

News

Once more, the Supreme Court disapproves of senior advocates showing up during court holidays.



The Court has often called on senior advocates to resign so that junior attorneys have more chances to present their arguments during court holidays.

On Monday, the Supreme Court voiced its dissatisfaction of senior attorneys showing up during court vacations, stating that it has already disapproved of the practice [**Arvind Dham v. Directorate of Enforcement**].

Following Senior Advocate **Mukul Rohatgi's** appearance today on behalf of Amtek Group promoter Arvind Dham, a vacation bench consisting of Justices **Sandeep Mehta** and **Prasanna B. Varale** made the observation.

Dham has applied for temporary bail in relation to a case involving money laundering.

"We don't understand why senior counsel would show up while on vacation. In reference to Rohatgi's involvement in the case, the Court made an oral statement during the hearing that read, "This Court has often commented on that."

The Supreme Court has previously advised senior attorneys to avoid appearing before the highest court during its court holidays.

A bench consisting of Justices **Vikram Nath and Ahsanuddin Amanullah** stated in June 2023 that advocates-on-record (AoRs) or instructing lawyers should be allowed to discuss and debate issues during the Court's summer vacation.

A bench consisting of Justices **PS Narasimha and Sanjay Karol** stated in May of last year that senior counsel ought to allow junior members of the bar to present arguments during court holidays.

"We want the younger bar to grow, that is all; vacation was meant (to be an opportunity) only for the younger people," Justice Karol had said at the time.

When a bench of Justices **BV Nagarathna and SC Sharma** stated last month that senior attorneys should not argue cases during the summer break, this was once more reaffirmed.

The Court today, however, questioned why Senior Advocate Rohatgi had come to present a matter while the court was on vacation. But in the end, Rohatgi's brief submissions were heard.

Rohatgi argued that the petitioner had been detained for eleven months and that the Delhi High Court had been considering his regular bail request since February 2025.

In response, the Court noted that a three-judge bench had already rejected a similar plea.

"All those arguments—the petitioner's strategies don't impress us at all. A three-judge panel of this court rejected your SLP. You are now attempting to enter during this vacation and seek the same relief in a case that has already been rejected," said Justice Mehta.

Rohatgi asked for permission to withdraw the petition as the Court started dictating its ruling. The plea was withdrawn after the court granted the motion.