

# **Punjab Haryana High Court**

**Previous Year Paper  
Stenographer Grade III  
March 2018**



# Test Prime

**ALL EXAMS,  
ONE SUBSCRIPTION**



**70,000+**  
Mock Tests



**Personalised  
Report Card**



**Unlimited  
Re-Attempt**



**600+**  
Exam Covered



**Previous Year  
Papers**



**500%  
Refund**



**ATTEMPT FREE MOCK NOW**

## HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB &amp; HARYANA

SOCIETY FOR CENTRALIZED RECRUITMENT OF STAFF IN SUBORDINATE COURTS  
(S.S.S.C.)ENGLISH SHORTHAND TEST FOR THE POST OF STENOGRAPHER GRADE-III  
IN SUBORDINATE COURTS OF PUNJAB  
09<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2018 TO 11<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2018

SET-C

DURATION: 5 MINUTES

SPEED: 80 WPM

*Dictation Passage--*

Another two Judge Bench of this Court, while treating writ petition as a leading petition, directed that other petitions that / are pending in the High Court or which may be filed thereafter shall remain stayed till further orders of this // Court. The parties have exchanged the relevant pleadings which are all brought on record supported by documents on which they /// rely. It appears that earlier when these group of matters reached final hearing, in the light of what transpired in <sup>(1)</sup> the Court then, a Bench of this Court adjourned these proceedings to enable the Bar Council of India to take / a fresh decision in the matter in the light of its decision taken in the earlier meetings regarding suitable modification // of the impugned rules. It appears that ultimately, before the Bench of three learned Judges, learned senior counsel, placed /// a copy of the resolution of Bar Council of India whereby the Rules were amended. We have also mentioned the <sup>(2)</sup> earlier resolution by which the impugned rules were amended. It is thereafter that this group of matters reached for final/ hearing before us. We, therefore, have to examine the legality and validity of the impugned rules as amended by the // resolution of the Bar Council of India. We may briefly mention the rival contentions submitted for our consideration by learned/// counsel, as well as learned senior advocate on behalf of other writ petitioners, learned senior counsel for the Bar Council <sup>(3)</sup> of India, which is the author of the impugned rules in support of their respective cases. Learned counsel for the / petitioners submitted, tracing the history of the relevant provisions of the Act and the rules, that there is no power // with the Bar Council of India to frame the impugned rules. That the Act lays down the statutory functions of /// the Bar Council of India. The provisions thereof do not entitle the Bar Council of India to frame such impugned<sup>(4)</sup> rules prescribing a condition before enrolment of an applicant as an advocate under the Act by requiring him to undergo / enrolment training and apprenticeship as laid down under the impugned rules. It was also submitted that the Act also was// not available to the Bar Council of India to frame such rules. As a sequel, it was submitted that rule /// making power of the Bar Council of India could not be pressed in service by it in support of the <sup>(5)</sup>

**400 WORDS**