

News

I'm horrified that a supporter would go so low: The strange behavior of the petitioner-in-person astonished the Kerala High Court.



Adding, "We were shocked and petrified, to say the least," the Court said.

After a petitioner, posing as a lawyer and appearing in person to present her case, accused judges on the bench of having "evil thoughts" and being "**undeserving**," among other strange remarks, the Kerala High Court was recently left perplexed.

During the hearing, a Division Bench consisting of Justices Devan Ramachandran and

MB Snehalatha said it was appalled by the petitioner's (litigant's) behavior and derogatory comments directed at the judges.

Despite the fact that attorneys are typically not allowed to wear advocates' clothing when arguing their own causes, the Court recalled that the petitioner had shown up wearing advocates' clothing. As a result, the petitioner was informed by the court that it was improper for her to argue while wearing advocates' clothing.

The petitioner then chastised the judges, much to their surprise, for having "evil thoughts" and attempting to force her to "expose herself" before the court.

The judges recalled that in order "to diffuse the baffling situation that the petitioner was attempting to create," they first held back and postponed the hearing until later.

The woman grudgingly took off her gown but kept on wearing a lawyer's band when a few other advocates stepped in and chatted with her.

According to the Court, she persisted in her confrontational arguments when the case was reopened. The petitioner eventually claimed that the judges hearing the case were ignorant of the law when she realized she would not receive a favorable decision.

"The petitioner started speaking incoherently after noticing our viewpoint, accusing us of being 'undeserving' judges and lacking legal knowledge. She even said in a cruel and twisted way that the Bench doesn't want to hear her in her robes because it wants her body to be seen. We will not repeat her exact statements because doing so would undoubtedly violate all decorum standards, but we were, to put it mildly, astonished and terrified," the Court said.

The Bench was troubled by the entire series of events, but it chose not to take any immediate action against the petitioner.

"As disgusting and repugnant as the petitioner's actions are, we decide not to take notice of them. However, we would like to express our shock that an advocate, if she is one, has descended to such a low level. We leave it at that." The Court said.

We are shocked that an advocate, if she is one, has descended to such a low level. That's where we stop!

High Court of Kerala

However, it implied that if the petitioner is a lawyer, the Bar Council or Bar Association ought to investigate her actions.

The petitioner's apparent ignorance of the most fundamental and elementary ideas, such as the fact that an advocate cannot appear in person in professional robes or that Article 32 of the Constitution cannot be invoked before a High Court, is concerning for the profession, assuming she is an advocate as she claims. We have serious doubts about whether she is an advocate and, if so, how she is permitted to practice law given her willfully unconstrained and unbridled demeanor, which is a complete and utter violation of the decorum, propriety, and decency required in a court. In order to prevent the profession from losing its dignity due to the conduct of a few bad actors, the Bar Council and the relevant Bar Association should look into this," the Court stated.

A family court judgment that had granted her husband's divorce petition was contested by the petitioner. Her challenge was submitted as a writ petition. However, after stating that the petition was unmaintainable and that an appeal under the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) ought to have been filed instead, the Court's Registry declined to number it.

When the petitioner refused to fix this flaw, the case went to the court, which had to decide if the writ petition could be maintained.

The Registry and the High Court both concluded that the writ petition could not be maintained.

Some of her submissions were also deemed inconsistent by it. The Court noted, among other things, that the petitioner had failed to provide an explanation for the three-year delay in contesting the divorce decree from 2022.

Because the petitioner had filed a writ petition under Article 32 of the Constitution—which is often used to reach the Supreme Court rather than a High Court—instead of pursuing a statutory appeal, the Court declined to number her case.

The petitioner could still submit a legitimate appeal in accordance with the law, the court said, closing the case as not maintainable.