



\$~93

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 4237/2026

ANJU TANWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Mehra, Advocate along  
with petitioner in person.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT  
COMMITTEE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **30.03.2026**

1. From a bare perusal of the Minutes of Meeting of the Chamber Allotment Committee ('CAC'), it emerges that the Chamber No. 570 was allotted in the name of Mr. Rabinder Mohanty i.e., respondent no.3 and Mr. Rajesh Nayan i.e., respondent no. 2.

2. It appears from the record that the petitioner was allowed to use the aforesaid Chamber as an associate of Mr. Rajesh Nayan. The CAC, therefore, rightly concluded that the petitioner was merely a permissive user of the Chamber. The Court further concurs with the view taken by the CAC that in the absence of there being any policy/rule/regulation entitling the petitioner, there is no vested right in favour of the petitioner to use the Chamber. The Court is unable to interfere with the decision taken by the CAC.



3. Insofar as the submission that the petitioner has paid certain amounts to the original allottees is concerned, if the petitioner so desires, she may undertake an appropriate remedies for recovery of the said amount and/or damages etc. The said aspect cannot be looked into by this Court in exercise of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Even otherwise, it be noted that the original allottees were not empowered to sub-let the Chamber.

4. With respect to Prayer 'b', made in the instant petition, the CAC to look into the said grievance and if the CAC finds that the original allottees of Chamber No. 570 have violated any of the applicable terms and conditions, then the necessary consequences shall follow.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**MARCH 30, 2026**

aks