



Reserved on 22.07.2026

Delivered on 28.07.2026

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL WRIT-PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No. - 8 of 2026

Suo Motu Cognizance of Incident Dated 21/07/2026 in the Court
Premises

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Lko.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Suo Moto,
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A., Anupam Mehrotra

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE MANJIVE SHUKLA, J.**

(Per: Rajan Roy, J.)

1. Heard Ms. Abhipsa Mohanty, Ms. Komal Agarwal and Shri Ashutosh Shrivastava, learned counsel, who are the applicants of I.A. No. 08 of 2026 which has been ordered to be registered as a separate Public Interest Litigation, Dr. V.K. Singh, learned Government Advocate assisted by Shri Girijesh Kumar Dwivedi, learned A.G.A.-I and Shri Shivendra Shivam Singh Rathore, State Law Officer (Criminal), Shri S.B. Pandey, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India assisted by Shri Raj Kumar Singh, learned Advocate, Shri Anurag Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing for C.B.I. and Shri Anupam Mehrotra, learned counsel

appearing for Saurabh Kumar Verma. The President and Secretary of the Central Bar Association, Lucknow Shri Akhilesh Jaiswal and Shri Avnish Dixit were present in Court alongwith Dr. L.P. Mishra, learned Advocate.

2. In compliance of our order passed on 21.07.2026 on the application of certain Advocates bearing No.IA/8/2026 which was treated as an application in bunch of writ petitions bearing C.R.L.P. No.8810 of 2023, the District Judge, Lucknow has sent his report in a sealed cover so has the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow. CCTV footage has also been sent by the District Judge, Lucknow. An F.I.R. bearing Case Crime No.0174 of 2026 under Section 109, 191(2), 115(2), 127(2) and 351(3) of B.N.S., 2023 dated 22.07.2026 at about 00:20 hours has already been registered on the application of-Mohd. Shakir-plaintiff No.1 in Suit No.2933 of 2025 copy of which is available and is taken on record.

3. We have perused the CCTV footage sent by the District Judge, Lucknow. The District Judge, Lucknow has also gone through the CCTV footage and has identified the Advocates who are said to have committed the offences as alleged in the F.I.R. and also to have manhandled plaintiff no.1. Identification has been done by concerned court officials as is mentioned in the report of District Judge, Lucknow. The District Judge, Lucknow should send the details i.e. parentage and address of the aforesaid Advocates who have been identified.

4. The Advocates who have been identified are Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma, Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma. On perusal of the CCTV footage as also the video which is in possession of the applicants which we had seen on 21.07.2026, there appear to be other Advocates also present at the time of incident. An exercise for identification of all those who were part of the mob which manhandled the plaintiff No.1 or played a role in the incident will have to be undertaken by the District Judge, Lucknow as also the police authorities. The name of all those persons who are identifiable and their details shall be submitted to this Court on the next date.

5. As of now, Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma, Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma Advocates are seen beating up plaintiff no.1-Mohd. Shakir. Plaintiff No.1-Mohd Shakir is also present before us in pursuance to our order dated 21.07.2026. He has narrated the incident as has happened and how he was thrashed and beaten up by the aforesaid Advocates and their accomplices. He broke down while narrating his version of story and pleaded to the Court with folded hands for justice. He also stated that he was threatened with dire consequences including of being killed if he pursued the suit proceedings in which Saurabh Kumar Verma, Advocate was defendant No.1. He also told us as to how he was beaten up and the injuries which he has sustained. He appeared to be shaken, frightened and visibly in pain. His statement has already been recorded and F.I.R. has been lodged at his behest. Shri Kamlesh Kumar Dixit, Deputy Commissioner of

Police (West), Lucknow says suitable action will be taken against the concerned Advocates and investigation shall proceed as per law. He assures us that investigation would be fair and in accordance with law.

6. On 21.07.2026 certain facts were stated by the applicants before us but in the rush of the proceedings and considering that hearing was taking place in late hours, it could not be recorded in our order of the said date. We now deem it fit to put in on record. We were informed by the applicants that the Advocate-Saurabh Kumar Verma was carrying a gun and was asking one of his accomplices i.e. Advocate Abhay Pratap Verma to place it in the hands of their client-Mohd. Shakir so that he could be framed in a criminal case. Secondly, after being thrashed badly, their client-Mohd. Shakir was taken away to the Central Bar Association, Lucknow and was illegally detained there. It is only after three or four hours later that the applicants were able to contact their client i.e. Mohd. Shakir who told them that he was at Police Station-Wazirganj, Lucknow. The fact that Advocates Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma was carrying a gun was mentioned by the applicants before Hon'ble the Supreme Court in an online mentioning at about 04:00 P.M. on the date of incident i.e. on 21.07.2026.

7. The Commissioner of Police, Lucknow has informed us through his report about an application given by Advocate Harshit Pandey alleging that some person was carrying a firearm, he fired but missed, however, in the report of the police submitted to us it is mentioned that

there is no evidence of any such firearm having been carried or used nor it is seen in the CCTV footage.

8. We asked Shri Anupam Mehrotra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma pointedly as to whether Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma has a licensed firearm, though he had for his assistance Shri Sadiq Hasan, Advocate but, could not give any reply in this regard.

9. Shri Anupam Mehrotra, learned counsel who had put in appearance on behalf of Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma narrated the background to the case. He submitted that a suit was filed by Mohd. Shakir who claims to have been beaten up and is present in Court, bearing Suit No.1317 of 2022 versus one Kamaluddin. He submitted that as per his instructions, Mohd. Shakir was himself an Advocate but in reality he is a property dealer. One Sadiq Hasan, Advocate was present and was instructing Shri Mehrotra. We categorically asked Shri Mehrotra thrice as to whether Mohd. Shakir is an advocate, he said that he has instructions to inform the Court that he is an advocate. We asked Mohd. Shakir, who stated that he is not an Advocate but he is a government employee and is posted in Rajkiya Medical College which is a Super Specialty Hospital in District-Azamgarh, Uttar Pradesh. We took Shri Sadiq Hasan, Advocate who was instructing Shri Mehrotra to task, for giving false instructions and trying to mislead the Court but he immediately retracted and said that he had not given the said instruction. On being confronted, Shri Mehrotra submitted that there appears to be

some communication gap. It is an apparent case of a misleading statement based on false instructions. Of course, Shri Mehrotra is not responsible, for obvious reasons but Shri Hasan or any other person instructing him could be proceeded for this falsehood.

10. On 21.07.2026, we had been informed by the applicants that Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma was an Advocate for one of the parties presumably one of the defendants in the earlier suit which today as informed by Shri Anupam Mehrotra, learned Counsel for Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma bore the number 1317 of 2022 and during pendency of the said suit, purchased the suit property vide a sale deed which appears to be annexed with the subsequent suit filed by Mohd. Shakir. In the subsequent Suit bearing No.2399 of 2025, the said Saurabh Kumar Verma is defendant No.1. In this context, our order dated 21.07.2026 is relevant.

11. Shri Mehrotra further stated that Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma was not an advocate for any of the parties in the earlier Suit bearing No.1317 of 2022 but a wrong impression was given to the Court on 21.07.2026 as if he was. We then confronted the applicants who placed before us a document bearing the signature of Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma. It appears to be some pleading filed in the earlier suit with the signature Saurabh and copy of Aadhar card of Saurabh Kumar Verma. Shri Anupam Mehrotra initially submitted that Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma has no interest in the earlier suit property, however, on being confronted that he should be doubly sure before making such statement, he sought

instructions from the said Shri Sadiq Hasan, Advocate who then informed that Saurabh Kumar Verma had purchased the property. Accordingly, Shri Mehrotra corrected himself.

12. The sale deed by which the said suit property was purchased by Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma is said to be annexed with the subsequent Suit filed by Mohd. Shakir and others bearing Suit No.2933 of 2025. If Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma was an advocate or having a professional engagement in any manner in the earlier suit then he could not have purchased such a property in view of Rule 22A of Chapter II, Part VI of the Bar Council of India Rules, 1975 (Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette), framed under Section 49(1)(c) of the Advocates Act, 1961. Shri Anupam Mehrotra submitted that his client would like respond to the allegations made in the application, a copy of which may be furnished to him. The Office shall furnish a true copy of the application bearing No.IA/8/2026 on which cognizance was taken by us on 21.07.2026 to Shri Anupam Mehrotra, learned Counsel for Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma so that he may respond to the same. Not only, he should respond to the allegations therein but also to those noticed in our order dated 21.07.2026 and what is being observed herein.

13. The documents placed before us by the applicants as referred above which is said to be an application under Order 7 Rule 11 C.P.C. and Order 6 Rule 2 C.P.C. etc., in Suit No.1317 of 2022 wherein it is claimed that Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma had signed the verification clause identifying the deponent and has also annexed and a copy of

Aadhar is also annexed with the said application, is taken on record subject to any objections to be filed in this regard by Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma.

14. The District Judge, Lucknow is directed to seal the records of Suit No.1317 of 2022 and Suit No.2933 of 2025 and send it to this Court. The Senior Registrar of this Court at Lucknow is directed to keep the records of the said suits in sealed cover under his own lock and key and ensure its safety. The said records will be produced before this Court on the next date or as and when required.

15. Shri Anupam Mehrotra also informed that initially a status quo order was passed on 24.12.2025 in Suit No.2933 of 2025 but the same was vacated on 17.01.2026 on an application being filed by Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma. Against the said order a First Appeal from Order was filed by the plaintiffs before the High Court bearing F.A.F.O. No.300 of 2026 which was dismissed on merits on 28.04.2026. He also submitted that filing the second suit, Mohd. Shakir and others had concealed the filing of the first suit, however, we are not concerned with the merits of the suit but we are concerned with the conduct of the Advocates and the incident which took place firstly on 30.04.2026 and then on 21.07.2026 wherein the litigant was prevented from pursuing his case, his lawyers were prevented from filing a Vakalatnama and pursuing the cause of their clients. We need not say much because we have already passed a detailed order on 21.07.2026.

16. Shri Mehrotra submitted that some accomplice of Mohd. Shakir was carrying a firearm and when the Advocates saw it, it is then they pounced upon him and took him to the Central Bar Association, Lucknow and then to the Police Station-Wazeerganj, Lucknow, however, on being asked if one single person assuming it to be so was carrying a firearm but not Mohd. Shakir then why such a huge crowd of Advocates as is visible in the video could do anything to stop him, he submitted that he was able to runaway. The report of the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow says that there is no such evidence, as of now. We do not wish to express any conclusive opinion except that if somebody feels that he can come up with a cock and bull story and get away with it then he is highly mistaken.

17. We have perused the report of District Judge, Lucknow dated 21.07.2026. It is a very detailed report and mentions briefly about the contents of the footage and the events visible therein which clearly indicate an incident of misbehavior, manhandling and beating up of plaintiff No.1-Mohd. Shakir of Suit No.2933 of 2025. The report clearly mentions presence of Advocates in large number. CCTV footage shows Mohd. Shakir being dragged by Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma and others including Shri Abhay Pratap Verma being held by the neck and dragged. The main perpetrator i.e. Saurabh Kumar Verma is said to be Junior Vice-President of the Central Bar Association, Lucknow.

18. When we heard Mohd. Shakir in person and when he broke down narrating his version of the incident as to how he was thrashed black and

blue and dragged to the Central Bar Association, Lucknow, Shri Anupam Mehrotra also appeared to be visibly disturbed and assured us that more than an Advocate he is also a human being and would assist the Court, accordingly.

19. Another person, namely, Shri Saurabh son of Ramdev (not Saurabh Kumar Verma) is seen in the CCTV footage advancing the group of persons indulging in the aforesaid violence who is said to be an attesting witness in the sale deed appended with the suit records of Suit No.2399 of 2025 in favour of Saurabh Kumar Verma. The report of the District Judge, Lucknow towards the end states that the security personnel deployed in the security of District Court campus have neither informed the District Judge nor any other concerned officer of court regarding the aforesaid incident which shows that there was security lapse on the part of security personnel deputed in the court regarding which the District Judge says that a detailed report shall be submitted later.

20. The Commissioner of Police, Lucknow or whosoever is in-charge of security of District Court, Lucknow and supervises the functioning of the security personnel assigned such duties within the campus of District Court, Lucknow needs to inquire into the lapses in this regards as noticed in the report of the District Judge, Lucknow. Why the incident was not reported to the District Judge? Why suitable action was not taken? what were the handicaps? One can understand that within the court campus, the number of lawyers being huge, the police is hesitant to

act but then a solution has to be found in this regard. Such handful of lawyers cannot be allowed to hold the justice delivery system to ransom. Strict measures are required while innocent and sincere lawyers should not be harassed and ill-treated. Those who are adamant to vitiate the atmosphere within the campus or outside have to be dealt with strictly.

21. Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma has as many as eight criminal cases against him in various police stations in Lucknow details of which have been provided by Dr.V.K. Singh, learned Government Advocate which are as under:-

“1. Case Crime No.478/2007 under Section 37/406/411/420/468/471 I.P.C., Police Station-Mahanagar, District Lucknow.

2. Case Crime No.566/2008 under Section 379/411/420/467/468/471 I.P.C., Police Station-Madiaon, District Lucknow.

3. Case Crime No.1021/2017 under Section 406/504/506 I.P.C., Police Station-Madiaon, District Lucknow.

4. Case Crime No.93/2024 under Section 186/188/504 I.P.C., Police Station-Hazratganj, District Lucknow.

5. Case Crime No.92/2025 under Section 115(2)/117(2)/126(2)/191(2)/351(3)/352/74 B.N.S, 2023, Police Station-Vibhuti Khand, District Lucknow.

6. Case Crime No.95/2025 under Section 126(2)/132/189(2)/190/191(2)/223/270/285/292/324(4)/352 B.N.S.,2023 and Section 7 of Criminal Law Amendment Act Police Station-Vibhuti Khand, District Lucknow.

7. Case Crime No.429/2025 under Section 115(2)/191(2)/308(2)/318(4)/324(4)/351(2)/352 B.N.S., 2023, Police Station-Madiaon, District Lucknow.

8. Case Crime No.140/2026 under Section 191(2)/324(4)/329(3)/351(3)/352 B.N.S., 2023 Police Station-Dubagga, District Lucknow.”

22. Such a person is Junior Vice President of the Central Bar Association, Lucknow. While we do not record any conclusive opinion about the guilt of Shri Verma in the aforesaid criminal cases but it is a moot point as to how and why so many criminal cases are lodged against an Advocate. The other person Shri Harshit Pandey who has given the application against Mohd. Shakir has one criminal case against him.

23. It seems that Shri Anupam Mehrotra was not aware of the pendency of eight criminal cases against Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma and on being shown the same, he was also taken aback and said that he will assist the Court to the best of his ability as an officer of the Court.

24. The Director General of Police, Uttar Pradesh and Commissioner of Police, Lucknow shall collect information as regards any other criminal case or F.I.R. filed or pending against the aforesaid Advocates who have been identified and submit details in this regard on affidavit clearly mentioning the status of the said cases. If there are any cases in which reports have been filed in court then as far as possible, the status of the court proceedings would be mentioned.

25. The report of the District Judge, Lucknow has been put back in sealed cover. We have also perused the report of Police Commissioner, Lucknow. It admits to an application having been submitted relating to an incident dated 30.04.2026 in the context of same Suit bearing No.2933 of 2025 in relation to which the subsequent event took place on

21.07.2026. The report very fairly states that the circumstances in which the application was not acted upon any further are a subject matter of inquiry which has been assigned to Assistant Commissioner of Police, Chowk, Lucknow by the Deputy Commissioner of Police (West), Lucknow.

26. We find that in the case at hand, lawyers ran amok freely, abused, humiliated & manhandled a litigant at will, threatened him with dire consequences, as alleged by the applicants and Mohd. Shakir-the informant of the F.I.R. The allegation is that they have cooked up a story to implicate the informant himself. We have already observed that the report of the Police Commissioner says there is no evidence of anybody carrying firearm on the part of the plaintiff or his accomplices nor of its being fired. No such thing is visible in the CCTV footage. The allegations of the applicants during court proceedings was that they are powerful people and will implicate the plaintiffs.

27. The F.I.R. is against Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma, Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma and unknown male and female Advocates numbering about 10 to 20. As already stated earlier it is for the police authorities to identify these 10 or 20 or more, as the case may be, female and male Advocates and make them accountable in law. Any dithering in this regard will not be tolerated. Investigation should be taken to its logical conclusion strictly and in accordance with law without any fear or favour. We will consider the status of the investigation on the next date.

28. Several members of the Bar earlier and on 21.07.2026 have alleged that in District Court, Lucknow there are group of lawyers who act like goons and use their status as Advocates and their influence in the district court premises, to grab property. In this process, they fabricate documents, initiate suit proceedings to facilitate aforesaid grabbing of property. They pressurize the courts also. They prevent the parties in a suit who are against them from putting in appearance through an Advocate and contesting the matter to defend their rights thereby compromising the entire justice delivery system. It is informed at the Bar and as has also been noticed in our earlier orders passed in bunch of petitions leading being C.R.L.P. No.8810 of 2023 that, in District Court, Lucknow there are groups of Advocates who indulge in property delaing and grabbing and in that process also manipulate and influence court proceedings in their favour or in the favour of litigants who approach them and use all means to ensure the same including pressurizing and threatening Advocates from appearing on behalf of the contesting parties and some time attempting to exercise influence upon the court itself by various means. These Advocates create a ruckus in the court room and outside but within the court campus taking advantage of their numbers and aggressive attitude thereby influencing the entire atmosphere adversely in the court campus. We only have to refer to the earlier orders passed by us in a bunch of petitions leading petition being CRLP No.8810 of 2023 on several dates to emphasize the gravity of the situation which is prevailing in District Court at Lucknow. We are conscious that such persons are few and most of the lawyers are sincere

not only to their clients but also to the cause of justice but it is these few black sheep who are more vocal, assertive and dominant. Our earlier orders it seems have not had the desired effect. We have already observed in our earlier orders passed in these bunch of petitions about a possible nexus between the lawyers, police and other powerful persons. How to break this nexus and how to restore sanctity and faith in judicial proceedings is the million dollar question and a humongous task before us. We cannot achieve anything unless the police and all other stakeholders including the Bar Associations and the Advocates put their heads together to stand up against such malpractices to defend the cause of the litigants so that purity which is attached to justice delivery system is restored and maintained. The time for harsh words appears to be over as these have not have had the desired effect. It is now time for action for the police and all other stakeholders who can remedy the situation.

29. We must put in on record that when this case was being taken up, one of the Advocates mentioned that he has filed a P.I.L. on 22.07.2026 where about 200 lawyers trespassed a premises, vandalized and took over the same in the presence of police personnel and the name of Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma also figures among these 200 persons. The said W.P.I.L No.682 of 2026 was taken up on 22.07.2026 and a detailed order has been passed. Several lawyers who reside in the said locality submitted that there is a premises where cricket net practice is being done and it is used for marriage lawn but on account of the aforesaid

presence of hundreds of lawyers who virtually took over the premises, people have stopped going to the said premises.

30. Certain photocopies of photographs have been placed before us showing a property with the name Saurabh Kumar Verma, Advocate and his mobile number mentioned therein which are taken on record. Instructions of the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow which, in fact, is a report addressed to the Chief Standing Counsel for the State for being produced before the Court is already on record but the documents annexed with it are also taken on record. The office shall number the pages of the said documents which are part of the report of Commissioner of Police, Lucknow.

31. We must put it on record at this very stage that while hearing another W.P.I.L. No.682 of 2026 reference of which has been made in the earlier part of this order, it transpired that the brother of Shri Avnish Dixit, Secretary, Central Bar Association, Lucknow, is an accused in the F.I.R. as referred in the aforesaid W.P.I.L. No.682 of 2026. This is quite a disturbing feature.

32. The aforesaid Advocates shall be arrayed as opposite parties herein. Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma is already represented by Shri Anupam Mehrotra, Advocate. Notices shall be served upon Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma through the District Judge, Lucknow, who can take the services of the President of

the Central Bar Association, Lucknow in this regard, if not, then through the police concerned.

33. The aforesaid Advocates, namely Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma, Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma shall respond to the allegations against them as contained in the application dated 21.07.2026, and as noticed in our order dated 21.07.2026 and hereinabove. Copy of the said application dated 21.07.2026 shall be transmitted to them. The orders of course are in public domain and can be seen by them.

34. The Bar Council of the India, New Delhi through its Chairman/Secretary, U.P. Bar Council, Prayagraj through its Chairman/Secretary be impleaded as opposite parties in these Suo Motu proceedings. Union of India through Ministry of Home and the Ministry of Law and Justice through its Secretary should also be impleaded separately as opposite parties by Office of this Court. Shri S.B. Pandey, learned Senior Advocate & D.S.G.I. assisted by Shri Raj Kumar Singh, Advocate are present in Court. The Director General of Police, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow shall also be impleaded as an opposite party so will the Commissioner of Police, Police Commissionerate Lucknow, the Deputy Commissioner of Police (West), Police Commissionerate Lucknow and the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Chowk, Police Commissionerate Lucknow, the Station House Officer, Police Station-Wazeerganj, Police Commissionerate Lucknow. Office to do the needful

35. The President and Secretary of Central Bar Association, Lucknow namely-Shri Akhilesh Jaiswal and Shri Avnish Dixit are present in Court. Let the Central Bar Association, Lucknow be impleaded through its President.

36. Shri Anurag Kumar Singh, learned Counsel for the Central Bureau of Investigation is present in the other petitions in the bunch, his name shall be shown in the Suo Motu proceedings also for assistance in future, if required.

37. Let the Principal Chief Commissioner, Income Tax Department, Lucknow be also impleaded as an opposite party in these proceedings by the office and notice be given to the Counsel for the Income Tax Department as the presence of the said officer as a party may be necessary in future.

38. The defendants other than the defendant No.1 in Suit No.2933 of 2025 shall also be arrayed herein as opposite parties by the Office and notices shall be issued to them on their address as mentioned in the plaint as we also have to consider the prayer for transfer of the suit proceedings elsewhere considering the influence exercised by the defendant No.1 and others.

39. In view of the discussion already made, we further order as under:-

“The aforesaid Advocates, if they are income tax payees shall file copies of their Income Tax Returns filed by them in the last ten years. They shall also give details of their family members who are alive i.e. father, mother, sister, brother, son and daughter. The aforesaid Advocates shall also furnish details of assets and businesses, if any, in their name and those in the name of their family members as mentioned hereinabove. If they have sold off/leased out/gifted any property within the last five years or if they do so now, then they shall furnish the details of said transactions also. Similarly, if any such property in the name of their family members has been sold in the past five years or is sold/leased/gifted hereinafter, details whereof shall also be disclosed by them in their affidavit as this is necessary to make an assessment of the activities of these Advocates. In future, we may consider whether this inquiry into assets is required to be expanded.”

40. The reason for the aforesaid order or direction is contained in the observations made by us earlier in our order dated 21.07.2026 and the orders passed in a bunch of writ petitions leading petition being C.R.L.P. No.8810 of 2023 wherein similar issues are engaging our attention wherein it was alleged that certain Advocates are earning huge sums of money through illegal means or through means other than the legal profession. They have amassed this wealth overnight or within a very short span leading to a strong suspicion that they are engaged in activities other than the legal profession possibly dealing with property etc. In this case also the allegation is of attempt to grab property. We are not forming any conclusive opinion about any of the Advocates but considering the nature of the allegations, we would certainly like to probe as to what is the financial status of these Advocates.

41. We, therefore, need to set the house in order and have to take some stern action. Several orders have already been passed by us in this regard in the bunch of writ petitions leading petition C.R.L.P. No.8810 of 2023. We need to identify the black sheep and make them accountable at the earliest, we, however, hasten to add that our order should not be construed to mean nor should it be made the basis for harassment or ill treatment of any innocent and well meaning Advocate, who himself deserves to be protected as he appears to be visibly afraid against the might of these handful of aggressive Advocates.

42. The aforesaid Advocates, who are already represented or to whom notices have been issued, shall also give details of all civil cases where they are either parties or are appearing as Advocates on behalf of the contesting parties. This is necessary in view of the allegations against them that they indulge in land and property grabbing and also use court proceedings for the said purposes, so that we may find out the truth and have a better picture before us.

43. The local office of the Intelligence Bureau of the Central Government at Lucknow which as informed by Shri S.B. Pandey, learned D.S.G.I. is headed by an officer of the rank of Joint Director shall get a discreet inquiry conducted with regard to the antecedents and activities of the aforesaid Advocates and the result thereof shall be presented in the form of a report to this Court in a sealed cover, if possible, by the next date of listing. Shri S.B. Pandey, learned D.S.G.I. shall do the needful in this regard.

44. The applicants have offered to identify the District Court's personnel referred in the order dated 21.07.2026. The District Judge, Lucknow shall do the needful to facilitate the same and take appropriate action in this regard. A report shall be submitted by him in this regard also by the next date.

45. We have also gone through a recent judgment by a Single Judge Bench of this Court at Allahabad dated 03.06.2026 in exercise of his powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India bearing Matters under Article 227 No.12231 of 2025.

46. Considering the gravity of the situation, we will not be bound by technicalities and procedural niceties as we need to ensure that order and not chaos prevails in the District Court Campus, Lucknow and the courts are able to render justice unhindered without any obstruction and interference from any quarter. The litigants should feel safe to enter into the portals of the District Court at Lucknow.

47. On the next date if we find that the eight criminal cases pending against Shri Saurabh Kumar Verma are under investigation at Lucknow or are pending in any court, we will consider transferring the same to other districts. Similarly, if there are cases pending against other Advocates involved in these incidents or in the incidents referred in any of the petitions which are part of this bunch we will consider this aspect in respect to them also.

48. The Special Cell created under our orders passed in C.R.P.L. No.8810 of 2023 headed by the Joint Commissioner of Police, Lucknow shall also submit a report as to whether there are any other complaints against the aforesaid Advocates. The District Judge, Lucknow shall also submit a report in this regard so will the Counsel for the U.P. Bar Council and the Counsel for the Bar Council of India.

49. From the facts and material on record before us prima facie a case of gross professional misconduct, abuse of process of law, gross interference with due course of judicial proceedings, interference and obstruction in the administration of justice has occurred for which the aforesaid Advocates mentioned in this order appear to be liable.

50. Considering what has been noticed by us in our earlier order dated 21.07.2026 and in this order especially the material before us in the form video footage which we had seen on 21.07.2026 a copy of which is available which shall be placed on record suitably, the CCTV footage sent by the District Judge, Lucknow, the report of the District Judge, Lucknow in this regard, the report of the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow, the gravity of the allegations against the Advocates, who have been identified as of now, we are constrained to order that Shri Saurabh Verma or Saurabh Kumar Verma, Shri Harshit Pandey, Shri Yash Pandey and Shri Abhay Pratap Verma are prohibited from entering any Court premises in District Lucknow till the next date of listing. This order, however, shall not come in their way in appearing in these proceedings on the date fixed, if they so choose. This order will also not come in their

way if they have to appear or are to be produced in any court in connection with any criminal case, as per law.

51. As regards the criminal offence an F.I.R. has already been registered and the Deputy Commissioner of Police (West), Lucknow has assured us about fair investigation and that appropriate action would be taken as per law.

52. Considering the nature of allegations and the fact that such activities of land grabbing or influencing court proceedings etc., has been undertaken in an organized manner, we may refer to Section 111 of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 pertaining to organized crime. It is for the police authorities to see as to how far the said provisions or other similar provisions are attracted in a given case such as the one at hand and the one which is the subject matter of the W.P.I.L. No.682 of 2026 filed separately on 22.07.2026 wherein about 200 Advocates are alleged to have taken over a premises management of which was disputed.

53. As Mohd. Shakir-plaintiff No.1 of Suit No.2933 of 2025 is present before us, is at security risk, therefore, we direct the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Azamgarh, Uttar Pradesh to provide him adequate security at Azamgarh, Uttar Pradesh until further orders. The Commissioner of Police, Lucknow to coordinate with Senior Superintendent of Police, District Azamgarh in this regard. The Government Advocate, Dr. V.K. Singh to communicate this order to

Senior Superintendent of Police, District Azamgarh for compliance and necessary action.

54. List this case on 24.08.2026 alongwith C.R.L.P. No.8810 of 2023 and other connected matters showing the name of Shri Kushagra Dixit, Advocate as Counsel for the Income Tax Department.

(Manjive Shukla,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

July 28, 2026

-Piyush-/Shanu