

## INDEX

Sr. No.	Parties	Relevant Para
<b><i>Bar Council Rules on Professional Conduct and Etiquette</i></b>		
1.	Bar Council of India Rules, Chapter II – <b>Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette</b> Rules under section 49(1)(c), Advocates Act, 1961	Section I – Duty to court <i>Rules 1 to 10</i>  Section II – Duty to Client <i>Rules 11 to 33</i>  Section III – Duty to Opponent <i>Rules 34 &amp; 35</i>  Section IV – <b>Duty to Colleagues</b> <i>Rules 36 to 44B</i>  Section V – Duty in Imparting Training <i>Rule 45</i>  Section VI – Duty to Render Legal Aid <i>Rule 46</i>  Section VII – Restriction on Other Employments <i>Rules 47 to 52</i>
2.	District Bar Association v. Ishwar Shandilya <b>2020 SCC OnLine SC 244</b>	10, 11, 12
3.	Harish Uppal (Ex-Capt.) v. Union of India <b>(2003) 2 SCC 45</b>	20, 21, 34-36
<b><i>Professional Misconduct and Unethical Practices</i></b>		
4.	Harish Chander Singh v. S.N. Tripathi, <b>(1997) 9 SCC 694</b> <i>Duping Client by misusing his confidence</i>	8
5.	P.D. Khandekar v. Bar Council of Maharashtra, <b>(1984) 2 SCC 556</b> <i>Improper legal advice</i>	7, 8, 10, 19
6.	C.D. Sekkizhar v. Secretary, Bar Council, <b>1966 SCC OnLine Mad 181</b> <i>Advertising profession</i>	Page 154
7.	S.J. Chaudhary v. State (Delhi Admn.), <b>(1984) 1 SCC 722</b> <i>Failure to appear in court after accepting brief: Breach of professional duty</i>	3

8.	Harish Chander Singh v. S.N. Tripathi, <b>(1997) 9 SCC 694</b> <i>Duping Client by misusing his confidence</i>	8
9	Deepak Kansal v. The Registrar General of the High Court of Judicature at Madras (2019) 16 SC 407 <i>Advocate not to cast aspersions on Registry on Hon'ble Court</i>	
10	V.C. Rangadurai vs. D. Gopalan 1979 SCR (1) 1054 <i>Lawyer to disclose conflict of interest to client</i>	
11	Byram Pestonji Gariwal vs. Union Bank of India (1992) 1 SCC 31 <i>Lawyer cannot act without client's authority</i>	
12	Narain Pandey vs. Pannalal Pandey (2013) 11 SCC 435 <i>Lawyer cannot act without client's authority</i>	
<b>Scope and Ambit of Misconduct</b>		
13	Noratanmal Chaurasia vs. M. R. Murli (2004) 5 SCC 689	
14	Shambhuram Yadav vs. Hanumandas Khatri AIR 2001 SC 2509	
15	NG Dastane vs. Shrikant S. Shivde AIR 2001 SC 2028	
16	Central Bureau of Hyderabad vs. K. Narayan Rao (2012) 9 SCC 512	
17	State of Punjab v. Ram Singh AIR 1992 SC 2188	
<b>Misconduct arising out of Advocate's Fees</b>		
18	Rajendra Pai vs. Alex Fernandes AIR 2002 SC 1808	
19	D.S. Dalal v. State Bank of India AIR 1993 SC 1608	
20	L.C. Goyal v. Suresh Joshi AIR 1999 SC 2222	
21	R.D. Saxena vs. Balram Prasad Sharma (2000) 7 SCC 264 <i>Advocate do not have lien for his fees</i>	
22	John D'souza v. Edward Ani 1994 (2) SCC 64 <i>Advocate do not have lien for his fees</i>	
<b>Punishment for Misconduct under BCI Rules</b>		
23	Narain Pandey vs. Pannalal Pandey (2013) 11 SCC 435	
24	Harish Chandra Tiwari vs. Baiju 2002 (2) SCC 67	

25	Hikmat Ali Khan vs. Ishwar Prasad Arya AIR 1997 SC 464	
26	R.K. Anand vs. Registrar, Delhi High Court (29.07.2009 - SC) (2009) 8 SCC 106	
27	Mahipal Singh Rana vs. State of UP (2016)8SCC335	
28	R Muthu Krishnanan vs. RG of High Court of Judicature of Madras (2019) 16 SCC 407.	
<b><u>Disciplinary Proceedings under BCI</u></b>		
29	Bar Council of Andhra Pradesh vs. Karupati Satyanarayana AIR 2003 SC 178	
30	Bar Council of Maharashtra vs. V. Dabholkar and Ors. (1975) 2 SCC 702	
<b><u>Lawyers Strike is Contempt</u></b>		
31	Common Cause, A Registered Society v. Union of India, <b>(2006) 9 SCC 304</b> <i>Bar Council's power to take action against strike.</i>	2-4
32	District Bar Association Dehradun v. Ishwar Shandilya, <b>2021 SCC OnLine SC 1071</b> <i>Bar Council or Bar Association cannot permit calling of a meeting for purposes of considering a call for strike.</i>	3, 5
33	Krishnakant Tamrakar v. State of M.P. <b>(2018) 17 SCC 27</b>	42-51
34	Mahabir Prasad Singh v. Jacks Aviation (P) Ltd. <b>(1999) 1 SCC 37</b>	2,16,18
35	Hussain v. Union of India, <b>(2017) 5 SCC 702</b> <i>Lawyer's strike and suspension of court – Illegal.</i>	27,
36	Praveen Pandey v. State of M.P., <b>2018 SCC OnLine MP 281</b> <i>State Bar Council's call to strike – illegal</i>	18 to 21
<b><u>Role &amp; Responsibility of Amicus Curiae</u></b>		
37	Anokhilal v. State of M.P. <b>(2019) 20 SCC 196</b> <i>guidelines for appointment of amicus curiae</i>	31-31.4
38	Mukesh v. State (NCT of Delhi) <b>(2016) 14 SCC 416</b>	2
39	Mohd. Sukur Ali v. State of Assam, <b>(2011) 4 SCC 729</b>	5 and 17 (pg. 730 and 733),

<b>Bar Council Rules on Advertising &amp; Solicitation</b>		
41	<b>Rule 36, Section IV, BCI Rules:</b> (amended in 2008 by Resolution No. 50/2008)	The said amendment allows 5 pieces of information to be advertised on the internet i.e. –  (1) name of the firm, (2) address, telephone number s and email id, (3)(a) enrolment number, (b) date of enrolment, (c) name of State Bar Council where originally enrolled, (d) name of the State Bar Council on whose roll name stands currently, (e) name of the Bar Association of which the advocate is a member; (4) professional qualifications and academic qualifications &; (5) areas of practice.
42	<b>Rule 36, r/w S. 49(1)(c), Advocates Act, 1961:</b>	“Lawyers are not conferred with the right to advertise and publicize their work, with the aim to solicit clients.”
<b>Judgements on Advertisement and Solicitation</b>		
43	Bar Council of Maharashtra v. M. V. Dabholkar <b>(1976) 2 SCC 291</b> <i>Commercial procurement could vulgarize the legal profession</i>	6, 19, 20, 22
44	Government Pleader v. S.A. Pleader, <b>1929 SCC OnLine Bom 128</b> <i>Sending postcards amounts to advertisement</i>	6, 7
45	‘A’ an Advocate, In re, <b>1962 Supp (1) SCR 288</b> <i>Advocate soliciting – unworthy of the profession</i>	2, 4, 5
46	Rajendra V. Pai v. Alex Fernandes, <b>(2002) 4 SCC 212</b>	3
<b>Advertisement, a part of Right Freedom of Speech</b>		
47	Tata Press Ltd. v. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., <b>(1995) 5 SCC 139</b>	17, 18, 25
<b>Advocate and Contempt</b>		
48	Supreme Court Bar Association vs. Union of India (UOI) and Ors. (1998 ) 4 SCC 409	

49	Bar Council of India vs. High Court of Kerala (2004 ) 6 SCC 311	
50	Pravin C Shah vs. KA Mohd. (2001)8SCC650	
51	In re: Vinay Chandra Misra (1995)2SCC584 Inter-relation between Article 129 and Article 142	