



RAMA UNIVERSITY

www.ramauniversity.ac.in

FACULTY OF JURIDICAL SCIENCES

SUBJECT: Professional Ethics and
Professional Accounting System

SUBJECT CODE: BAL 704/BBL704/ LL.B. 503

LECTURE: 29

NAME OF FACULTY: Ms. Anjali Dixit

Assistant Professor

Lecture-29



Contempt of Court As Misconduct

LECTURE 29 : Contempt of Court As Misconduct

Contempt of Court As Misconduct

In the recent case of *B. M. Verma v. Utrakhnad Regulatory Commission* court noted that, it was given the wide powers available with a Court exercising contempt jurisdiction. In the case of *Court of Its Own Motion v. State* dealing with the contempt proceedings involving two senior advocates, observed that 'given the wide powers available with a Court exercising contempt jurisdiction, it cannot afford to be hypersensitive and therefore, a trivial misdemeanor would not warrant contempt action. Circumspection is all the more necessary because as observed by the SC in *SC Bar Association v. Union of India* the Court is in effect the jury, the judge and the hangman; while in *M.R. Parashar H. L. Sehgal* it was observed that the Court is also a prosecutor *Anil Kumar Sarkar v. Hirak Ghosh*, reiterates this.

In the most controversial and leading case of *R.K. Anand v. Registrar of Delhi High Court*, On 30th May, 2007 a TV news channel NDTV carried a report relating to a sting operation. The report concerned itself with the role of a defence lawyer and the Special Public Prosecutor in an ongoing Sessions trial in what is commonly called the BMW case. On 31st May, 2007 a Division Bench of this Court, on its own motion, registered a writ Petition and issued a direction to the Registrar General to collect all materials that may be available in respect of the telecast and also directed NDTV to preserve the original material including the CD/video pertaining to the sting operation. The question for our consideration is whether Mr. R.K. Anand and Mr. I.U. Khan, Senior Advocates and Mr. Sri Bhagwan Sharma, Advocate have committed criminal contempt of Court or not. It was observed that prima facie their acts and conduct were intended to subvert the administration of justice in the pending BMW case and in particular to influence the outcome of the pending judicial proceedings. Accordingly, in exercise of powers conferred by Article 215 of the Constitution proceedings for contempt of Court (as defined in Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971) were initiated against Mr. Anand, Mr. Khan and Mr. Sri Bhagwan Sharma and they were asked to show cause why they should not be punished accordingly. Court said that Courts of law are structured in such a design as to evoke respect and reverence for the majesty of law and justice. The machinery for dispensation of justice according to law is operated by the court. Proceedings inside the courts are always expected to be held in a dignified and orderly manner. The very sight of an advocate, who was found guilty of contempt of court on the previous hour, standing in the court and arguing a case or cross-examining a witness on the same day, unaffected by the contemptuous behaviour he hurled at the court, would erode the dignity of the court and even corrode the majesty of it besides impairing the confidence of the public in the efficacy of the institution of the courts. This necessitates vesting of power with the HC to formulate rules for regulating the proceedings inside the court including the conduct of advocates during such proceedings. That power should not be confused with the right to practise law. Thus court held that there may be ways in which conduct and actions of an advocate may pose a real and imminent threat to the purity of court proceedings cardinal to any court's functioning, apart from constituting a substantive offence and contempt of court and professional misconduct. In such a situation the court does not only have the right but also the obligation to protect itself. Hence, to that end it can bar the advocate from appearing before the courts for an appropriate period of time. In the present case since

the contents of the sting recordings were admitted and there was no need for the proof of integrity and correctness of the electronic materials. Finally the Supreme Court upheld High Court's verdict making Anand guilty on the same count. On the other hand, the Supreme Court let off I U Khan, who was found guilty by the High Court.

Attempt of Murder:

In the case of Hikmat Ali khan v. Ishwar Prasad Arya and ors, Ishwar Prasad Arya, respondent No. 1, was registered as an advocate with the Bar Council of Uttar Pradesh and was practising at Badaun. An incident took place on May 18, 1971 during lunch interval at about 1.55 p.m., in which respondent No. 1 assaulted his opponent Radhey Shyam in the Court room of Munsif/Magistrate, Bisauli at Badaun with a knife. A pistol shot is also said to have been fired by him at the time of incident. After investigation he was prosecuted for offences under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of the Arms Act. The 1st Temporary Civil and Sessions Judge, by his judgment dated July 3, 1972, convicted him of the said offence and sentenced him to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years for the offence under Section 307, I.P.C. and for a period of nine months for offence under Section 25 of the Arms Act.

On the basis of the said complaint disciplinary proceedings were initiated against respondent No. 1 by the Bar Council of U.P. he was found guilty of gross professional mis-conduct by taking the benefit himself of a forged and fabricated document which had been prepared at his behest. The Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of U.P. directed that respondent No. 1 be debarred from practising as an advocate for a period of two years from the date of the service of the order. Respondent No. 1 filed an appeal, the said appeal was allowed by the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of India by order dated June 8, 1984 and the order of the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of U.P. dated January 30, 1982 was set aside on the view that there was no material on the basis of which it could reasonably be held that respondent No. 1 had prepared the document which was subsequently found forged. Further the submission of Shri Markendaya was that having regard to the gravity of the misconduct of respondent No. 1 in assaulting his opponent in the Court room with a knife and his having been committed the offence under Section 307, I.P.C. and his being sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years in connection with the said incident, the punishment of removal of the name of respondent No. 1 from the roll of advocates should have been imposed on him and that the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of U. P. was in error in imposing the light punishment of debarring respondent No. 1 from practising as an advocate for a period of three years only and that this was a fit case in which the appeal filed by the appellant should have been allowed by the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of India. It was held that the acts of mis-conduct found established are serious in nature. Under Sub-section (3) of Section 35 of the Act the Disciplinary Committee of the State Bar Council is empowered to pass an order imposing punishment on an advocate found guilty of professional or other mis-conduct. Such punishment can be reprimand [Clause (b)], suspension from practice for a certain period [Clause (c)] and removal of the name of the advocate from the State roll of advocate [Clause (d)], depending on the gravity of the mis-conduct found established. The punishment of removal of the name from the roll of advocates is called for where the misconduct is such as to show that the advocate is unworthy of remaining in the profession. In this context, it may be pointed out that under Section 24(A) of the Act a person who is convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude is disqualified for being admitted as an advocate on the State roll of advocates. This means that the conduct involving conviction of an offence involving moral turpitude which would disqualify a person from being enrolled as an advocate has to be

considered a serious misconduct when found to have been committed by a person who is enrolled as an advocate and it would call for the imposition of the punishment of removal of the name of the advocate from the roll of advocates. In the instant case respondent No. 1 has been convicted of the offence of attempting to commit murder punishable under Section 307, IPC. He had assaulted his opponent in the Court room with a knife. The gravity of the mis-conduct committed by him is such as to show that he is unworthy of remaining in the profession. The said mis-conduct, therefore, called for the imposition of the punishment of removal of the name of respondent No. 1 from the State roll of advocates and the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of U. P., in passing the punishment of debarring respondent No. 1 from practising for a period of three years, has failed to take note of gravity of the misconduct committed by respondent No. 1. Having regard to the facts of the case the proper punishment to be imposed on respondent No. 1 under Section 35 of the Act should have been to direct the removal of his name from the State roll of advocates. The appeal filed by the appellant, therefore, deserves to be allowed. Finally court held that the respondents name should be removed from the rolls.

Misbehaviour As Misconduct

Vinay chandra mishra, in re; In this case a senior advocate in on being asked a question in the court started to shout at the judge and said that no question could have been put to him. He threatened to get the judge transferred or see that impeachment motion is brought against him in Parliament. He further said that he has turned up many Judges and created a good scene in the Court. He asked the judge to follow the practice of this Court. He wanted to convey that admission is as a course and no arguments are heard, at this stage. But this act was not only the question of insulting of a Judge of this institution but it is a matter of institution as a whole. In case dignity of Judiciary is not being maintained then where this institution will stand. The concerned judge wrote a letter informing the incident to the chief justice of India. A show cause notice was issued to him.

Whether the advocate had committed a professional misconduct? Is he guilty of the offence of the criminal contempt of the Court for having interfered with and obstructed the course of justice by trying to threaten, overawe and overbear the Court by using insulting, disrespectful and threatening language, and convict him of the said offence. Since the contemner is a senior member of the Bar and also adorns the high offices such as those of the Chairman of the Bar Council of India, the President of the U.P. HC Bar Association, Allahabad and others, his conduct is bound to infect the members of the Bar all over the country. We are, therefore, of the view that an exemplary punishment has to be meted out to him. Thus the contemner Vinay Chandra Mishra is hereby sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of six weeks and he shall stand suspended from practising as an advocate for a period of three years.

Strike As Misconduct

Ex-capt. Harish uppal V. Union of India, Several Petitions raise the question whether lawyers have a right to strike and/or give a call for boycotts of Court/s. The petitioners submitted that strike as a mean for collective bargaining is recognised only in industrial disputes. He submitted that lawyers who are officers of the Court cannot use strikes as a means to blackmail the Courts or the clients. He submitted that the Courts must take action against the Committee members for giving such calls on the basis that they have committed contempt of court. He submitted that the law is that a lawyer who has accepted a Vakalat on behalf of a client must attend Court and if he does not attend Court it would amount to professional misconduct and also contempt of court. He submitted that Court should now frame rules whereby the

Courts regulate the right of lawyers to appear before the Court. He submitted that Courts should frame rules whereby any lawyer who mis-conducts himself and commits contempt of court by going on strike or boycotting a Court will not be allowed to practice in that Court. He further submitted that abstention from work for the redressal of a grievance should never be resorted to where other remedies for seeking redressal are available. He submitted that all attempts should be made to seek redressal from the concerned authorities. He submitted that where such redressal is not available or not forthcoming, the direction of the protest can be against that authority and should not be misdirected, e.g., in cases of alleged police brutalities Courts and litigants should not be targeted in respect of actions for which they are in no way responsible. He agreed that no force or coercion should be employed against lawyers who are not in agreement with the “strike call” and want to discharge their professional duties. Respondent submitted that lawyers had a right to go on strike or give a call for boycott. He further submitted that there are many occasions when lawyers require to go, on strike or gave a call for boycott. He submitted that this Court laying down that going on strike amounts to misconduct is of no consequence as the Bar Councils have been vested with the power to decide whether or not an Advocate has committed misconduct. He submitted that this Court cannot penalise any Advocate for misconduct as the power to discipline is now exclusively with the Bar Councils. He submitted that it is for the Bar Councils to decide whether strike should be resorted to or not. Petitioner further relied on the case of Lt. Col. S.J. Chaudhary v. State (Delhi Administration), the HC had directed that a criminal trial go on from day to day. Before this Court it was urged that the Advocates were not willing to attend day to day as the trial was likely to be prolonged. It was held that it is the duty of every advocate who accepts a brief in a criminal case to attend the trial day to day. It was held that a lawyer would be committing breach of professional duties if he fails to so attend. In the case of K. John Koshy and Ors. v. Dr. Tarakeshwar Prasad Shaw, one of the questions was whether the Court should refuse to hear a matter and pass an Order when counsel for both the sides were absent because of a strike call by the Bar Association. This Court held that the Court could not refuse to hear the matter as otherwise it would tantamount to Court becoming a privy to the strike. Considering the sanctity of the legal profession the court had relied on words said in case of “In Indian Council of Legal Aid and Advice v. Bar Council of India, the SC observed thus : “It is generally believed that members of the legal profession have certain social obligations, e.g., to render “pro bono publico” service to the poor and the underprivileged. Since the duty of a lawyer is to assist the court in the administration of justice, the practice of law has a public utility flavour and, therefor, an advocate must strictly and scrupulously abide by the Code of Conduct behoving the noble profession and must not indulge in any activity which may tend to lower the image of the profession in society. That is why the functions of the Bar Council include the laying down of standards of professional conduct and etiquette which advocates must follow to maintain the dignity and purity of the profession.” In Re: Sanjeev Datta, the SC has stated thus: “The legal profession is a solemn and serious occupation. It is a noble calling and all those who belong to it are its honourable members. Although the entry to the profession can be had by acquiring merely the qualification of technical competence, the honour as a professional has to be maintained by its members by their exemplary conduct both in and outside the Court. The legal profession is different from other professions in that what the lawyers do, affects not only an individual but the administration of justice which is the foundation of the civilised society. Both as a leading member of the intelligentsia of the society and as a responsible citizen, the lawyer has to conduct himself as a model for others both in his professional and in his private and public life. The society has a right to expect of him such ideal behavior. It must not be forgotten that the legal profession has always been held in high esteem and its members have played an enviable role in public life. The regard for the legal and judicial systems in this

country is in no small measure due to the tireless role played by the stalwarts in the profession to strengthen them. They took their profession seriously and practice it with dignity, deference and devotion. If the profession is to survive, the judicial system has to be vitalised. No service will be too small in making the system efficient, effective and credible.” In the case of SC Bar Association v. Union of India, it has been held that professional misconduct may also amount to Contempt of Court. It has further been held as follows: “An Advocate who is found guilty of contempt of court may also, as already noticed, be guilty of professional misconduct in a given case but it is for the Bar Council of the State or Bar Council of India to punish that advocate by either debarring him from practice or suspending his licence, as may be warranted, in the facts and circumstances of each case. The learned Solicitor General informed us that there have been cases where the Bar Council of India taking note of the contumacious and objectionable conduct of an advocate, had initiated disciplinary proceedings against him and even punished him for “professional misconduct”, on the basis of his having been found guilty of committing contempt of court.”

Solicitation of Professional Work

Rajendra V. Pai V. Alex Fernandes and Ors. Court held that debarring a person from pursuing his career for his life is an extreme punishment and calls for caution and circumspection before being passed. No doubt probity and high standards of ethics and morality in professional career particularly of an advocate must be maintained and cases of proved professional misconduct severely dealt with; yet, we strongly feel that the punishment given to the appellant in the totality of facts and circumstances of the case is so disproportionate as to prick the conscience of the Court. Undoubtedly, the appellant should not have indulged into prosecuting or defending a litigation in which he had a personal interest in view of his family property being involved.

Breach of Trust By Misappropriating The Asset Of Client

Harish Chandra Tiwari v. Baiju; Court held on these facts, Appellant Harish Chandra Tiwari was enrolled as an advocate with the Bar Council of the State of UP in May 1982 and has been practising since then, mainly in the courts at Lakhimpur Kheri District in UP. Respondent Baiju engaged the delinquent advocate in a land acquisition case in which the respondent was a claimant for compensation. The Disciplinary Committee has described the respondent as “an old, helpless, poor illiterate person.” Compensation of Rs. 8118/- for the acquisition of the land of the said Baiju was deposited by the State in the court. Appellant applied for releasing the amount and as per orders of the court he withdrew the said amount on 2.9.1987. But he did not return it to the client to whom it was payable nor did he inform the client about the receipt of the amount. Long thereafter, when the client came to know of it and after failing to get the amount returned by the advocate, complaint was lodged by him with the Bar Council of the State for initiating suitable disciplinary action against the appellant. Court held that among the different types of misconduct envisaged for a legal practitioner misappropriation of the client’s money must be regarded as one of the gravest. In this professional capacity the legal practitioner has to collect money from the client towards expenses of the litigation, or withdraw money from the court payable to the client or take money of the client to be deposited in court. In all such cases, when the money of the client reaches his hand it is a trust. If a public servant misappropriates money he is liable to be punished under the present Prevention of Corruption Act, with imprisonment which shall not be less than one year. He is certain to be dismissed from service. But if an advocate misappropriates money of the client there is no justification in de-escalating the gravity of the misdemeanor. Perhaps the dimension of the gravity of

such breach of trust would be mitigated when the misappropriation remained only for a temporary period. There may be justification to award a lesser punishment in a case where the delinquent advocate returned the money before commencing the disciplinary proceedings.

Informing About Bribe: Shambhu Ram Yadav v. Hanuman Das Khatry, the Court upheld the order of bar council of India dated 31st July 1999, which held that the appellant has served as advocated for 50 years and it was not expected of him to indulge in such a practice of corrupting the judiciary or offering bribe to the judge and he admittedly demanded Rs.10,000/- from his client and he orally stated that subsequently order was passed in his client's favour. This is enough to make him totally unfit to be a lawyer by writing the letter in question. We cannot impose any lesser punishment than debarring him permanently from the practice .His name should be struck off from, the roll of advocates maintained by the Bar Council of Rajasthan. Hereafter the appellant will not have any right to appear in any Court of Law, Tribunal or any authority. Court impose a cost of Rs. 5,000/- to the appellant which should be paid by the appellant to the Bar Council of India which has to be within two months.

The list of instances of professional misconduct is not exhaustive, the Supreme court has widened the scope and ambit of the term misconduct in numerous instances, only few cases has been elaborated above.

Sl no	Instance of misconduct	Held in Case	Citation
1	Retention of money deposited with advocate for the decree holder even after execution proceedings	Prahlad Saran Gupta V Bar council of India	AIR 1997.SC.1338
2	Misguiding Junior Advocate	Harish Chander Singh V SN Tripathi	AIR. 1997 SC 879
3	Assaulting opponent with Knife in Court room	Hikmat AliKhan v Ishwar Prasad Arya	AIR 1997. SC 864
4	Scandalisation against Judge	In re DC Saxena	AIR 1996 SC 2481
5	Attending court with fire arm	UP Sales tax service association v taxation Bar Association, Agra	AIR 1996.SC 98
6	Discussion of the conduct of judge and pass resolution by bar council, bar association or group of practicing advocates	C Ravichandran Iyer v Justice AM Bhattacharjee	1995. (2) KLT, SN 56 case no 77.

7	Failure to return will executed and kept in safe custody	John D Souza v Edward Ani	1994. SC 975
8	Constant abstention from conducting of cases	Onkar Singh V Angrez Singh	1993, (1) KLT 650, P&H High Court.
9	Misappropriation of amount paid	DS Dalai V State Bank of India JS Jadhav v Mustafa Haji Mohamed Yusuf	AIR 1993 SC 1608 / AIR 1993. SC 1535
10	Attesting forged affidavit	M Veerendra Rao v Tek Chand	AIR 1985 SC 28
11	Failure to attend trial after accepting the brief	SJ Choudhary v State	AIR 1984 SC 618
12	Improper legal advice	PD Khandekar v Bar Council of Maharashtra	AIR 1984 SC 110
13	Misappropriation of Decretal amount	KV Umre v Venubai	AIR 1983 SC 1154
14	Taking money from client for the purpose of giving bribe	Chandra Sekhar Soni v Bar Council of Rajasthan	AIR 1983 SC 1012
15	Rushing towards potential clients and snatching briefs	The bar Council of Maharashtra v MV Dabholkar	AIR 1976 SC 242
16	Taking advantage of the ignorance and illiteracy of the clients	NA Mirzan V the disciplinary committee of the Bar council of Maharashtra	AIR 1972 SC 46
17	Appearing with out authority on a forged vakalath	In re advocate	AIR 1971 Ker 161
18	Advertising profession	CD Sekkizhar v Secretary, Bar Council, Madras.	AIR 1967 Mad. 35

19	Gross negligence involving moral turpitude	In the matter of P an Advocate and VP Kumaravelu v the Bar council of India	AIR 1963. SC 1313 / AIR 1997 SC 1014
20	Coercing Colleagues	In re Badri Narin	AIR 1960 Pt. 307
21	Appearing for both sides	Rambharosa Kalar v Surendra nath Thakur	AIR 1960 MP 81
22	False identification of Deponents	Brahma din and others v Chandrasekhar Shukla	AIR 1958 AP 116
23	Indecent cross examination	Shri Narain Jafa V The Hon. Judges of the High Court, Allahabad	AIR 1953 SC 368
24	Shouting political slogans and holding demonstrations in court	In the matter of a pleader, Ottapalam	AIR 1943, Mad. 130
25	Attending court in drunken state	In the matter of a lower grade pleader	AIR 1934 Rang. 423
26	Breach of trust	Bapurao Pakhiddey v Suman Dondey	1999 (2) SCC 442
27	bribe	Purushottam Eknath Nemade v DN Mahajun	1999 (20) SCC 215
28	Fraud and forgery	LC Goyal v Nawal Kishore and Devender Bhai Shanker Mehta v Ramesh Chandra Vithal Dass Seth	1997 (2) SCC 258 / AIR 1996 SC 2022

Procedure Followed on the Notice of Professional Misconduct

The following is the procedure followed (1) In exercise of powers under Section 35 contained in Chapter V entitled “conduct of advocates”, on receipt of a complaint against an advocate (or suo motu) if the State Bar Council has ‘reason to believe’ that any advocate on its roll has been guilty of “professional or other misconduct”, disciplinary proceeding may be initiated against him.

(2) Neither Section 35 nor any other provision of the Act defines the expression ‘legal misconduct’ or the expression ‘misconduct’.

(3) The Disciplinary Committee of the State Bar Council is authorised to inflict punishment, including removal of his name from the rolls of the Bar Council and suspending him from practice for a period deemed fit by it, after giving the advocate concerned and the ‘Advocate General’ of the State an opportunity of hearing.

(4) While under Section 42(1) of the Act the Disciplinary Committee has been conferred powers vested in a civil court in respect of certain matters including summoning and enforcing attendance of any person and examining him on oath, the Act which enjoins the Disciplinary Committee to ‘afford an opportunity of hearing’ (vide Section 35) to the advocate does not prescribe the procedure to be followed at the hearing.

(5) The procedure to be followed in an enquiry under Section 35 is outlined in Part VII of the Bar Council of India Rules made under the authority of Section 60 of the Act. Rule 8(1) of the said Rules enjoins the Disciplinary Committee to hear the concerned parties that is to say the complainant and the concerned advocate as also the Attorney General or the Solicitor General or the Advocate General. It also enjoins that if it is considered appropriate to take oral evidence the procedure of the trial of civil suits shall as far as possible be followed.

Critique

The advocates act 1961 was a long sought after legislation to consolidate the law relating to the legal practioners, constitution of autonomous Bar Councils, prescription of uniform qualification for admission and enrolment of persons as advocates, more importantly it imposes punishment for professional misconduct by advocates and in that respect it acts as a quasi-judicial body. Only body that can be approached for professional misconduct of advocate is Bar council constituted under the Act except for contempt of court which is also a misconduct. However the following criticisms are levelled against the Act in terms of its power to punish for professional and other misconduct;

1) No provision of appeal is provided in the act in respective High courts, hence power of bar Council of the State is equated with that of High court.

2) In ordinary course it is difficult for an advocate to approach the Supreme Court and get the case admitted from an aggrieved order of the Bar Council of India.

3) The act has not defined the term misconduct, instead it has included professional and other misconduct and definition is left to the Bar councils and Supreme court to decide and to widen the scope.

4) Denial of the principle of natural justice to an ordinary litigant who is aggrieved with the misconduct of the advocate, as the body of their association ie Bar council is deciding the case in which their own member is the respondent. This is against the rule that “no man can be a judge in his own case”. The lay person has to approach appropriate fora constituted under Consumer Protection act 1986 to get any

pecuniary relief due to the loss caused by such misconduct, if it fits under deficiency of service.

5) At times, based on the circumstances the Act is violative of Article 19 (1) (g), right to practice trade or profession, and also freedom of speech and expression enshrined in Article 19(1)(a).

However the intention of the legislature to uphold the dignity of the profession and to preserve the moral etiquette among legal practioners have been largely achieved by the Act.

Comparable provisions in other countries

England – In England The Legal Profession Act, 1987 is “an Act to regulate the admission and practice of barristers and solicitors” (as amended in 2007) and the The Revised Professional Conduct and Practice Rules made by the Council of the Law Society of New South Wales on 24 August 1995 pursuant to its power under Section 57B of the Legal Profession Act, 1987 and the Statement of Ethics proclaimed by the Law Society of New South Wales in November 1994 governs the conduct in legal profession. From 2010 on wards legal ombudsman is formed to deal with complaints against all lawyers, including solicitors, registered in England and Wales. The Legal Ombudsman replaced the previous complaint handling bodies (for example, the Legal Complaints Service in the case of complaints against solicitors), and has been dealing with new complaints since 6 October 2010. Anyone who is dissatisfied with the standard of service received from their lawyer should complain, in the first instance, to the lawyer concerned. If the matter cannot be resolved in this way, then a complaint may be made to the Legal Ombudsman.

USA – in USA each state has a separate set of rules of practices and different code of conduct for the advocates. For example the newyork state has a separate rules of Professional Conduct promulgated as Joint Rules of the Appellate Divisions of the Supreme Court, effective from April 1, 2009. They supersede the former part 1200 (Disciplinary Rules of the Code of Professional Responsibility). Indiana state has separate rules for professional conduct, which elaborates in detail about all aspects of professional conduct and code of ethics to be followed by an advocate.

SELF-TEST QUESTIONS

S.NO	Question	Option (a)	Option (b)	Option (c)	Option (d)
1	Failure to return will executed and kept in safe custody	John D Souza v Edward Ani	M Veerendra Rao v Tek Chand	In re DC Saxena	None of the Above
2	Constant abstention from conducting of cases	Onkar Singh V Angrez Singh	Harish Chander Singh V SN Tripathi	Harish Chander Singh V SN Tripathi	None of the Above
3	Misappropriation of amount paid	DS Dalai V State Bank of India	Harish Chander Singh V SN Tripathi	Harish Chander Singh V SN Tripathi	None of the Above
4	Attesting forged affidavit	M Veerendra Rao v Tek Chand	M Veerendra Rao v Tek Chand	In re DC Saxena	None of the Above
5	Appearing with out authority on a forged vakalath	In re advocate	M Veerendra Rao v Tek Chand	In re DC Saxena	None of the Above

Answers: 1-(a),2-(a), 3-(a),4-(a),5-(a)