidavit she had specifically mentioned that from 2022 onwards she was completely dedicated to the study of law and that there was no suppression of any material fact. It was further stated that the insistence on production of a cancellation certificate from the Homoeopathic Council has no basis as it is not a precondition for enrolment as an Advocate. Petitioner also asserted that under section 24 of the Advocates Act, 1961, she is fully eligible and qualified to be an Advocate on the State roll and the Rules for professional conduct



and etiquette is not applicable at the time of enrolment, as the question of continuing in practice would arise only on enrolment and not before. Petitioner also denied that for the purpose of enrolment, sanction from the Medical Council is not needed.

6. Sri. O.V. Radhakrishnan, the learned Senior Counsel instructed by Sri.Vishnudas, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the restrictions introduced by the Bar Council cannot be insisted upon at the pre-entry stage as those obligations arise only after enrolment and hence the petitioner cannot be prevented from enrolment as an Advocate merely because her name appears in the register as a medical practitioner of Homoeopathy. The learned Senior Counsel asserted that there is no reason or logic nor is there any legal provision entitling the Bar Council to deny permission for enrolment to the petitioner and such irrational decisions as is seen from Ext.P17 cannot be taken by such a body. The learned Senior Counsel also submitted that, in the absence of any prescription under law regarding the restriction on enrolment, denying the petitioner her right to enrol merely because her name appears in the register of medical practitioners amounts to violation of her right under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India. It was also submitted that after enrolment the petitioner can decide whether to cancel her registration as a medical practitioner or not and if she refuses to do so, the Bar Council will be at liberty to initiate appropriate steps.



However, that does not confer a right on the Bar Council to refuse enrolment.

7. Sri. Jaju Babu, the learned Senior Counsel instructed by Sri. Manikandan S. Kandathil, the learned counsel for the Bar Council of Kerala contended that the Bar Council has a duty to ensure that an applicant for enrolment is not engaged in any other profession and the requirement to cancel her registration as a medical practitioner is to ensure that a person does not pursue two professions at the same time. The learned Senior Counsel also invited the attention of the Court to the Travancore-Cochin Medical Practitioners Act, 1953 and the Kerala State Medical Practitioners Act, 2021 and pointed out that those statutes also restrict the right of a person from pursuing another profession at the same time. It was also submitted that if the petitioner does not wish to pursue the medical practice as a Homoeopath, nothing prevents her from cancelling the same as it is always open to re-register herself as a medical practitioner later, after cancelling her licence to practice any other profession.

8. While considering the questions mentioned in the initial paragraph, this Court has to bear in mind that though petitioner had cancelled the licence issued by the Municipality to run her Homoeo clinic, still, her name is included in the register of medical practitioners. The corollary of such continued inclusion in the list of medical practitioners is that, petitioner being treated as a registered medical practitioner is entitled as of right, to practice as a



Homoeopath. Nevertheless, the petitioner has asserted that after enrolment as an Advocate, she will not practice the profession of medicine. An undertaking has also been given to that effect. Despite the above undertaking, the Bar Council of Kerala is insisting that the petitioner must cancel her registration as a Doctor.

9. The Advocates Act, 1961 (for short, 'the Act') has codified the law relating to legal practitioners and has provided for the constitution of the Bar Council of India as well as the State Bar Councils. The control and jurisdiction regarding enrolment of Advocates and their discipline became vested with the Bar Council of India and the State Bar Councils which are autonomous bodies, with representatives elected from the Advocates. Amongst the various committees, every State Bar Council is mandated to have an Enrolment Committee. Section 24 of the Act deals with persons who can be admitted as Advocates on a State roll and the relevant provision reads as follows :

“24. Persons who may be admitted as advocates on a State roll.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, and the rules made thereunder, a person shall be qualified to be admitted as an advocate on a State roll, if he fulfils the following conditions, namely:

(a) he is a citizen of India:

.....(omitted as not relevant)

(b) he has completed the age of twenty-one years;

(c) he has obtained a degree in law -



.....(*omitted as not relevant*)

(d).....(*omitted*)

(e) *he fulfils such other conditions as may be specified in the rules made by the State Bar Council under this Chapter;*

(f).....(*omitted*)

10. Section 24A of the Act also provides for disqualification for being admitted as an advocate on a State roll and states that a person convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude, or for an offence under the provisions of the Untouchability (Offences) Act, 1955 or was dismissed or removed from employment or office under the State or any charge involving moral turpitude shall not be admitted to the rolls as an Advocate. Section 25 of the Act provides for the authority before whom the application for enrolment has to be made and stipulates that it shall be submitted to the State Bar Council within whose jurisdiction the applicant proposes to practice. Once an application is submitted to the State Bar Council, as per Section 26, the said application has to be referred to its Enrolment Committee, who shall dispose of the application in the prescribed manner and subject to the provisions of sub-clause (2) and (3) as well as to any direction that may be given in writing by the State Bar Council in that behalf.

11. Apart from the requirements of citizenship, minimum age and a degree in law, section 24 also requires the fulfillment of the conditions



specified in the rules made by the State Bar Councils. The Bar Council of Kerala Rules, 1979 (hereinafter for brevity mentioned as 'BCK Rules'), prescribes in Chapter V Rule 2(h) that an applicant for enrolment must submit a declaration. For the purpose of better comprehension, the said provision is extracted below:

“2. Every person applying for enrolment under section 24 of the Act as an Advocate on the roll shall file with the Secretary, the following:

XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

(h) A declaration in Form No.6 that the applicant is not in full or part time employment or service and is not engaged in any trade, business or profession except a person who is in part time service as a Professor, Lecturer or Teacher in Law.” (emphasis supplied)

12. The above referred provision stipulates that the declaration that an applicant for enrolment is not engaged in any profession must accompany the application for enrolment. This leads to the question as to what is meant by 'engaged in any trade, business or profession'. The dictionary meaning of the term 'engage' is 'to employ', 'involve oneself', 'to take part in', 'to embark on'. (See Black's Law Dictionary 8th Edition). The term 'engaged' has been interpreted by the Supreme Court as meaning 'embarking upon' in **Carew and Co. v. Union of India** [(1975) 2 SCC 791]. A person who has a right to involve himself or embark upon a particular profession, he has to be regarded



as engaged in that profession. The right to practice a profession which entitles that person to earn a remuneration or profit, will regard him as engaged in that profession.

13. In the decision in **Bar Council of India v. Mary Tresa and Others** [2006 (2) KLT 210], a Division Bench of this Court considered the claim of priests and nuns to enrol as Advocates. After analysing the issue in detail, it was concluded that if a person is engaged in another profession, he cannot enrol as an Advocate. It was also elaborated that 'engaged' means earning profit or remuneration. When an applicant for enrolment has a right to practice the profession of medicine and has his name registered in the State Rolls as a medical practitioner, it will be practically impossible to identify whether he is actually practicing such a profession or not and even whether he is earning any remuneration from such a profession. Hence, the term 'engaged in any profession', as envisaged in Rule 2(h) of Chapter V of BCK Rules has to be interpreted as being entitled to or having a right to pursue another profession with the possibility of earning a remuneration.

14. In the instant case, the petitioner had submitted her declaration in Form No.6, stating that she is not engaged in any profession. However, the Enrolment Committee identified that the petitioner's name continues to find a place in the register of medical practitioners under the Kerala State Medical



Practitioners Act, 2021 (for brevity referred to as 'MP Act 2021'). This is, in fact, not disputed as well. The existence of the petitioner's name in the list of medical practitioners published under section 30 of the MP Act 2021 entitles the petitioner to practice as a Homoeopath or as a Medical Practitioner in the branch of Homoeopathy. As long as petitioner's name remains in the register under the MP Act 2021, she has a right to practice the profession of medicine.

15. A professional cannot share his/her allegiance with another profession. Such sharing of loyalty can lead to compromising of values of each profession and even result in having to serve two 'masters' at the same time. Splitting the professional soul between two masters can lead to losing focus in both professions. Such divided loyalty cannot be countenanced in the profession of law as the said profession has often been stated to be a jealous mistress. Bar Councils are institutions set up under the Act not only to ensure professional excellence, but also to identify and weed out elements that are unsuitable to the profession. The filtration of persons or identifying persons eligible to practice the profession of law is not restricted to a stage only after they commence the practice of law. Such a power must be capable of being exercised even at the threshold itself. Thus, if the Bar Council concerned has, from the materials made available, identified that an applicant for enrolment has a right to practice another profession and is listed in the register for



another profession, it is certainly within its realm of authority to deny that candidate the permission to enrol as an Advocate.

16. True that a citizen has a fundamental right to practice any profession. The said right however, is not absolute and is subject to reasonable restrictions. Under Article 19(6) of the Constitution after acquiring the degree in law, and clearing the Bar examination, petitioner can certainly expect herself to be permitted to enrol as an Advocate. Nevertheless, by virtue of the BCK Rules, an applicant's entry into the legal profession can be restricted if he/she is engaged in another profession. Such a restriction has been already declared by the Supreme Court to be reasonable, coming within the purview of Article 19(6) of the Constitution of India.

17. In **Dr. Haniraj L. Chulani v. Bar Council of Maharashtra & Goa** [(1996) 3 SCC 342], the Supreme Court considered the validity of the Rules framed by the State Bar Council of Maharashtra & Goa. The applicant in that case - a colorectal surgeon, though wanted to pursue both professions (medicine and law) at the same time, during the course of arguments, it was submitted that he will not practice medicine during court hours. While dealing with the above issues, certain observations were made by the Court which are of relevance in this case and hence they are reproduced below:



“.....Question is whether such a person carrying on other profession can be validly told off the gates by the State Bar Council by resorting to the impugned rule. In our view looking to the nature of the legal profession to which we have made detailed reference earlier the State Bar Council would be justified in framing such a rule prohibiting the entry of a professional who insists on carrying on other profession simultaneously with the legal profession. As we have seen earlier legal profession requires full time attention and would not countenance an advocate riding two horses or more at a time. He has to be a full-time advocate or not at all. Learned senior counsel for the appellant submitted that even though the appellant is a practising surgeon, he undertakes, if given entry to the legal profession, not to practise medicine during the court hours. This is neither here nor there. It is obvious that even though medical profession also may be a dignified profession a person cannot insist that he will be a practising doctor as well as a practising advocate simultaneously. Such an insistence on his part itself would create an awkward situation not only for him but for his own clients as well as patients. It is easy to visualise that a practising surgeon like the appellant may be required to attend emergency operation even beyond court hours either in the morning or in the evening. On the other hand the dictates of his legal profession may require him to study the cases for being argued the next day in the court. Under these circumstances his attention would be divided. He would naturally be in a dilemma as to whether to attend to his patient on the operation table in the evening or to attend to his legal profession and work for preparing cases for the next day and to take instructions from his clients for efficient conduct of the cases next day in the court. If he is an original side advocate he may be required to spend his evenings and even late nights for making witnesses ready for examination in the court next day. Under these circumstances as a practising advocate if he gives attention to his clients in his chamber after court hours and if he is also required to attend an emergency operation at that very time, it would be very difficult for him to choose whether to leave his clients and go to attend his patient in the operation theatre or to refuse to attend to his patients. If he selects the first alternative his clients would clamour, his preparation as advocate would suffer and naturally it would reflect upon his performance in the court next day. If on the other hand he chooses to call to the needs of his clients and his legal work, his patients may suffer and may in given contingency even stand to lose their lives without the aid of his expert hand as a surgeon. Thus he would be torn between two conflicting loyalties, loyalty to his clients on the one hand and loyalty to his patients on the other. In a way he will instead of having the best of both the worlds, have worst of both the worlds. Such a



person aspiring to have simultaneous enrolment both as a lawyer and as a medical practitioner will thus be like 'trishanku' of yore who will neither be in heaven nor on earth. It is axiomatic that an advocate has to burn midnight oil for preparing his cases for being argued in the court next day. Advocates face examination every day when they appear in courts. It is not as if that after court hours an advocate has not to put in hard work on his study table in his chamber with or without the presence of his clients who may be available for consultation. To put forward his best performance as an advocate he is required to give whole-hearted and full time attention to his profession. Any flinching from such unstinted attention to his legal profession would certainly have an impact on his professional ability and expertise. If he is permitted to simultaneously practise as a doctor then the requirement of his full-time attention to the legal profession is bound to be adversely affected. Consequently however equally dignified may be the profession of a doctor he cannot simultaneously be permitted to practise law which is a full time occupation. It is for ensuring the full time attention of legal practitioners towards their profession and with a view to bringing out their best so that they can fulfill their role as an officer of the court and can give their best in the administration of justice, that the impugned rule has been enacted by the State Legislature. It, therefore, cannot be said that it is in any way arbitrary or that it imposes an unreasonable restriction on the new entrant to the profession who is told not to practice simultaneously any other profession and if he does so to deny to him entry to the legal profession. It is true as submitted by learned Senior Counsel for the appellant that the rule of Central Bar Council does not countenance an advocate simultaneously carrying on any business and it does not expressly frown upon any simultaneous profession. But these are general rules of professional conduct. So far as regulating enrolment to the profession is concerned it is the task entrusted solely to the State Bar Councils by the Legislature as seen earlier while considering the scheme of the Act. While carrying on that task if the entry to the profession is restricted by the State Bar Council by enacting the impugned rule for not allowing any other professional to enter the Bar when he does not want to give up the other profession but wants to carry on the same simultaneously with legal practice, it cannot be said that the Bar Council has by enacting such a rule imposed any unreasonable restriction on the fundamental right of the prospective practitioner who wants to enter the legal profession."

18. When a profession is governed by statutory prescriptions, the right



to practice or giving up of such right, are all matters which will have to be carried out as per the statutory provisions. Under the Travancore-Cochin Medical Practitioners Act, 1953 (for short referred to as 'MP Act of 1953') a Council of Homoeopathic Medicine was created for the erstwhile State of Travancore-Cochin, which now forms part of Kerala. The medical practitioners in the different fields of medicine including Homoeopathy, are entitled to register under the said Act and the list of such practitioners is, as per section 30(1), to be published in the Gazette. Section 30(3) of the MP Act of 1953 creates a presumption that a person whose name is included in the list so published, is a registered practitioner, while a person not so entered in the register is not a registered practitioner.

19. The MP Act of 1953 was replaced by the MP Act 2021, as per which all persons registered under the former statute are deemed to be registered under the latter Act. The MP Act 2021 also prescribes in section 30(1) for the publication of a list of registered medical practitioners in the website, and again, in section 30(3), stipulate that "In any proceeding, it shall be presumed that every person whose name is entered in the list published under subsection (1) is a registered practitioner and that any person whose name is not so entered is not a registered practitioner". Section 31(2) of MP Act 2021 creates a disability for a registered medical practitioner that he/she shall not



follow any other profession without the sanction of the Council concerned as long as his name continues in the register concerned. Section 36 of the MP Act 2021 mandates that no person other than those registered under that Act shall practice or hold himself out directly or by implication as practising any of the fields of medicine mentioned therein, which include Homoeopathy.

20. A perusal of the provisions of the MP Act 2021 especially those referred to above, it is quite evident that, if a person's name is included in the list of registered medical practitioners, he cannot follow any other profession without permission from the Council or without cancelling his registration. Concededly, petitioner's name continues to remain in the list of registered medical practitioners of the State. Such continuance, projects to the world that, petitioner is a medical practitioner. Mere cancellation of the licence to run the Homoeopathy clinic does not satisfy the requirement of the aforementioned provisions of law. Hence, albeit the petitioner's undertaking that she is not practicing the profession of medicine, the requirement of the rules of the Bar Council of Kerala and that of the MP Act 2021 will not be satisfied in the facts of the present case. The spirit of the provisions in rule 2(h) of BCK Rules apart from that of section 30(3), 31(2) and 36 of MP Act 2021 cannot be ignored as it is manifest that, a person should not only be actually practising but should not be entitled to practice the profession of



medicine as of right, unless he has obtained consent from the Council.

21. The contention of the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the above rules framed by the Bar Council of Kerala would apply only after the petitioner enrolls as an Advocate, though impressive on first blush, on a deeper scrutiny it is evident that once the State Bar Council becomes aware about the petitioner's entitlement to practice another profession, they are at liberty, under law, to deny petitioner the right to enrol as an Advocate.

In view of the above discussion, it has to be concluded that a registered medical practitioner of Homoeopathy can be denied permission to enrol as an Advocate unless the registration as a Homoeopath is cancelled. Ext.P17 to the extent it directs the petitioner to produce the cancellation certificate from the Homoeopathic Council does not call for any interference. The reliefs prayed for, including the claim for damages, are without any merit and hence the writ petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
BECHU KURIAN THOMAS
JUDGE**

vps

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 6893 OF 2026

PETITIONER'S/S' EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR ENROLMENT BEARING REGISTRATION NO. 3551/2025/DATE 17-11-2025 ALONG WITH 14 (FOURTEEN) REQUISITE DOCUMENTS
- Exhibit P2 A TRUE COPY OF THE E-MAIL RETRIEVED FROM THE PERSONAL E-MAIL OF THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE ABOVE E-MAIL RECEIVED BY THE PETITIONER ON 13-12-2025 IN HER PERSONAL E-MAIL
- Exhibit P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO BEFORE THE NOTARY ON 05-12-2025 AND SUBMITTED TO BAR COUNCIL OFFICE
- Exhibit P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT-CHAIRMAN
- Exhibit P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE CANCELLATION OF LICENCE ISSUED BY THE KALAMASSERY MUNICIPALITY ON 19-02-2022 IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE E-MAIL SENT BY THE SECRETARY, BAR COUNCIL OF KERALA
- Exhibit P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 03-01-2026 ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY, BAR COUNCIL OF KERALA
- Exhibit P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE E-MAIL SENT ON 07-01-2026 TO THE SECRETARY, BAR COUNCIL IN THE E-MAIL I.D. ENROLMENT@BCKONLINE.ORG RETRIEVED FROM THE PERSONAL MAIL OF THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF NON-INVOLVEMENT IN OFFENCES



- Exhibit P11 A TRUE COPY OF THE ABOVE LETTER DATED 09-01-2026 ALONG WITH THE UNDERTAKING IN FORM NO.6
- Exhibit P12 A TRUE COPY OF THE LIST OF CANDIDATES TO BE ENROLLED ON 10-01-2026
- Exhibit P13 A TRUE COPY OF THE LIST OF CANDIDATES TO BE ENROLLED ON 11-01-2026
- Exhibit P14 THE RESULT STATUS DETAILS FOR AIBE-XX OF THE PETITIONER TAKEN FROM THE ALL INDIA BAR EXAMINATION WEBSITE SHOWS THE RESULTS STATUS OF THE PETITIONER AS 'PASS (UNDERTAKING) '
- Exhibit P15 A TRUE COPY OF THE CANDIDATE RESULT CARD DETAILS FOR AIBE-XX
- Exhibit P16 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION ALONG WITH THE RESULT CARD OF THE ALL INDIA BAR EXAMINATION-XX
- Exhibit P17 A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ENROLMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 01-01-2026