



# COURT NEWS

Vol. XI Issue No. 3

July - September, 2016



## EDITORIAL BOARD

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra, Judge, Supreme Court of India  
Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar, Judge, Supreme Court of India

## COMPILED BY

Ravindra Maithani, Secretary General, Supreme Court of India  
Bibhuti Bhushan Bose, Editor, Supreme Court Reports

---

*A quarterly newsletter published by Supreme Court of India, New Delhi*

**Also available on website : [www.supremecourtfindia.nic.in](http://www.supremecourtfindia.nic.in)**

# LIST OF SUPREME COURT JUDGES

## (As on 30-09-2016)

S.No.	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement
01.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice T.S. Thakur, Chief Justice of India	17-11-2009 As CJI: 03-12-2015	04-01-2017
02.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil R. Dave	30-04-2010	19-11-2016
03.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar	13-09-2011	28-08-2017
04.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra	10-10-2011	03-10-2018
05.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar	10-10-2011	23-06-2018
06.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Gogoi	23-04-2012	18-11-2019
07.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur	04-06-2012	31-12-2018
08.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Gopala Gowda	24-12-2012	06-10-2016
09.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Pinaki Chandra Ghose	08-03-2013	28-05-2017
10.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph	08-03-2013	30-11-2018
11.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Sikri	12-04-2013	07-03-2019
12.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sharad Arvind Bobde	12-04-2013	24-04-2021
13.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Shiva Kirti Singh	19-09-2013	13-11-2016
14.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice C. Nagappan	19-09-2013	04-10-2016
15.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.K. Agrawal	17-02-2014	05-05-2018
16.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.V. Ramana	17-02-2014	27-08-2022
17.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Mishra	07-07-2014	03-09-2020
18.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Adarsh Kumar Goel	07-07-2014	07-07-2018
19.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.F. Nariman	07-07-2014	13-08-2021
20.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abhay Manohar Sapre	13-08-2014	28-08-2019
21.	Hon'ble Mrs. Justice R. Banumathi	13-08-2014	20-07-2020
22.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prafulla C. Pant	13-08-2014	30-08-2017
23.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Uday U. Lalit	13-08-2014	09-11-2022
24.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy	27-02-2015	01-03-2018
25.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.M. Khanwilkar	13-05-2016	30-07-2022
26.	Hon'ble Dr. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud	13-05-2016	11-11-2024
27.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhushan	13-05-2016	05-07-2021
28.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Nageswara Rao	13-05-2016	08-06-2022

# CONTENTS

Appointments and Retirements in the Supreme Court of India.....	2
Appointments and Retirements in the High Courts .....	3
Transfer between the High Courts.....	4
Vacancies in the Courts.....	5 – 6
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the Supreme Court.....	7
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the High Courts .....	8
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the District and Subordinate Courts .....	9
Some Supreme Court Judgments / Orders of Public Importance.....	10 – 21
Major activities of National Judicial Academy.....	22 – 24
Major activities of National Legal Services Authority.....	25 – 27
Some Important Visits and Conferences .....	28 – 32

---

*This newsletter is intended to provide public access to information on the activities and achievements of the Indian Judiciary in general. While every care has been taken to ensure accuracy and to avoid errors/omissions, information given in the newsletter is merely for reference and must not be taken as having the authority of, or being binding in any way on, the Editorial Board of the newsletter and the officials involved in compilation thereof, who do not owe any responsibility whatsoever for any loss, damage, or distress to any person, whether or not a user of this publication, on account of any action taken or not taken on the basis of the information given in this newsletter.*

---

**APPOINTMENTS AND RETIREMENTS  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
(FROM 01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)**

**RETIREMENT**

<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>
Hon'ble Mr. Justice F.M. Ibrahim Kalifulla	23-07-2016

**APPOINTMENTS AND RETIREMENTS  
IN THE HIGH COURTS  
(FROM 01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name of the High Court</b>	<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>
1	Allahabad	D.B. Bhosale (Chief Justice)	30-07-16
2	Calcutta	G.C. Gupta (Chief Justice)	21-09-16
3	Chhattisgarh	Sanjay Agrawal	29-09-16
		Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant	29-09-16
		A.K. Shukla	29-09-16
4	Jharkhand	Dr. S.N. Pathak	30-09-16
		Rajesh Shankar	30-09-16
5	Kerala	S.M. Mallikarjunagouda (Chief Justice)	22-09-16
6	Madras	N. Authinathan	07-09-16
7	Manipur	R.R. Prasad (Chief Justice)	22-09-16
8	Patna	I.A. Ansari (Chief Justice)	29-07-16
9	Punjab & Haryana	S.J. Vazifdar (Chief Justice)	06-08-16
10	Sikkim	S.K. Agnihotri (Chief Justice)	22-09-16
11	Tripura	T. Vaiphei (Chief Justice)	21-09-16

**TRANSFERS BETWEEN THE HIGH COURTS  
(FROM 01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>From (Name of concerned High Court)</b>	<b>To (Name of concerned High Court)</b>	<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Transfer</b>
1	Calcutta	Delhi	Indira Banerjee	08-08-16
2	Karnataka	Kerala	S.M. Mallikarjunagouda	01-08-16
3	Gujarat	Rajasthan	K.S. Jhaveri	24-08-16
4	Calcutta	Bombay	Manjula Chellur	22-08-16
5	Madhya Pradesh	Jammu & Kashmir	Alok Aradhe	20-09-16
6	Himachal Pradesh	Uttarakhand	Rajeev Sharma	26-09-16

## VACANCIES IN THE COURTS

### A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (As on 30-09-2016)

Sanctioned Strength	Working strength	Vacancies
31	28	03

### B) HIGH COURTS (As on 30-09-2016)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Allahabad	160	77	83
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	61	23	38
3	Bombay	94	62	32
4	Calcutta	72	39	33
5	Chhatisgarh	22	11	11
6	Delhi	60	34	26
7	Gujarat	52	32	20
8	Gauhati	24	13	11
9	Himachal Pradesh	13	10	3
10	Jammu & Kashmir	17	10	7
11	Jharkhand	25	15	10
12	Karnataka	62	26	36
13	Kerala	47	33	14
14	Madhya Pradesh	53	32	21
15	Madras	75	39	36
16	Manipur	5	3	2
17	Meghalaya	4	3	1
18	Orissa	27	19	8
19	Patna	53	27	26
20	Punjab & Haryana	85	44	41
21	Rajasthan	50	32	18
22	Sikkim	3	3	0
23	Tripura	4	3	1
24	Uttarakhand	11	7	4
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1079</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>482</b>

- Above statement is compiled on the basis of figures received from the High Courts.

**C) DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (As on 30-09-2016)**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>State/ Union Territory</b>	<b>Sanctioned Strength</b>	<b>Working Strength</b>	<b>Vacancies</b>
1	Uttar Pradesh	2262	1674	<b>588</b>
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	975	798	<b>177</b>
3(a)	Maharashtra	2257	2248	<b>9</b>
3(b)	Goa	57	46	<b>11</b>
3(c)	Diu and Daman & Silvassa	7	6	<b>1</b>
4	West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar	1013	885	<b>128</b>
5	Chhattisgarh	395	334	<b>61</b>
6	Delhi	793	491	<b>302</b>
7	Gujarat	1953	1133	<b>820</b>
8(a)	Assam	424	314	<b>110</b>
8(b)	Nagaland	34	25	<b>9</b>
8(c)	Mizoram	63	30	<b>33</b>
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	26	17	<b>9</b>
9	Himachal Pradesh	155	145	<b>10</b>
10	Jammu & Kashmir	246	219	<b>27</b>
11	Jharkhand	671	454	<b>217</b>
12	Karnataka	1299	923	<b>376</b>
13(a)	Kerala	470	415	<b>55</b>
13(b)	Lakshadweep	3	3	<b>0</b>
14	Madhya Pradesh	1461	1233	<b>228</b>
15	Manipur	41	34	<b>7</b>
16	Meghalaya	57	41	<b>16</b>
17(a)	Tamil Nadu	1038	948	<b>90</b>
17(b)	Puducherry	26	14	<b>12</b>
18	Orissa	863	606	<b>257</b>
19	Bihar	1825	1016	<b>809</b>
20(a)	Punjab	674	548	<b>126</b>
20(b)	Haryana	644	505	<b>139</b>
20(c)	Chandigarh	30	30	<b>0</b>
21	Rajasthan	1203	1081	<b>122</b>
22	Sikkim	18	14	<b>4</b>
23	Tripura	106	78	<b>28</b>
24	Uttarakhand	285	220	<b>65</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>21374</b>	<b>16528</b>	<b>4846</b>

- Above statement is compiled on the basis of figures received from the High Courts.



## INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT [01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016]

i) Table I

						Pendency (At the end of 30-06-2016)		
						Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
						36,262	26,384	62,646
Institution (01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016) (including unregistered CC matters and conversion)			Disposal (01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016) (including unregistered CC matters and conversion)			Pendency (At the end of 30-09-2016)		
Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
20,270	2,502	22,772	22,536	1,944	24,480	33,996	26,942	60,938

ii) Table II

	OPENING BALANCE AS ON 01-07-16	INSTITUTION FROM 01-07-16 TO 30-09-16	DISPOSAL FROM 01-07-16 TO 30-09-16	PENDENCY AT THE END OF 30-09-16
<b>CIVIL CASES</b>	51,173	17,479	18,447	50,205
<b>CRIMINAL CASES</b>	11,473	5,293	6,033	10,733
<b>ALL CASES (TOTAL)</b>	62,646	22,772	24,480	60,938

**Note:**

1. Out of the **60,938** pending matters as on 30-09-2016, if connected matters are excluded, the pendency is only of **34,601** matters as on 30-09-2016.
2. Out of the **60,938** pending matters as on 30-09-2016, **16,647** matters are upto one year old and thus arrears (i.e. cases pending more than a year) are only of **44,291** matters as on 30-09-2016.
3. Total institution shown above of **22,772** matters includes conversion of **2,516** matters from one case type to other and also registration of **7,950** unregistered CC matters.
4. Total Disposal shown above of **24,480** matters includes conversion of **982** matters from one case type to other and also registration of **9,028** unregistered CC matters.

## INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)

Sl. No.	Name of the High Court	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) As on 01/07/2016			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.)			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.)			Pending Cases at the end of this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) (As on 30/09/2016)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)			
1	Allahabad	557705	361890	919595	38148	40873	79021	35701	37831	73532	560152	364932	925084	8.59	8.00	0.60
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	238920	39775	278695	18487	6472	24959	12916	5075	17991	244491	41172	285663	8.96	6.46	2.50
3	Bombay	206397	49045	255442	19118	6539	25657	16699	5574	22273	208816	50010	258826	10.04	8.72	1.32
4	Calcutta	175993	37521	213514	18540	4618	23158	15331	3747	19078	179202	38392	217594	10.85	8.94	1.91
5	Chhatisgarh	33712	20382	54094	5867	4039	9906	4376	3975	8351	35203	20446	55649	18.31	15.44	2.87
6	Delhi	48032	17133	65165	8300	3860	12160	7289	3755	11044	49043	17238	66281	18.66	16.95	1.71
7	Gujarat	52202	33851	86053	13156	14261	27417	15162	13410	28572	50196	34702	84898	31.86	33.20	-1.34
8	Gauhati	22400	5145	27545	3332	588	3920	2380	447	2827	23352	5286	28638	14.23	10.26	3.97
9	Himachal Pradesh	25254	5395	30649	4812	1256	6068	5718	1260	6978	24348	5391	29739	19.80	22.77	-2.97
10	Jammu & Kashmir	53534	5018	58552	2751	533	3284	2112	120	2232	54173	5431	59604	5.61	3.81	1.80
11	Jharkhand	42540	39498	82038	3614	6802	10416	3005	5507	8512	43149	40793	83942	12.70	10.38	2.32
12	Karnataka	234110	22399	256509	33024	4657	37681	20500	3467	23967	246634	23589	270223	14.69	9.34	5.35
13	Kerala	124619	36433	161052	16569	5755	22324	12830	5159	17989	128358	37029	165387	13.86	11.17	2.69
14	Madhya Pradesh	178298	105632	283930	18355	17463	35818	15768	15615	31383	180885	107480	288365	12.62	11.05	1.56
15	Madras*	259740	36176	295916	26792	18822	45614	22482	18127	40609	264050	36871	300921	15.41	13.72	1.69
16	Manipur	3111	123	3234	415	11	426	375	17	392	3151	117	3268	13.17	12.12	1.05
17	Meghalaya	584	43	627	166	11	177	120	22	142	630	32	662	28.23	22.65	5.58
18	Orissa*	131119	39768	170887	8553	9677	18230	9684	8542	18226	129988	40903	170891	10.67	10.67	0.00
19	Patna	81059	49546	130605	9563	17600	27163	8234	15654	23888	82388	51492	133880	20.80	18.29	2.51
20	Punjab & Haryana	202307	86621	288928	19464	17066	36530	14646	14116	28762	207125	89571	296696	12.64	9.95	2.69
21	Rajasthan	183978	66258	250236	14878	13649	28527	16179	11760	27939	182677	68147	250824	11.40	11.17	0.23
22	Sikkim	82	41	123	42	31	73	25	26	51	99	46	145	59.35	41.46	17.89
23	Tripura	2493	494	2987	775	154	929	535	219	754	2733	429	3162	31.10	25.24	5.86
24	Uttarakhand	20957	9581	30538	2453	2065	4518	1439	1994	3433	21971	9652	31623	14.79	11.24	3.55
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2879146</b>	<b>1067768</b>	<b>3946914</b>	<b>287174</b>	<b>196802</b>	<b>483976</b>	<b>243506</b>	<b>175419</b>	<b>418925</b>	<b>2922814</b>	<b>1089151</b>	<b>4011965</b>	<b>12.26</b>	<b>10.61</b>	<b>1.65</b>

● Above statement is compiled on the basis of figures received from the High Courts

\* Opening balance modified by the High Court concerned.

## INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (FROM 01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)

Sl. No	Name of the State/UT	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) As on 01/07/2016			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.)			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.)			Pending Cases at the end of this Quarter (Jul - Sep 2016) (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) (As on 30/09/2016)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/07/2016
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+ Crl.)			
1	Uttar Pradesh	1514573	4373991	5888564	160662	925231	1085893	144179	783209	927388	1531056	4516013	6047069	18.44	15.75	2.69
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	502742	553429	1056171	67513	98364	165877	62901	93766	156667	507354	558027	1065381	15.71	14.83	0.87
3(a)	Maharashtra	1113755	2018849	3132604	97725	499439	597164	89270	423465	512735	1122210	2094823	3217033	19.06	16.37	2.70
3(b)	Goa	24675	17895	42570	2734	5562	8296	2818	5251	8069	24591	18206	42797	19.49	18.95	0.53
3(c)	Diu and Daman	919	777	1696	174	379	553	195	331	526	898	825	1723	32.61	31.01	1.59
3(d)	Silvassa	1608	2407	4015	92	189	281	37	323	360	1663	2273	3936	7.00	8.97	-1.97
4(a)	West Bengal	555705	2130953	2686658	38568	270824	309392	34678	251364	286042	559595	2150413	2710008	11.52	10.65	0.87
4(b)	Andaman & Nicobar	3369	5442	8811	314	1889	2203	223	2011	2234	3460	5320	8780	25.00	25.35	-0.35
5	Chhatisgarh	64919	218003	282922	8021	42904	50925	7329	39841	47170	65611	221066	286677	18.00	16.67	1.33
6	Delhi *	166596	431644	598240	36734	174001	210735	30121	143879	174000	173209	461766	634975	35.23	29.09	6.14
7	Gujarat	574593	1481638	2056231	52839	304430	357269	60906	385687	446593	566526	1400381	1966907	17.37	21.72	-4.34
8(a)	Assam	66641	188735	255376	11602	62821	74423	10950	54396	65346	67293	197160	264453	29.14	25.59	3.55
8(b)	Nagaland	1761	2701	4462	383	1130	1513	376	1181	1557	1768	2650	4418	33.91	34.89	-0.99
8(c)	Mizoram	1923	2261	4184	1828	1245	3073	1784	1193	2977	1967	2313	4280	73.45	71.15	2.29
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	1662	8111	9773	288	730	1018	356	778	1134	1594	8063	9657	10.42	11.60	-1.19
9	Himachal Pradesh	99232	138795	238027	16992	75644	92636	16147	75445	91592	100077	138994	239071	38.92	38.48	0.44
10	Jammu & Kashmir	48080	93830	141910	3809	13792	17601	3123	13931	17054	48766	93691	142457	12.40	12.02	0.39
11	Jharkhand	65058	269551	334609	5095	25031	30126	5866	23605	29471	64287	270977	335264	9.00	8.81	0.20
12	Karnataka *	699908	632145	1332053	81708	229294	311002	77915	215583	289498	703773	649614	1353387	23.35	21.73	1.60
13(a)	Kerala	433222	1032182	1465404	68550	249828	318378	85423	191029	276452	416349	1090981	1507330	21.73	18.87	2.86
13(b)	Lakshadweep	132	196	328	6	28	34	5	30	35	133	194	327	10.37	10.67	-0.30
14	Madhya Pradesh	277953	959752	1237705	48479	252266	300745	42961	244526	287487	283471	967492	1250963	24.30	23.23	1.07
15	Manipur	4222	3445	7667	608	1180	1788	888	1146	2034	3942	3479	7421	23.32	26.53	-3.21
16	Meghalaya	3222	11034	14256	673	2684	3357	332	2061	2393	3563	11657	15220	23.55	16.79	6.76
17(a)	Tamil Nadu *	649317	436134	1085451	67746	148667	216413	90637	132587	223224	626421	452223	1078644	19.94	20.57	-0.63
17(b)	Puducherry	14058	13780	27838	1877	2652	4529	1915	2421	4336	14020	14011	28031	16.27	15.58	0.69
18	Orissa	271906	861671	1133577	18011	85051	103062	16183	72973	89156	273734	873749	1147483	9.09	7.87	1.23
19	Bihar	336973	1751554	2088527	20474	80857	101331	18275	68993	87268	339172	1763418	2102590	4.85	4.18	0.67
20(a)	Punjab	251709	283269	534978	58589	119966	178555	59467	118202	177669	250831	285033	535864	33.38	33.21	0.17
20(b)	Haryana	241897	312235	554132	56276	133186	189462	49646	117965	167611	248527	327456	575983	34.19	30.25	3.94
20(c)	Chandigarh	15849	24619	40468	3839	38708	42547	4122	37525	41647	15566	25802	41368	105.14	102.91	2.22
21	Rajasthan	475415	1058325	1533740	78410	331158	409568	73481	310840	384321	480344	1078643	1558987	26.70	25.06	1.65
22	Sikkim	416	903	1319	206	510	716	190	495	685	432	918	1350	54.28	51.93	2.35
23	Tripura	9743	129727	139470	1877	35150	37027	1833	39513	41346	9787	125364	135151	26.55	29.65	-3.10
24	Uttarakhand	31909	149891	181800	7142	55423	62565	7067	49430	56497	31984	155884	187868	34.41	31.08	3.34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8525662</b>	<b>19599874</b>	<b>28125536</b>	<b>1019844</b>	<b>4270213</b>	<b>5290057</b>	<b>1001599</b>	<b>3900975</b>	<b>4902574</b>	<b>8543974</b>	<b>19968879</b>	<b>28512853</b>	<b>18.81</b>	<b>17.43</b>	<b>1.38</b>

● Above statement is compiled on the basis of figures received from the High Courts

\* Figures modified by the High Court concerned.

## **SOME SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS/ORDERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (01-07-2016 TO 30-09-2016)**

1. On 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *U. Subhadramma v. State of A.P. rep. by Pub. Prosecutor & Anr.* [Criminal Appeal No.1596 of 2011], while examining the question as to whether the property of a person accused of misappropriation but who died during pendency of the criminal trial can be attached in the hands of his legal representatives under the provisions of Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 1944, the Court held that “if the law requires that the orders of attachment should be withdrawn upon acquittal it stands to reason that such orders must be withdrawn when the prosecution abates or cannot result in a conviction due to the death of the accused, whose property is attached.” In the instant case, it was accordingly held that the District Judge “could not have proceeded with the attachment proceedings at all since the attachment proceedings were initiated by the State” against the accused “under clause 3 of the Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 1944, who was actually dead.”
2. On 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Surinderjit Singh Mand & Anr. v. State of Punjab & Anr.* [Criminal Appeal No. 565 of 2016], it was held that “a Court just cannot take cognizance, without sanction by the appropriate authority”, and thus, it cannot be said that “where cognizance is taken under Section 319 CrPC, sanction either under Section 197 CrPC (or under the concerned special enactment) is not a mandatory pre-requisite.” The Bench, however, observed that it cannot be said that the determination rendered by a Court under Section 319 CrPC is subservient to the decision of the competent authority under Section 197 and held that “the grant of sanction under Section 197, can be assailed by the accused by taking recourse to judicial review” and “likewise, the order declining sanction, can similarly be assailed by the complainant or the prosecution.”
3. On 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Mahipal Singh Rana, Advocate v. State of Uttar Pradesh* [Criminal Appeal No. 63 of 2006], a three Judge Bench observed that there is an “urgent need to review the provisions of the Advocates Act dealing with regulatory mechanism for the legal profession and other incidental issues, in consultation with all concerned.” Accordingly, the Law Commission of India was requested to go into all relevant aspects relating to regulation of legal profession while the Government of India was requested to consider taking further appropriate steps in the light of report of the Law Commission.

4. On 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Anil Kumar Gupta v. Union of India & Ors.* [Writ petition (Civil) no. 68 of 2011], while examining an incident where few passengers sitting and travelling on the roof of the coaches of a train got struck against a Foot Over Bridge and died or sustained injuries, the Court observed that “those who were in charge of Railway Administration in the concerned Divisions ought to have taken sufficient precaution. The Administration can certainly be taken to be aware of the fact that the Foot-Over Bridges or any structures on the way could possibly be a hindrance and could have caused such incident with people in large number on roof top. The Administration alone would be in a position to know about the existence of infringements with regard to certain structures and what could be possible implications if the train were to run at a great speed with large number of people on roof top. Reasonable care would naturally be expected of those incharge of the Administration.”

It was held that “it must be expected of the persons concerned to be aware of the inherent danger in allowing the train to run with such speed having large number of persons travelling on roof top.” Concluding that though the people who travelled on roof top also contributed to the mishap, the Railway Administration “was not free from blame”, the Court directed that “the next of kin of those who died in the incident and those who sustained injuries must be duly compensated by the Railway Administration.”

5. On 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Extra Judicial Execution Victim Families Association (EEVFAM) & Anr. v. Union of India & Anr.* [Writ Petition (Criminal) No.129 of 2012], while examining allegations concerning extra-judicial executions carried out by the police and security forces in Manipur, the Court held that “before a person can be branded as a militant or a terrorist or an insurgent, there must be the commission or some attempt or semblance of a violent overt act” and that “it would not be correct to say that merely because a person was carrying arms in a prohibited area, that person automatically became an enemy or an active member of a banned or unlawful organization.”

Rejecting the contention that a person carrying weapons in violation of prohibitory orders in the disturbed area of Manipur is *ipso facto* an enemy or that the security forces in Manipur in such a case are dealing with an ‘enemy’ as defined in Section 3(x) of the Army Act, the Court held that “each instance of an alleged extra-judicial killing of even such a person would have to be examined or thoroughly enquired into to ascertain and determine the facts” It was held that “even while dealing with the ‘enemy’ the rule of law would apply and if there have been excesses beyond the call of duty, those members of the Manipur Police or the armed forces who have committed the excesses which do not have a reasonable connection with the performance of their official duty would be liable to be proceeded against.” It was held that “if an offence is committed even by Army personnel, there is no concept of absolute immunity from trial by the criminal court constituted under the Cr.P.C.”

In conclusion, the Court held that “the use of excessive force or retaliatory force by the Manipur Police or the armed forces of the Union is not permissible”; that “an allegation of excessive force resulting in the death of any person by the Manipur Police or the armed forces in Manipur must be thoroughly enquired into” and further that “in the event of an offence having been committed by any person in the Manipur Police or the armed forces through the use of excessive force or retaliatory force, resulting in the death of any person, the proceedings in respect thereof can be instituted in a criminal court subject to the appropriate procedure being followed.”

6. On 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Vijay Chhibber & Ors.* [Contempt Petition (C) No. 483 of 2013 in Writ Petition (C) No.510 of 2005], various directions / guidelines were issued for proper implementation of the High Security Registration Plates (HSRP) scheme [devised by the Central Government to ensure public safety, security and to curb the increasing menace of vehicle thefts and their usage in commission of crimes like murder, dacoity, kidnapping etc.]. The State Governments were *inter alia* directed to ensure the strict adherence of Rule 50 of CMV Rules [Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989] and to ensure selection and authorisation only of those TAC [Type Approved Certificate] manufactures who have been financially and technically competent to manufacture and supply the requisite number of HSRP in the State. The Central Government was *inter alia* directed to create a nationwide common repository of Vehicular Registration Data for achieving the basic objective behind the idea of HSRP scheme and thereby ensuring smooth implementation at the grass root level.

7. On 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Nabam Rebia, and Bamang Felix v. Deputy Speaker and others* [Civil Appeal Nos. 6203-6204 of 2016], while examining the validity of the order dated 9-12-2015 of the Governor, by which the 6<sup>th</sup> session of Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly was preponed from 14-1-2016 to 16-12-2015, indicating *inter alia* the manner in which the proceedings of the House should be conducted, and a message dated 9-12-2015 issued by the Governor in its’ support, the Court observed that “a Governor under the Constitution, is not an elected representative” but “an executive nominee”, and “such a nominee, cannot have an overriding authority, over the representatives of the people, who constitute the House or Houses of the State Legislature (on being duly elected from their respective constituencies) and/or even the executive Government functioning under the Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister as the head. Allowing the Governor to overrule the resolve and determination of the State legislature or the State executive, would not harmoniously augur with the strong democratic principles enshrined in the provisions of the Constitution. Specially so, because the Constitution is founded on the principle of ministerial responsibility.”

It was held that “in ordinary circumstances during the period when the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers enjoy the confidence of the majority of the House, the power vested with the Governor under Article 174, to summon, prorogue and

dissolve the House(s) must be exercised in consonance with the aid and advice of the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers. In the above situation, he is precluded to take an individual call on the issue at his own will, or in his own discretion. In a situation where the Governor has reasons to believe, that the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers have lost the confidence of the House, it is open to the Governor, to require the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers to prove their majority in the House, by a floor test. Only in a situation, where the Government in power on the holding of such floor test is seen to have lost the confidence of the majority, it would be open to the Governor to exercise the powers vested with him under Article 174 at his own, and without any aid and advice.” In the fact-situation of the instant case, the Court observed that since the Governor had never called for a floor test, it was reasonable to infer, “that the Governor did not ever entertain any doubt, that the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers were still enjoying the confidence of the majority, in the House. Nor was a motion of no confidence moved against the Government. In the above situation, the Governor just could not have summoned the House, vide his order dated 9.12.2015, in his own discretion, by preponing the 6th session of the Legislative Assembly from 14.1.2016 to 16.12.2015. This, for the simple reason, that the Governor neither had the jurisdiction nor the power to do so, without the aid and advice of the Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister as the head.”

It was held that the impugned order “of the Governor dated 9.12.2015 preponing the 6th session of the Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, from 14.1.2016, to 16.12.2015” was violative of Article 163 read with Article 174 of the Constitution of India, and as such, was “liable to be quashed.” It was further held that “the message of the Governor dated 9.12.2015, directing the manner of conducting proceedings during the 6th session of the Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, from 16.12.2015 to 18.12.2015”, was violative of Article 163 read with Article 175 of the Constitution of India, and as such, was also “liable to be quashed.” It was accordingly held that “all steps and decisions taken by the Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, pursuant to the Governor’s order and message dated 9.12.2015, were unsustainable, and consequently, “the *status quo ante* as it prevailed on 15.12.2015, was ordered to be restored.”

8. On 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Anita Kushwaha v. Pushap Sudan* [Transfer Petition (C) No.1343 of 2008], while examining the question as to whether access to justice is indeed a fundamental right and if so, what is the sweep and content of that right, a Constitution Bench held that “Article 21 of the Constitution apart, access to justice can be said to be part of the guarantee contained in Article 14 as well” and the following “four main facets constitute the essence of access to justice:- (i) The State must provide an effective adjudicatory mechanism; (ii) The mechanism so provided must be reasonably accessible in terms of distance; (iii) The process of adjudication must be speedy; and (iv) The litigant’s access to the adjudicatory process must be

affordable.” Answering the further question whether the Supreme Court has the power to transfer a civil or criminal case pending in any Court in the State of Jammu and Kashmir to a Court outside that State and *vice versa*, in the affirmative, it was held that the extraordinary power available to the Supreme Court under Article 142 of the Constitution can “be usefully invoked in a situation where the Court is satisfied that denial of an order of transfer from or to the Court in the State of Jammu and Kashmir will deny the citizen his/her right of access to justice.” It was observed that the provisions of Articles 32, 136 and 142 of the Constitution are wide enough to empower the Supreme Court “to direct such transfer in appropriate situations, no matter Central Code of Civil and Criminal Procedures do not extend to the State nor do the State Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure contain any provision that empowers this court to transfer cases.”

9. On 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Muthuramalingam & Ors. v. State Rep. By Inspector of Police*, [Criminal Appeal Nos. 231–239 of 2009], while answering the question “whether consecutive life sentences can be awarded to a convict on being found guilty of a series of murders for which he has been tried in a single trial”, in the negative, a Constitution Bench held that while multiple sentences for imprisonment for life can be awarded for multiple murders or other offences punishable with imprisonment for life, the life sentences so awarded cannot be directed to run consecutively.” The Court, however, said that such sentences would “be super imposed over each other so that any remission or commutation granted by the competent authority in one does not ipso facto result in remission of the sentence awarded to the prisoner for the other.”

Rejecting the contention that once the prisoner is sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life, the term sentence awarded to him must run concurrently, it was further held that “the power of the Court to direct the order in which sentences will run is unquestionable in view of the language employed in Section 31 of the Cr.P.C. The Court can, therefore, legitimately direct that the prisoner shall first undergo the term sentence before the commencement of his life sentence. Such a direction shall be perfectly legitimate and in tune with Section 31. The converse however may not be true for if the Court directs the life sentence to start first it would necessarily imply that the term sentence would run concurrently. That is because once the prisoner spends his life in jail, there is no question of his undergoing any further sentence.”

10. On 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2016, in the case of *Avtar Singh v. Union of India & Ors.* [Special Leave Petition (C) No. 20525 of 2011], a three Judge Bench, while examining the issue of candidates suppressing information at the time of recruitment or submitting false information in the verification form as to the question of having been criminally prosecuted, arrested or as to pendency of a criminal case, held as follows:-



- 
- (1) Information given to the employer by a candidate as to conviction, acquittal or arrest, or pendency of a criminal case, whether before or after entering into service must be true and there should be no suppression or false mention of required information.
- (2) While passing order of termination of services or cancellation of candidature for giving false information, the employer may take notice of special circumstances of the case, if any, while giving such information.
- (3) The employer shall take into consideration the Government orders/instructions/rules, applicable to the employee, at the time of taking the decision.
- (4) In case there is suppression or false information of involvement in a criminal case where conviction or acquittal had already been recorded before filling of the application/verification form and such fact later comes to knowledge of employer, any of the following recourse appropriate to the case may be adopted :-
- (a) In a case trivial in nature in which conviction had been recorded, such as shouting slogans at young age or for a petty offence which if disclosed would not have rendered an incumbent unfit for post in question, the employer may, in its discretion, ignore such suppression of fact or false information by condoning the lapse.
  - (b) Where conviction has been recorded in case which is not trivial in nature, employer may cancel candidature or terminate services of the employee.
  - (c) If acquittal had already been recorded in a case involving moral turpitude or offence of heinous/serious nature, on technical ground and it is not a case of clean acquittal, or benefit of reasonable doubt has been given, the employer may consider all relevant facts available as to antecedents, and may take appropriate decision as to the continuance of the employee.
- (5) In a case where the employee has made declaration truthfully of a concluded criminal case, the employer still has the right to consider antecedents, and cannot be compelled to appoint the candidate.
- (6) In case when fact has been truthfully declared in character verification form regarding pendency of a criminal case of trivial nature, employer, in facts and circumstances of the case, in its discretion may appoint the candidate subject to decision of such case.
- (7) In a case of deliberate suppression of fact with respect to multiple pending cases such false information by itself will assume significance and an employer may pass appropriate order cancelling candidature or terminating services as appointment of a person against whom multiple criminal cases were pending may not be proper.
- (8) If criminal case was pending but not known to the candidate at the time of filling the form, still it may have adverse impact and the appointing authority would take decision after considering the seriousness of the crime.

(9) In case the employee is confirmed in service, holding Departmental enquiry would be necessary before passing order of termination/removal or dismissal on the ground of suppression or submitting false information in verification form.

(10) For determining suppression or false information attestation/verification form has to be specific, not vague. Only such information which was required to be specifically mentioned has to be disclosed. If information not asked for but is relevant comes to knowledge of the employer the same can be considered in an objective manner while addressing the question of fitness. However, in such cases action cannot be taken on basis of suppression or submitting false information as to a fact which was not even asked for.

(11) Before a person is held guilty of *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi*, knowledge of the fact must be attributable to him.”

11. On 1<sup>st</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *Lok Prahari v. State of U.P. & Ors.* [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 657 of 2004], a three Judge Bench held that the Ex-Chief Ministers Residence Allotment Rules, 1997 framed by respondent no.1-State which permitted the former Chief Ministers to occupy government bungalows for life cannot be said to be valid as they were only in the nature of executive instructions and were in contravention of the Uttar Pradesh Ministers (Salaries, Allowances and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1981 which enabled the Chief Minister to have residential accommodation only during his tenure and for 15 days after completion of his tenure.

It was held that “the 1981 Act deals with the salaries and perquisites to be given to all the Ministers, including the Chief Ministers. The said provisions are statutory, but the 1997 Rules are not statutory and they are only in the nature of executive instructions.” “The said Rules are definitely in contravention of the statutory provisions and therefore, the said Rules can be said to be bad in law so far as they are in contravention of the statutory provisions. “When the rules and regulations or executive instructions are contrary to any statutory provision, the statutory provision would prevail and the rules or executive instructions, so far as they are contrary to the statutory provisions, would fail.” In the circumstances, it was held that “respondent no.1 cannot permit any former Chief Minister to occupy any government bungalow or any government accommodation after 15 days from the date on which his term comes to an end.”

12. On 5<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *Jayam & Co. v. Assistant Commissioner & Anr.* [Civil Appeal Nos. 8070-8073 of 2016], the issue for consideration was whether sub-section (20) of Section 19 of the Tamil Nadu Value Added Tax Act, 2006, an altogether new provision inserted by way of amendment for determining input tax which came into force on August 19, 2010, could be given retrospective effect from January 01, 2007. The Court observed that sub-section (20) of Section 19 was altogether a new provision introduced for determining the input tax in specified situation, i.e., where goods are sold at a lesser price than the purchase price of goods, and further that it was clearly a provision “made for the first time to the detriment of the dealers”, and accordingly held

that such a provision “cannot have retrospective effect, more so, when vested right had accrued in favour of these dealers in respect of purchases and sales made between January 01, 2007 to August 19, 2010.”

13. On 5<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *Swami Achyutanand Tirth & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.* [Writ Petition (C) No.159 of 2012], while examining the menace of growing sales of adulterated and synthetic milk in different parts of the country, a three Judge Bench observed that “since in India traditionally infants/children are fed milk, adulteration of milk and its products is a concern and stringent measures need to be taken to combat it” and “it will be in order, if the Union of India considers making suitable amendments in the penal provisions at par with the provisions contained in the State amendments to the Indian Penal Code.” The Bench also observed that it is “desirable that Union of India revisits the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 to revise the punishment for adulteration making it more deterrent in cases where the adulterant can have an adverse impact on health.”

14. On 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *Vijay Kumar Mishra and Another v. High Court of Judicature at Patna and Others* [Civil Appeal No.7358 of 2016] while examining the issue as to whether in terms of Article 233(2) of the Constitution, the appellants could not be permitted to continue with the selection process in respect of District Judge Entry Level (Direct from Bar) Examination, since before the date of interview they had qualified for the Subordinate Judicial service of the State and had already joined the subordinate Judicial service, it was held that “the text of Article 233(2) only prohibits the appointment of a person as a District Judge, if such person is already in the service of either the Union or the State. It does not prohibit the consideration of the candidature of a person who is in the service of the Union or the State. A person who is in the service of either of the Union or the State would still have the option, if selected to join the service as a District Judge or continue with his existing employment.” While advertent to the advice of the High Court to the appellants to resign from subordinate judicial service if they aspired to become District Judge, the Supreme Court observed that “compelling a person to resign his job even for the purpose of assessing his suitability for appointment as a District Judge” is not permitted “either by the text of Art. 233(2) nor contemplated under the scheme of the Constitution as it would not serve any constitutionally desirable purpose.”

While directing the respondents to permit the appellants to participate in the selection process without insisting upon their resigning from their current employment, the Court observed “if the appellants are found suitable, it is open to the appellants to resign their current employment and opt for the post of District Judge, if they so choose.”

15. On 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *State of Uttarakhand & Ors. v. Rajiv Berry & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No. 6900 of 2009], while setting aside a judgment of the High Court

which had struck down the acquisition of land for the purpose of expansion of the Uttaranchal Secretariat at Dehradun, it was held that Sections 17(1) and 17(2) of the Land Acquisition Act on the one hand and Section 17(4) on the other operate in two different fields and that “it is extent of urgency or emergency that would determine the application of the respective clauses/sub-sections of Section 17” of the Land Acquisition Act.

It was further held that “even though the urgency clause under Section 17(1) and Section 17(2) may be invoked in a given case, the opportunity of filing objections under Section 5A of the L.A. Act need not be dispensed with and can still be afforded. However, if the provisions of Section 17(4) are invoked, the State would be empowered to dispense with the requirement of affording opportunity under Section 5A and take possession prior to making of the award. The dispensation of the opportunity contemplated by Section 5A by invoking Section 17(4) is not an invariable consequence of the invocation of Sections 17(1) or (2).”

16. On 17<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *Central Coalfields Limited & Anr. v. SLL – SML (Joint Venture Consortium) & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No. 8004 of 2016], it was held that “the issue of the acceptance or rejection of a bid or a bidder should be looked at not only from the point of view of the unsuccessful party but also from the point of view of the employer.”

It was further held that “whether a term of the NIT is essential or not is a decision taken by the employer which should be respected. Even if the term is essential, the employer has the inherent authority to deviate from it provided the deviation is made applicable to all bidders and potential bidders.” “However, if the term is held by the employer to be ancillary or subsidiary, even that decision should be respected. The lawfulness of that decision can be questioned on very limited grounds”, “but the soundness of the decision cannot be questioned, otherwise this Court would be taking over the function of the tender issuing authority, which it cannot.” “Again, looked at from the point of view of the employer if the Courts take over the decision-making function of the employer and make a distinction between essential and non-essential terms contrary to the intention of the employer and thereby re-write the arrangement, it could lead to all sorts of problems.”

17. On 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2016, in the case of *M.S. Kazi v. Muslim Education Society* [Civil Appeal No.11976 – 11977 of 2014], wherein the Gujarat Higher Secondary Education Tribunal constituted under Section 39 of the Gujarat Secondary Education Act, 1972 had upheld the dismissal of appellant-school teacher, and maintainability of the Special Civil Application filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution against the order of the Tribunal was challenged on the ground that the Tribunal was not impleaded as a party in the Special Civil Application, a three Judge Bench held that “the tribunal is not required to defend its orders when they are challenged before the High Court in a

Special Civil Application under Articles 226 and 227” of the Constitution. “An order of the tribunal is capable of being tested in exercise of the power of judicial review under Articles 226 and 227. When the remedy is invoked, the tribunal is not required to step into arena of conflict for defending its order. Hence, the tribunal is not a necessary party to the proceedings in a Special Civil Application.”

While observing that the lawfulness of the punishment imposed upon the Appellant was a matter for the employer to defend against a challenge of illegality in the Special Civil Application, it was held that “even if the High Court was to require the production of the record before the tribunal, there was no necessity of impleading the tribunal as a party to the proceedings. The tribunal not being required in law to defend its own order, the proceedings under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution were maintainable without the tribunal being impleaded.”

18. On 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2016, in the case of *Cardamom Marketing Corporation & Anr. v. State Of Kerala & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No. 4453 of 2008], the appellants challenged the *vires* of a notification issued by the Government of Kerala in exercise of powers under Section 76(1) of the Kerala Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act, 1959 [CF Act] which authorised levy of additional court fee in respect of each appeal or revision; and further provided that the amount so collected shall be credited to the Kerala Legal Benefit Fund constituted under sub-section (2) of Section 76 of the CF Act. Upholding the said levy of additional court fee, a three Judge Bench observed that “as per Section 76(3) of the CF Act, one of the purposes for which the Fund is to be utilised is for providing efficient legal services for the people of the State. It clearly amounts to *quid pro quo*. Other purpose is also for the benefit of the public at large.”

While observing that “legal community and advocates are inseparable and important part of robust legal system and they not only aid in seeking access to justice but also promote justice”, the Bench held “that providing social security to the legal profession becomes an essential part of any legal system which has to be effective, efficient and robust to enable it to provide necessary service to the consumers of justice. Section 76 of the CF Act and the impugned notification vide which additional court fee is imposed have a direct nexus to the objective sought to be achieved in relation to the service available to the appellants or others who approached the courts/tribunals for redressal of their grievances.”

19. On 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2016, in the case of *Larsen & Toubro Limited v. Additional Deputy Commissioner Of Commercial Taxes & Anr.* [Civil Appeal No. 2956 of 2007], while examining the liability of the assessee to pay turnover tax under Section 6-B of the Karnataka Sales Tax Act, 1957 on the payment made to the sub-contractor inspite of the fact that the sub-contractor had declared the turnover and paid taxes, it was held “that the value of the work entrusted to the sub-contractors or payments made to them

shall not be taken into consideration while computing total turnover for the purposes of Section 6-B of the Karnataka Sales Tax Act.”

20. On 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2016, in the case of *L. Narayana Swamy v. State of Karnataka & Ors.* [Criminal Appeal No.721 of 2016] while adverting to the issue of obtaining sanction at the time of taking cognizance in relation to a public servant, it was held that “an order directing further investigation under Section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C. cannot be passed in the absence of valid sanction” as required under Section 19(1) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947.

Examining the further question as to whether a public servant who is not on the same post and is transferred (whether by way of promotion or otherwise to another post) loses the protection under Section 19(1) of the P.C. Act, though he continues to be a public servant, albeit on a different post, the Court held that “where the public servant had abused the office which he held in the check period but had ceased to hold “that office” or was holding a different office, then a sanction would not be necessary.”

In the fact-situation of the instant case, it was held that sanction under Section 19 of the P.C. Act was not needed as the appellants-Government officials, “at the time of taking cognizance, were not holding the post which is alleged to have been misused.” It was held that the appellants “had abused entirely different office or offices than the one which they were holding on the date on which cognizance was taken and, therefore, there was no necessity of sanction under Section 19, P.C. Act.”

21. On 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2016, in the case of *Youth Bar Association of India v. Union of India and Others* [Writ Petition (Crl.) no.68 of 2016], various important directions were issued on the First Information Report (FIR). The Supreme Court *inter alia* directed that “an accused is entitled to get a copy of the First Information Report at an earlier stage than as prescribed under Section 207 of the Cr.P.C.”; and that “copies of the FIRs, unless the offence is sensitive in nature, like sexual offences, offences pertaining to insurgency, terrorism and of that category, offences under POCSO Act and such other offences, should be uploaded on the police website, and if there is no such website, on the official website of the State Government, within twenty-four hours of the registration of the First Information Report.” However, it was clarified that “in case there is connectivity problems due to geographical location or there is some other unavoidable difficulty, the time can be extended up to forty-eight hours” and “the said 48 hours can be extended maximum up to 72 hours.”

It was further directed that the “decision not to upload the copy of the FIR on the website shall not be taken by an officer below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police or any person holding equivalent post. In case, the States where District Magistrate has a role, he may also assume the said authority.” The Court also clarified that if an FIR is not uploaded “it shall not enure *per se* a ground to obtain the benefit under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C.” It was also directed that “in case a copy of the FIR is

not provided on the ground of sensitive nature of the case, a person grieved by the said action, after disclosing his identity, can submit a representation to the Superintendent of Police or any person holding the equivalent post in the State. The Superintendent of Police shall constitute a committee of three officers which shall deal with the said grievance. As far as the Metropolitan cities are concerned, where Commissioner is there, if a representation is submitted to the Commissioner of Police who shall constitute a committee of three officers. The committee so constituted shall deal with the grievance within three days from the date of receipt of the representation and communicate it to the grieved person.”

22. On 14<sup>th</sup> September, 2016, in the case of *Devika Biswas v. Union of India & Ors.* [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 95 of 2012], while examining important issues concerning the entire range of conduct and management, under the auspices of State Governments, of sterilization procedures wherein women and occasionally men are sterilized in camps or in accredited centres, and also pre-operation procedures and post-operative care or lack of it, the Supreme court issued a number of directives.

It was *inter alia* directed that the “State-wise, district-wise or region-wise panel of doctors approved for carrying out the sterilization procedure, must be accessible through the website of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare of the Government of India as well the corresponding Ministry or Department of each State Government and each Union Territory” and the “list should contain all necessary particulars of each doctor and not merely the name and designation”. The Court also emphasized on the requirement of ensuring that a proposed patient gives “an informed consent for undergoing the sterilization procedure and not an incentivized consent.”

Further, while directing the Union of India to ensure strict adherence to the guidelines and standard operating procedures in the various manuals issued by it, the Court held that “the Sterilization program is not only a Public Health issue but a national campaign for Population Control and Family Planning. The Union of India has overarching responsibility for the success of the campaign and it cannot shift the burden of implementation entirely on the State Governments and Union Territories on the ground that it is only a public health issue.” Also, directing the Union of India to take a decision on or before 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2016 on whether it would like to frame a National Health Policy or not, the Court observed that “in case the Union of India thinks it worthwhile to have a National Health Policy, it should take steps to announce it at the earliest and keep issues of gender equity in mind as well.”

## **MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY (NJA) (01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016)**

**1. Annual National Seminar on Working of the NDPS Courts in India: 13<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2016:** The seminar was organised to discuss the working of the NDPS Courts as special courts in the judicial system in India. In course of the seminar, issues relating to provisions relating to search and seizure under the NDPS Act, presumption of “culpable mental state” vis-à-vis reverse burden of proof, pre-trial disposal of narcotics contrabands, procedural safeguards and immunities, sentencing policy for drug offenders under the amended NDPS Act, and measures for expediting disposal of NDPS cases were deliberated upon.

**2. Annual National Seminar on Working of the Human Rights Courts of India: 20<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> August, 2016:** In the seminar, inadequacies in the existing legislation and how to overcome the same with the help of constitutional principles were discussed. Apart from the current situation with regard to Human Rights, challenges and advancements made in the area of protection of human rights of the accused, victims and the disadvantaged sections of the society, the Conference also highlighted various approaches to achieving speedy trial of offences arising out of violation of human rights.

**3. Training Programme For Judicial Officers from Sri Lanka: 20<sup>th</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> August, 2016:** The group of participants were led by a judge of the Supreme Court of Sri Lanka and consisted of judges from High Courts and Subordinate Judiciary. Emerging issues like cybercrimes, electronic evidence, discrimination and disparity in sentencing related to crimes against human body, economic crimes, etc were among the five day deliberations. Subject matters like doctrine of death penalty and its status on a comparative basis between Sri Lanka and India, and judicial ethics were discussed at length. Cross cultural exposure through visit to world heritage religio-historic site “Sanchi” and a dedicated visit to experience the working of a “District Court” at Bhopal formed an integral part of the scheduled program. The programme provided a platform for the exchange of experience of the prevailing status and contemporary development of laws in specific domains at India and Sri Lanka.



**4. Conference on the use of Court Room Technology in the High Court: 27<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016:** The main aim of this Conference was to understand the ways in which technology can, and is helping the judiciary and effective ways to implement it. The experts highlighted how best to integrate technology in courtrooms and optimum utilisation of ICT to reduce time taken for tasks at different levels in the judicial process. The different themes that were presented during the Conference were Cadre of Technical manpower for implementing e-Court projects; E-Justice: Reengineering the Judicial process through effective use of technology; Uniform nomenclature for all High Courts Under National Court Management System; Information Technology and Computer Forensics; Information Technology in Law with focus on Cyber security and IPR; Technology and Security related issues.

**5. Annual National Conference on Economic Crimes: 3<sup>th</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2016:** The conference was organized with the objective of providing participant High Court Justices with a deeper understanding of economic crimes, the unique nature of economic crimes in various sectors and industries, the impact of such crimes on the industry and the economic growth of the country. Discussions highlighted the judicial role in addressing various problems, contemporaneous area of concern and current technology and strategies to deal with these problems.

**6. Workshop on Sentencing at Trial Court level: 10<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2016:** The workshop was organised with the objective of assisting the judges in comprehending, evolving and internalising good sentencing practices for some of the more challenging criminal cases among others, as well as providing jurisprudential insights into sentencing. Deliberations worked towards bringing a measure of convergence, which would be relevant in deciding appropriate sentences. For this purpose, the programme was designed and divided into five sessions namely Jurisprudence of Death Penalty; Sentencing in Economic Offences; Sentencing Parameters in Trial of Sexual Offences against Women and Children; Sentencing Parameters in Major Offences against Human Body; and Excluding Homicide and Sexual Offences against Women and Sentencing Parameters in cases of Young Offenders. Experts addressed on various issues relating to sentencing in various cases particularly capital offences, sexual offences and other major offences against the individual and the State.

**7. Workshop for Members of Railway Claims Tribunal: 10<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2016:** The workshop served as a common platform for the members to air their views and concerns about their day-to-day working and explore appropriate strategies for

expeditious resolution of claims in RCT. The thematic areas covered were Jurisdictional Charter of RCT, overview of railway accidents and claims, norms of strict liability, components of decision making as well as statutory interpretation of some of the key concepts such as untoward incident, self-inflicted injury and criminal act etc. Deliberations centred on the need for adopting a non-litigative approach under superintendence of RCT, methodologies for securing investigatory support for ascertaining genuineness of claims and approaches to identify appropriate strategies for expeditious disposals in RCT.

**8. Annual National Seminar on Functions of the Registrar General in different High Courts: 17<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2016:** The main aim of the seminar was to initiate discussions on vital issues related to the functions of the Registrars General and to sensitize them on Management skills, Augmentation of Human Resource Skills and capacity for occupational Stress Management. The various topics worked towards approaches to develop harmony & better co-ordination among judicial officers, ministerial staff and other stakeholders in the judicial system. Apart from sensitizing participants on management skills training which includes importance of leadership, team building, augmentation of human resource skills and capacity for occupational stress management, resource persons and participants shared the best ideas and experiences and came out with solutions to deal effectively with administrative issues.

**9. Annual National Seminar on Working of the First Level Commercial Courts in India: 24<sup>th</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2016:** The main objective of the seminar was to strengthen capacity of presiding officers of commercial courts and to facilitate sharing of experiences, skills and resources to enhance the quality of justice in commercial courts. The deliberations were on themes related to disputes regarding Construction and Infrastructure, Intellectual Property Rights, Carriage of Goods, Distribution & Licensing, Insurance and Re-Insurance and Joint Venture Agreements. The seminar also focussed on procedures relating to collection and disclosure of data and case management.

## **MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES AUTHORITY (NALSA) (01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016)**

**1. Regional Meets of State Legal Services Authorities:** Two Regional Meets of State Legal Services Authorities on “Effective Implementation of Legal Services Programmes: Challenges and Way Forward” were conducted during the period: (i) For Southern States held on 23-24 July, 2016 at Puducherry; and (ii) for Eastern States including Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand held on 3 - 4 September, 2016 at Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. The broad objectives of the Meets were: a) to understand and build consensus on priorities of State Legal Services Authorities in the Region; b) to discuss ways of enhancing the visibility of legal services institutions and their work; c) to find effective ways of full and proper utilisation of grants, by expanding the range and enhancing quality of legal services; and d) to identify area specific challenges and find a way forward.

**2. Special Talk by Hon’ble Chief Justice of India through All India Radio:** A special talk with the then Hon’ble the then Chief Justice of India & Patron-in-Chief, NALSA Mr. Justice T.S.Thakur on the topic “Empowerment through Legal Aid” was broadcast on the channels of Akashwani through the country on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 on the eve of International Justice Day.

**3. Remand Advocates:** In order to ensure that all the under trial prisoners get representation from the first day of production in court itself, all the SLSAs were advised to appoint one Remand Advocate for each of the criminal courts, to represent the unrepresented accused in custody, oppose remand, move bail applications and miscellaneous applications etc and to undertake such other action as may be necessary to effectively represent the accused at the stage of remand. Accordingly, most of the SLSAs have designated one panel lawyer for each Magistrates Court and Sessions Court wherever remand proceedings are conducted.

**4. Interaction with Jail Inmates:** Officers of NALSA visited jails namely Central Jail (Tripura), Yerawada (Pune), Jagdalpur (Chhattisgarh) Dimapur (Nagaland) and interacted with inmates both under trials and convicts and also with the DLSA officers, Para Legal Volunteers, Panel Lawyers and gave necessary directions for improving the system of representation of the inmates in courts. It was discovered that at many places, the inmates were not being produced before the Courts regularly for remand,

either physically or through video conferencing. Some of them did not know the status of their appeals in the higher courts. Consequently, a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for legal representation of persons in custody was prepared and sent to all SLSAs for implementation.

**5. Undertrial Review Committees:** Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in W.P.(C) No.406/2013 passed directions for release of under trial prisoners who had served half of the sentence giving the benefit of Section 436 A of the Cr.P.C. Pursuant to the same, Under Trial Review Committees have been set up in all the districts chaired by the District Judge of the concerned district and the District Legal Services Authorities have been assisting the under trial prisoners in getting benefit of Section 436 A of Cr.P.C. During the period from April, 2016 to September, 2016, 1729 such cases were identified by the DLSA Secretaries, out of which 438 UTPs were recommended by the UTRCs for release and 185 of them have been released.

**6. Standard Operating Procedure for Redressal of Complaints / Public Grievances:** With a view to streamlining the procedure and ensuring timely and effective redressal of grievances/complaints made by the general public, an SOP was developed and was sent to all SLSAs for implementation. The SLSAs are following the procedure which has resulted in zero pendency of grievances pertaining to Legal Services Authorities registered at Central Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS) Portal. An online Web Portal for this purpose has also been launched.

**7. Legal Services to Sex Workers:** Officers of NALSA interacted with the sex workers and CBOs working with them at Pune and Sangli (Maharashtra) which led to establishing linkages between the sex workers and organisations working for them with the District Legal Services Authorities, police authorities and legal services institutions in the said two districts.

**8. National Workshop on Rehabilitation of Missing and Trafficked Children Phase-I on 22nd & 23rd August, 2016:** The National Legal Services Authority in association with Delhi State Legal Services Authority and Bachpan Bachao Andolan through the All India Child Rights Cell organised a National Workshop on Rehabilitation of Missing and Trafficked Children Phase-I on 22nd & 23rd August, 2016. The Workshop was inaugurated by Hon'ble Mr. Justice T.S.Thakur, the then Hon'ble Chief Justice of India & Patron-in-Chief, National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) in the presence Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil R.Dave, Judge, Supreme Court of India & the then Executive Chairman, NALSA, Hon'ble Ms. Justice G.Rohini, Chief Justice, High Court of Delhi & Patron-in-Chief, Delhi State Legal Services Authority (DSLISA), Hon'ble Ms. Justice Indira Banerjee, Judge, High Court of Delhi & Executive Chairman, DSLISA and Nobel Peace Laureate Shri. Kailash Satyarthi. Discussions were held with various stakeholders in the

technical sessions on the next day regarding repatriation and rehabilitation of missing and trafficked children. This led to development of draft Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) with a view to facilitating easier and quicker identification of the Children's native home and drawing up the plan for repatriation and rehabilitation by the CWCs. The said draft SOP has been sent to all SLSAs for implementation.

**9. Initiative for Protection of Water Resources:** State Legal Services Authorities have been issued advisory to take up the issue of 'Protection of Water Resources' as a part of preventive and strategic level awareness programmes. In this regard a detailed concept note has been sent to all State Legal Services Authorities.

**10. Consultative Meet of Member Secretaries, SLSAs held on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 at India International Centre, New Delhi:** National Legal Services Authority organised Consultative Meet of the Member Secretaries, State Legal Services Authorities on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 at India International Centre, New Delhi to discuss various issues arising in the implementation of Legal Services Programmes.

**11. Hon'ble Executive Chairman, NALSA interactive session on Doordarshan:** Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil R.Dave, the then Executive Chairman, NALSA along with Shri Prakash Jha, Director & Producer of M/s. Prakash Jha Productions gave a brief description of the activities conducted by NALSA and SLSAs on the National Television (Doordarshan) for ensuring prompt and qualitative legal services to the marginalised sections of the society.

**TOTAL DISPOSAL IN MONTHLY NATIONAL LOK ADALATS ORGANISED ON VARIOUS SUBJECT MATTERS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY, 2016 TO SEPTEMBER, 2016**

S.No	Date	Subject	No. of Disposal of cases/matters (Both Pre-litigative and Post litigative stages)
1	09.07.2016	Electricity/ Water/ Telephone and Public Utility Dispute etc.	708305
2	13.08.2016	Banking Matters & U/s 138 NI Act	409487
3.	10.09.2016	Criminal Compoundable Matters	324208

## **SOME IMPORTANT VISITS AND MEETINGS (From 01-07-2016 to 30-09-2016)**

### **WITHIN SUPREME COURT PREMISES: Meeting of Belgian delegation with Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India and Hon'ble Judges of Supreme Court of India:**

A Belgian delegation comprising Hon'ble Mr. Etienne De Groot and Hon'ble Mr. Jean Spreutels, Presidents, Constitutional Court of the Kingdom of Belgium visited Supreme Court of India and held discussion with Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India and Hon'ble Judges of Supreme Court of India on 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2016. The following topics were discussed during the meeting: Division of authority / Separation of Powers; Independence of Judiciary; "Activism" in the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court; and Rights to human dignity and Challenges of enforcement of Human Rights.

### **ABROAD:**

1. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur visited Sri Lanka to participate as a Speaker at the 29<sup>th</sup> LAWASIA Conference organized by the LAWASIA (the Law Association for Asia and the Pacific) & Golden Jubilee held in Colombo from 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> August, 2016. His Lordship presented a paper on the subject "Case management through court-annexed mediation and other developments".
2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph visited Italy as part of the delegation led by the Hon'ble Minister for External Affairs 2016 in connection with canonization of Mother Teresa at Vatican (Rome) during first week of September, 2016.

### **INLAND:**

1. Hon'ble Shri T. S. Thakur, the then Chief Justice of India, visited (i) Ranchi (Jharkhand) – (a) to attend Ceremony of Laying of Foundation Stone for the "Lawyers' Academy", Ranchi and (b) to inaugurate National Seminar on "Continuing Legal Education for Lawyers and it's Benefits" at Judicial Academy, Ranchi on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; ii) Hyderabad (Telangana) – to deliver the Convocation address at the Fourteenth Annual Convocation of NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad on 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; iii) Shimla (Himachal Pradesh) – for (a) Laying of Foundation Stone of H.P. National Law University, Shimla; (b) Inauguration of Hostel Block of H.P. Judicial Academy, Shimla on 19<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; and (c) Convocation of Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; iv) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend (a) the General Council Meeting at National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; (b) the Memorial Lecture on

“Tackling the Arrears: In the Pursuit of Excellence” on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (c) Convocation of National Law School of India University, Bengaluru on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; v) Raipur & Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh) – to (a) attend public seminar on “Protection and Enforcement of Tribal Rights”, (b) attend the Bhoomi Poojan of Commercial Court Complex and (c) participate in Executive Council Meeting of Hidayatullah National Law University, Raipur on 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 and (d) for inauguration of Annual Conference of Judicial Officers at High Court of Chhattisgarh at Bilaspur on 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2016; and vi) Ahmedabad (Gujarat) – for (a) inauguration of newly constructed Auditorium of the Gujarat High Court on 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2016; (b) inauguration of newly constructed campus of Gujarat State Judicial Academy, (c) inauguration of State Level Conference of Judicial Officers, (d) Release of Souvenir on the occasion of inauguration of Campus Auditorium and (e) Meeting of the General Council of Gujarat National Law University (GNLU), Ahmedabad on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil R. Dave visited (i) Ranchi (Jharkhand) – to attend National Seminar and foundation stone laying ceremony at Ranchi on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (ii) Puducherry – to attend Southern Regional Conference of NALSA on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2016; (iii) Jodhpur (Rajasthan) – to attend function of Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority on 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (iv) Patiala (Punjab) – to attend First National Animal Law Moot Court Competition-2016 at Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (v) Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh) – to attend Regional meet of the State Legal Services Authorities of East Region on 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2016.

3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra (i) attended the 1<sup>st</sup> Regional Conference for Sensitization of Family Court Matters at Jaipur, Rajasthan on 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 and (ii) attended, as a Chief Guest, the Inauguration Ceremony of First National Animal Law Moot Court Competition at Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, at Patiala (Punjab) on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar visited (i) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend Valedictory Programme of the International Conference on Liberalization and Globalization: Changing Legal Paradigm organized by NLSIU, Bengaluru on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (ii) Guruvayur (Kerala) – to inaugurate the Legal Workshop for Junior Lawyers on Criminal Trial and Cyber Law organized by the Bar Council of India in association with Bar Council of Kerala and Menon Institute of Legal Advocacy Training at Raja Island, Guruvayur on 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2016; and (iii) Guntur (Andhra Pradesh) – to attend 200<sup>th</sup> Death Anniversary of Raja Vasireddy Venkatadri Naidu on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

5. Hon'ble Mr. Justice F. M. Ibrahim Kalifulla visited Mumbai (Maharashtra) – to (i) attend Orientation Day 2016 at MNLU Mumbai at TISS Campus, Deonar Mumbai and (ii) deliver Presidential Address on 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.

6. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur visited (i) Chhattisgarh – to (a) inaugurate the Commercial Dispute Resolution Centre comprising of Commercial Court, Commercial Arbitration Centre and Commercial Mediation Centre, Chhattisgarh on 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2016 and (b) inaugurate the Awareness cum Orientation Programme of e-Court, Mission Mode Project, Phase II at High Court Auditorium on 3<sup>rd</sup> July, 2016; (ii) Hyderabad (Andhra Pradesh & Telangana) – (a) to attend the valedictory function of the Screening Course on Cyber Laws, Cyber Crimes and Electronic Evidence in National Police Academy, Hyderabad for Judicial Officers and thereafter interact with the Faculty and Participants to obtain their feedback from 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; and (b) to inaugurate the first paper less court in the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad on 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (iii) Mumbai (Maharashtra) – to attend (a) State Level Consultations on “Interpreting Juvenile Crime Data” organized by the High Court Juvenile Justice Committee (Bombay High Court) in collaboration with Resource Cell for Juvenile Justice at Maharashtra Judicial Academy on 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2016 and (b) the programme on Juvenile Justice: Role of Socio-Legal Cells for Juveniles in Observation Homes organized by the Department of Justice at Mumbai on 24<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (iv) Allahabad (Uttar Pradesh) – to attend the Conference at the Centre for Information Technology on “Digitisation of Judicial Records”, High Court of Judicature at Allahabad on 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; and (v) Guwahati (Assam) – to inaugurate the ‘Workshop on International Humanitarian Laws’ organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in association with the Judicial Academy, Assam from 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

7. Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Gopala Gowda visited (i) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend a Seminar conducted by the District Legal Services Authority, Hassan on 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (ii) Hyderabad (Telangana) – to attend a Seminar at Sundraiyya Vigyanan Kendra, Baghlingam Palli, Hyderabad on 13<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; (iii) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend (a) the Academic Council Meeting of the National Law School of India University and (b) the General Council Meeting of the National Law School of India University, on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; (iv) Jaipur (Rajasthan) – to (a) inaugurate 6<sup>th</sup> FYLC Ranka Moot Court Competition, 2016 at Humanities Hall, Rajasthan University, Jaipur and (b) deliver ‘RC Ghiya Memorial Lecture’ at Mahaveer Auditorium, Mahaveer Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur on 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2016; (v) Chandigarh (Punjab/Haryana) – to inaugurate the Joint State Conferences at Chandigarh Judicial Academy, organized by the Punjab and Haryana State Units of the Indian Association of Lawyers on 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 and (vi) Bengaluru (Karnataka) and Chittoor (Andhra Pradesh) – to (a) attend Centenary Celebration of Courts at Kolar Gold Fields, (b) have an interaction with Bar Association



Members at Madanapalle, Chittoor and (c) to attend Madanapalle Institute of Technology & Science (MITS) Freshers' Day Celebrations at Madanapalle, Chittoor on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

8. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph visited (i) Jalandhar (Punjab) – to attend function at St. Joseph's Convent School, Cantonment, Jalandhar on 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 and (ii) Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh) – to attend the Annual National Seminar on functions of the Registrar General in different High Courts organized by National Judicial Academy, Bhopal on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

9. Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Sikri visited (i) Ranchi (Jharkhand) – to attend the ceremony of Laying of Foundation Stone for the Lawyer's Academy organized by the Jharkhand State Bar Council and the Bar Council of India from 16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (ii) Mumbai (Maharashtra) – to attend the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Legal Era International Arbitration Summit 2016 organized by Legal Era Magazine from 29<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (iii) Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh) – to attend the Training Programme by National Judicial Academy on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (iv) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend the Executive and General Council meetings as also Convocation of the National Law School of India University, Bengaluru from 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

10. Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. A. Bobde visited Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend the meeting of the General Council and Annual Convocation of National Law School of India University on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

11. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Shiva Kirti Singh visited Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend a function organized by National Law School of India University, Bengaluru from 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

12. Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. K. Agrawal visited (i) participated in the Inaugural Function of the ILA All India Seminar on 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2016 and also chaired the Session on 'Recognition/ Non-Recognition in International Law' on the same day; (ii) Kolkata (West Bengal) – to participate in the Annual Tax Conference on 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; (iii) Jamshedpur (Jharkhand) - to participate in the National Tax Conference on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; (iv) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to (a) attend Meetings at Conference Hall, Training Centre, NLSIU on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (b) participate in the 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Convocation of NLSIU on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (v) Dwarka (Delhi) – to Judge the Final Round of 5<sup>th</sup> Indraprastha National Moot Court Competition on 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

13. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Mishra visited Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to attend the General Council Meeting and the Annual Convocation of the National Law School of India University, Bengaluru from 26<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

14. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Adarsh Kumar Goel visited (i) Chandigarh (Punjab/ Haryana) – to attend the “National Lawyers’ Conference” on 13<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; and (ii) Bengaluru (Karnataka) – to (a) attend meeting of the Academic Council on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 and (b) Annual Convocation at NLSIU, Bengaluru on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

15. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abhay Mahohar Sapre visited (i) Raipur and Bilaspur (Chhattisgrarh) – to (a) attend public seminar on “Protection and Enforcement of Tribal Rights”, (b) attend the Bhoomi Poojan of Commercial Court Complex, (c) participate in Executive Council Meeting of Hidayatullah National Law University, Raipur on 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 and (d) for Inauguration of Annual Conference of Judicial Officers on 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2016; and (ii) Ahmedabad (Gujarat) – to attend the Meeting of Gujarat National Law University on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

16. Hon'ble Mrs. Justice R. Banumathi (i) visited Ranchi, Jharkhand to attend (a) the foundation stone laying ceremony for the Advocates’ Academy; and (b) the National Seminar on “Continuing Legal Education for Lawyers and its Benefits” organised by Jharkhand State Bar Council on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2016; (ii) attended a seminar on the occasion of release of handbook on “Gender Sensitisation” organised by the Gender Sensitization and Internal Complaints Committee of the Supreme Court of India in the Supreme Court premises on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016; and (iii) also attended the 6<sup>th</sup> Symposium of International Academy of Family Lawyers organised by IAFL at India International Centre, New Delhi on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

17. Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud visited Mumbai (Maharashtra) – to attend the inaugural session in connection with the Training Programme for Probation Officers and Legal Services Lawyers attached to the JJBs, organized by National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.



P.S.C. 4 II 2016 (2)  
1500

Annual Subscription for 2016  
(For 12 Volumes, each Volume consisting of  
4 Parts and an Index)

In Indian Rupees : 5,940/-  
In UK £ : 167  
In US \$ : 222

Each Additional Volume:

In Indian Rupees : 495/-  
In UK £ : 14  
In US \$ : 18

(Individual Volumes or Parts not available for Sale)

To Subscribe please Contact :

Assistant Controller (Business),  
Department of Publication, Govt. of India,  
Civil Lines, Delhi-110054  
Tel.: 011-23810150 Fax : 91-011-23817846  
Email : acop-dep@nic.in

Regd. No. D-(D) 155.

ISSN 0537-0590

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed by : Abhinav Prints  
K-88, Udyog Nagar Indl. Area, Rohtak Road, Delhi-41

SUPREME COURT REPORTS [2016] 2 S.C.R. (Part-II) Pages 277 - 560



The

# Supreme Court Reports

(WEEKLY)

Official Journal  
of Reportable Supreme Court Decisions

[2016] 2 S.C.R. (Part-II)

## Highlights of the issue

Decree – Meaning and scope of.

*Rishabh Chand Jain v.  
Ginesh Chandra Jain* ... 334

There cannot be uncontrolled or  
unguided exercise of Epistolary  
jurisdiction.

*Jt. Secy., Political Dept., Govt.  
of Meghalaya v. High Court of  
Meghalaya Thr. Registrar* ...376

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
BY THE CONTROLLER OF PUBLICATIONS, GOVT. OF INDIA, DELHI