



COURT NEWS

Vol. XII Issue No. 4

October - December, 2017



EDITORIAL BOARD

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sharad Arvind Bobde, Judge, Supreme Court of India

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Adarsh Kumar Goel, Judge, Supreme Court of India

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy, 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.supremecourtofindia.nic.in

LIST OF SUPREME COURT JUDGES

(As on 31-12-2017)

S.No.	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement
01.	Hon'ble Shri Dipak Misra, Chief Justice of India	10-10-2011 As CJI: 28-08-2017	03-10-2018
02.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar	10-10-2011	23-06-2018
03.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Gogoi	23-04-2012	18-11-2019
04.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur	04-06-2012	31-12-2018
05.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph	08-03-2013	30-11-2018
06.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Sikri	12-04-2013	07-03-2019
07.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sharad Arvind Bobde	12-04-2013	24-04-2021
08.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.K. Agrawal	17-02-2014	05-05-2018
09.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.V. Ramana	17-02-2014	27-08-2022
10.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Mishra	07-07-2014	03-09-2020
11.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Adarsh Kumar Goel	07-07-2014	07-07-2018
12.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.F. Nariman	07-07-2014	13-08-2021
13.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abhay Manohar Sapre	13-08-2014	28-08-2019
14.	Hon'ble Mrs. Justice R. Banumathi	13-08-2014	20-07-2020
15.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Uday U. Lalit	13-08-2014	09-11-2022
16.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy	27-02-2015	01-03-2018
17.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.M. Khanwilkar	13-05-2016	30-07-2022
18.	Hon'ble Dr. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud	13-05-2016	11-11-2024
19.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhushan	13-05-2016	05-07-2021
20.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Nageswara Rao	13-05-2016	08-06-2022
21.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul	17-02-2017	26-12-2023
22.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mohan M. Shantanagoudar	17-02-2017	05-05-2023
23.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. Abdul Nazeer	17-02-2017	05-01-2023
24.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Navin Sinha	17-02-2017	19-08-2021
25.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Deepak Gupta	17-02-2017	07-05-2020

CONTENTS

Appointments in the High Courts	2
Transfers between the High Courts.....	2
Vacancies in the Courts.....	3 - 4
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the Supreme Court.....	5
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the High Courts	6
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the District and Subordinate Courts	7
Some Supreme Court Judgments / Orders of Public Importance.....	8 - 22
Major activities of National Judicial Academy.....	23 - 26
Foreign delegations in Supreme Court.....	27
Some Major Events.....	28
Some Important Visits and Conferences	29 - 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 IN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-10-2017 TO 31-12-2017)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
1	Kerala	Ashok Menon	30-11-17
		Annie John	30-11-17
		R. Narayan Pisharadi	30-11-17
2	Madras	S. Ramathilagam	01-12-17
		R. Tharani	01-12-17
		P. Rajamanickam	01-12-17
		T. Krishnavalli	01-12-17
		R. Pongiappan	01-12-17
		R. Hemalatha	01-12-17

TRANSFERS BETWEEN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-10-2017 TO 31-12-2017)

S.No.	From (Name of concerned High Court)	To (Name of concerned High Court)	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Transfer
1.	Jammu & Kashmir	Punjab & Haryana	Bawa Singh Walia	09-10-17
2.	Rajasthan	Allahabad	Govind Mathur	21-11-17
3.	Orissa	Madras	Satrughana Pujahari	23-11-17
4.	Delhi	Patna	Ashutosh Kumar	24-11-17
5.	Meghalaya	Allahabad	V.P. Vaish	27-11-17

VACANCIES IN THE COURTS

A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (As on 31-12-2017)

Sanctioned Strength	Working strength	Vacancies
31	25	06

B) HIGH COURTS (As on 31-12-2017)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Allahabad	160	108	52
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	61	31	30
3	Bombay	94	70	24
4	Calcutta	72	33	39
5	Chhatisgarh	22	12	10
6	Delhi	60	37	23
7	Gujarat	52	31	21
8	Gauhati	24	18	6
9	Himachal Pradesh	13	8	5
10	Jammu & Kashmir	17	11	6
11	Jharkhand	25	14	11
12	Karnataka	62	25	37
13	Kerala	47	37	10
14	Madhya Pradesh	53	34	19
15	Madras	75	54	21
16	Manipur	5	2	3
17	Meghalaya	4	2	2
18	Orissa	27	18	9
19	Patna	53	33	20
20	Punjab & Haryana	85	50	35
21	Rajasthan	50	35	15
22	Sikkim	3	2	1
23	Tripura	4	2	2
24	Uttarakhand	11	9	2
Total		1079	676	403

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

C) DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (As on 31-12-2017)

S.No.	State/ Union Territory	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Uttar Pradesh	3204	1856	1348
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	986	920	66
3(a)	Maharashtra	2280	2216	64
3(b)	Goa	57	47	10
3(c)	Diu and Daman	4	4	0
3(d)	Silvassa	3	3	0
4	West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar	1013	933	80
5	Chhatisgarh	398	335	63
6	Delhi	799	482	317
7	Gujarat	1496	1121	375
8(a)	Assam	428	352	76
8(b)	Nagaland	34	22	12
8(c)	Mizoram	63	46	17
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	28	17	11
9	Himachal Pradesh	159	148	11
10	Jammu & Kashmir	253	224	29
11	Jharkhand	672	419	253
12	Karnataka	1303	976	327
13(a)	Kerala	535	452	83
13(b)	Lakshadweep	3	2	1
14	Madhya Pradesh	2021	1293	728
15	Manipur	49	40	9
16	Meghalaya	97	39	58
17(a)	Tamil Nadu	1108	908	200
17(b)	Puducherry	26	12	14
18	Odisha	862	658	204
19	Bihar	1828	993	835
20(a)	Punjab	674	538	136
20(b)	Haryana	645	496	149
20(c)	Chandigarh	30	30	0
21	Rajasthan	1225	1122	103
22	Sikkim	23	18	5
23	Tripura	107	76	31
24	Uttarakhand	291	230	61
TOTAL		22704	17028	5676

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

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT [01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017]

i) Table I

						Pendency (At the end of 30-09-2017)		
						Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
						32,798	23,591	56,389
Institution (01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)			Disposal (01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)			Pendency (At the end of 31-12-2017)		
Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
12,782	1,661	14,443	12,546	2,698	15,244	33,034	22,554	55,588

Note:

1. Out of the 55,558 pending matters as on 31-12-2017, if connected matters are excluded, the pendency is only of 28,323 matters as on 31-12-2017.
2. Out of the said 55,558 pending matters as on 31-12-2017, 9,442 matters are upto one year old and thus arrears (i.e. cases pending more than a year) are only of 46,146 matters as on 31-12-2017.

ii) Table II

	OPENING BALANCE AS ON 01-10-17	INSTITUTION (FROM 01-10- 17 TO 31-12-17)	DISPOSAL (FROM 01-10-17 TO 31-12-17)	PENDENCY AT THE END OF 31-12-17
CIVIL CASES	47,402	10,946	12,331	46,017
CRIMINAL CASES	8,987	3,497	2,913	9,571
ALL CASES (TOTAL)	56,389	14,443	15,244	55,588

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-10-2017 TO 31-12-2017)

Srl. No.	Name of the High Court	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.) (As on 1/09/2017)			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.)			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.)			Pending Cases at the end of this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.) (As on 31/12/2017)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1/09/17	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1/09/17	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1/09/17
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)			
1	Allahabad	537464	374726	912190	35919	42830	78749	41235	40877	82112	532148	376679	908827	8.63	9.00	-0.37
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	273153	45264	318417	17873	5046	22919	11985	4713	16698	279041	45597	324638	7.20	5.24	1.95
3	Bombay	216899	52955	269854	17002	6429	23431	14089	4891	18980	219812	54493	274305	8.68	7.03	1.65
4	Calcutta*	183587	39880	223467	8964	3897	12861	9089	4591	13680	183462	39186	222648	5.76	6.12	-0.37
5	Chhatisgarh	36441	23063	59504	5458	3540	8998	5433	3613	9046	36466	22990	59456	15.12	15.20	-0.08
6	Delhi	50207	19453	69660	6430	3564	9994	6135	3235	9370	50502	19782	70284	14.35	13.45	0.90
7	Gujarat*	78160	33078	111238	13294	10813	24107	11070	10449	21519	80384	33442	113826	21.67	19.35	2.33
8	Gauhati *	24545	5628	30173	3363	548	3911	2564	611	3175	25344	5565	30909	12.96	10.52	2.44
9	Himachal Pradesh	24658	5772	30430	5422	1105	6527	4503	1095	5598	25577	5782	31359	21.45	18.40	3.05
10	Jammu & Kashmir	55977	5871	61848	4011	690	4701	3830	657	4487	56158	5904	62062	7.60	7.25	0.35
11	Jharkhand	46444	42899	89343	2778	6062	8840	2011	5184	7195	47211	43777	90988	9.89	8.05	1.84
12	Karnataka	283230	28491	311721	28594	4503	33097	18056	3037	21093	293768	29957	323725	10.62	6.77	3.85
13	Kerala	136742	38631	175373	17072	6055	23127	15506	5732	21238	138308	38954	177262	13.19	12.11	1.08
14	Madhya Pradesh	187058	114220	301278	17066	16817	33883	13110	14631	27741	191014	116406	307420	11.25	9.21	2.04
15	Madras*	265545	35034	300579	21895	15627	37522	21141	14484	35625	266299	36177	302476	12.48	11.85	0.63
16	Manipur	3313	174	3487	394	46	440	231	26	257	3476	194	3670	12.62	7.37	5.25
17	Meghalaya	683	30	713	151	21	172	164	24	188	670	27	697	24.12	26.37	-2.24
18	Orissa*	124047	44103	168150	9188	9452	18640	10042	8451	18493	123193	45104	168297	11.09	11.00	0.09
19	Patna	84691	56040	140731	8877	19476	28353	6788	17629	24417	86780	57887	144667	20.15	17.35	2.80
20	Punjab & Haryana	221364	102955	324319	18003	16486	34489	13937	13333	27270	225430	106108	331538	10.63	8.41	2.23
21	Rajasthan	187759	70573	258332	18331	13625	31956	14446	13899	28345	191644	70299	261943	12.37	10.97	1.40
22	Sikkim	136	51	187	43	27	70	29	18	47	150	60	210	37.43	25.13	12.30
23	Tripura	2093	439	2532	616	100	716	395	94	489	2314	445	2759	28.28	19.31	8.97
24	Uttarakhand	20492	9254	29746	3439	1989	5428	3374	1778	5152	20557	9465	30022	18.25	17.32	0.93
	TOTAL	3044688	1148584	4193272	264183	188748	452931	229163	173052	402215	3079708	1164280	4243988	10.80	9.59	1.21

* Figures modified by the High Court concerned.

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

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (FROM 01-10-2017 TO 31-12-2017)

Srl.No	Name of the State/UT	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.) (As on 1/09/2017)			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.)			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.)			Pending Cases at the end of this Quarter (Oct-Dec 2017) (Civil/Crl.) (Nos.) (As on 31/12/2017)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/09/17	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/09/17	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/09/17
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ + Crl.)			
1	Uttar Pradesh	1557030	4736130	6293160	123858	722671	846529	113805	635200	749005	1567083	4823601	6390684	13.45	11.90	1.55
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	513620	533453	1047073	69403	125294	194697	70224	130682	200906	512799	528065	1040864	18.59	19.19	-0.59
3(a)	Maharashtra	1134135	2241892	3376027	94992	507925	602917	91397	547497	638894	1137730	2202320	3340050	17.86	18.92	-1.07
3(b)	Goa	23756	17868	41624	2495	5342	7837	4718	5494	10212	21533	17716	39249	18.83	24.53	-5.71
3(c)	Diu & Daman	861	846	1707	214	236	450	131	283	414	944	799	1743	26.36	24.25	2.11
3(d)	Silvassa	1457	2053	3510	120	223	343	97	204	301	1480	2072	3552	9.77	8.58	1.20
4(a)	West Bengal	483251	1623234	2106485	29880	181275	211155	31008	145378	176386	482123	1659131	2141254	10.02	8.37	1.65
4(b)	Andaman & Nicobar	3690	5975	9665	265	2135	2400	550	2288	2838	3405	5822	9227	24.83	29.36	-4.53
5	Chhatisgarh	61289	216652	277941	6673	48369	55042	8263	47382	55645	59699	217639	277338	19.80	20.02	-0.22
6	Delhi	177867	529863	707730	39534	174625	214159	36555	137630	174185	180846	566858	747704	30.26	24.61	5.65
7	Gujarat	496834	1114492	1611326	55254	227043	282297	72735	265685	338420	479353	1075850	1555203	17.52	21.00	-3.48
8(a)	Assam	68047	209194	277241	9566	85930	95496	9211	87006	96217	68402	208118	276520	34.45	34.71	-0.26
8(b)	Nagaland	1923	2816	4739	233	620	853	172	671	843	1984	2765	4749	18.00	17.79	0.21
8(c)	Mizoram	2339	2789	5128	1454	1546	3000	1410	1570	2980	2383	2765	5148	58.50	58.11	0.39
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	2875	8235	11110	188	841	1029	1174	1087	2261	1889	7989	9878	9.26	20.35	-11.09
9	Himachal Pradesh	105604	121792	227396	18345	61516	79861	17296	55322	72618	106653	127986	234639	35.12	31.93	3.19
10	Jammu & Kashmir	53729	100720	154449	7637	35520	43157	9724	26208	35932	51642	110032	161674	27.94	23.26	4.68
11	Jharkhand	60124	276324	336448	4486	29168	33654	4518	26904	31422	60092	278588	338680	10.00	9.34	0.66
12	Karnataka*	707475	701517	1408992	86606	237877	324483	82579	217560	300139	711502	721450	1432952	23.03	21.30	1.70
13(a)	Kerala	406240	1191067	1597307	63037	218172	281209	59255	196049	255304	410022	1213190	1623212	17.61	15.98	1.62
13(b)	Lakshadweep	142	206	348	14	10	24	7	11	18	149	205	354	6.90	5.17	1.72
14	Madhya Pradesh	293894	1025313	1319207	42968	257255	300223	45507	241357	286864	291355	1041211	1332566	22.76	21.75	1.01
15	Manipur	3600	3263	6863	489	794	1283	584	762	1346	3505	3295	6800	18.69	19.61	-0.92
16	Meghalaya	3606	11809	15415	645	2605	3250	725	3165	3890	3526	11249	14775	21.08	25.24	-4.15
17(a)	Tamil Nadu*	614246	456646	1070892	85041	168732	253773	89330	169447	258777	609947	455931	1065878	23.70	24.16	-0.47
17(b)	Puducherry	13223	14202	27425	2659	1522	4181	2996	1680	4676	12886	14044	26930	15.25	17.05	-1.80
18	Odisha	296277	847393	1143670	20670	103100	123770	19329	69229	88558	297618	881264	1178882	10.82	7.74	3.08
19	Bihar	345123	1847275	2192398	17788	87144	104932	12782	60804	73586	350129	1873615	2223744	4.79	3.36	1.43
20(a)	Punjab	249292	318920	568212	47475	157271	204746	49151	151005	200156	247616	325186	572802	36.03	35.23	0.81
20(b)	Haryana	257119	371598	628717	42483	122120	164603	38184	111742	149926	261418	381976	643394	26.18	23.85	2.33
20(c)	Chandigarh	16075	23966	40041	3007	28461	31468	2801	27013	29814	16281	25414	41695	78.59	74.46	4.13
21	Rajasthan	470444	1139326	1609770	51145	326855	378000	55417	296964	352381	466172	1169217	1635389	23.48	21.89	1.59
22	Sikkim	471	964	1435	210	292	502	161	371	532	520	885	1405	34.98	37.07	-2.09
23	Tripura	9567	106421	115988	1240	19585	20825	1223	28501	29724	9584	97505	107089	17.95	25.63	-7.67
24	Uttarakhand	32690	182789	215479	6945	59700	66645	6273	65833	72106	33362	176656	210018	30.93	33.46	-2.53
TOTAL		8467915	19987003	28454918	937019	4001774	4938793	939292	3757984	4697276	8465632	20230409	28696041	17.36	16.51	0.85

* Figures modified by the High Court concerned.

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

SOME SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS / ORDERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (01-10-2017 TO 31-12-2017)

1. On 4th October, 2017, in the case of *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and Ors. v. State of Gujarat and Anr.* [Criminal Appeal No.1723 of 2017], a three Judge Bench summarised the broad principles on the inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC as follows:-

“(i) Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court;

(ii) The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a First Information Report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

(iii) In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power;

(iv) While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court;

(v) The decision as to whether a complaint or First Information Report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated;

(vi) In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences;

(vii) As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

(viii) Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

(ix) In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

(x) There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions (viii) and (ix) above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the state have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

Bearing in mind the above principles, it was held that in the instant case “the High Court was justified in declining to entertain the application for quashing the First Information Report in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction.

The Bench observed that “the present case, as the allegations in the FIR would demonstrate, is not merely one involving a private dispute over a land transaction between two contesting parties. The case involves allegations of extortion, forgery and fabrication of documents, utilization of fabricated documents to effectuate transfers of title before the registering authorities and the deprivation of the complainant of his interest in land on the basis of a fabricated power of attorney. If the allegations in the FIR are construed as they stand, it is evident that they implicate serious offences having a bearing on a vital societal interest in securing the probity of titles to or interest in land. Such offences cannot be construed to be merely private or civil disputes but implicate the societal interest in prosecuting serious crime. In these circumstances, the High Court was eminently justified in declining to quash the FIR which had been registered under Sections 384, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 506(2) of the Penal Code.”

2. On 4th October, 2017, in the case of *Om Prakash v. Reliance General Insurance and Anr.* [Civil Appeal No. 15611 of 2017], while dealing with an appeal challenging an order of the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, it was held that the decision of the insurer to reject a “claim has to be based on valid grounds. Rejection of the claims on purely technical grounds in a mechanical manner will result in loss of confidence of policy-holders in the insurance industry. If the reason for delay in making a claim is satisfactorily explained, such a claim cannot be rejected on the ground of delay.” It was further held that “it would not be fair and reasonable to reject genuine claims which had already been verified and found to be correct by the Investigator. The

condition regarding the delay shall not be a shelter to repudiate the insurance claims which have been otherwise proved to be genuine.”

It was observed that the Consumer Protection Act “is a beneficial legislation that deserves liberal construction” and “this laudable object should not be forgotten while considering the claims made under the Act.” It was further observed that “it is common knowledge that a person who lost his vehicle may not straightaway go to the Insurance Company to claim compensation. At first, he will make efforts to trace the vehicle. It is true that the owner has to intimate the insurer immediately after the theft of the vehicle. However, this condition should not bar settlement of genuine claims particularly when the delay in intimation or submission of documents is due to unavoidable circumstances.”

In the instant case, it was held that the appellant had given cogent reasons for the delay of 8 days in informing the respondent about the incident and the Investigator had verified the theft to be genuine and the payment of Rs.7,85,000/- towards the claim was approved by the Corporate Claims Manager, which, was just and proper.” Accordingly, it was held that the National Commission was not justified in rejecting the claim of the appellant without considering the explanation for the delay, and also that the claimant was entitled for a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards compensation. The respondents 1 and 2 were accordingly directed to pay a sum of Rs. 8,35,000/- to the appellant with interest @ 8% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till the date of payment.

3. On 4th October, 2017, in the case of *S. Mohammed Ispahani v. Yogendra Chandak & Ors.* [Criminal Appeal No. 1720 of 2017], the power of the Court under Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. to summon even those persons who are not named in the charge sheet to appear and face trial was examined.

It was held that “when a person is named in the FIR by the complainant, but Police, after investigation, finds no role of that particular person and files the charge sheet without implicating him, the Court is not powerless, and at the stage of summoning, if the trial court finds that a particular person should be summoned as accused, even though not named in the charge sheet, it can do so. At that stage, chance is given to the complainant also to file a protest petition urging upon the trial court to summon other persons as well who were named in the FIR but not implicated in the charge sheet. Once that stage has gone, the Court is still not powerless by virtue of Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. However, this section gets triggered when during the trial some evidence surfaces against the proposed accused.”

4. On 5th October, 2017, in the case of *M/s. Meters and Instruments Private Limited & Anr. v. Kanchan Mehta* [Criminal Appeal No. 1731 of 2017], it was held that “where the cheque amount with interest and cost as assessed by the Court is paid by a specified date, the Court is entitled to close the proceedings” in exercise of its powers under Section 143 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 read with Section 258 Cr.P.C.” It was held that the “normal rule for trial of cases under Chapter XVII of the

Act is to follow the summary procedure and summons trial procedure can be followed where sentence exceeding one year may be necessary taking into account the fact that compensation under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. with sentence of less than one year will not be adequate, having regard to the amount of cheque, conduct of the accused and other circumstances.”

It was held that “in every complaint under Section 138 of the Act, it may be desirable that the complainant gives his bank account number and if possible e-mail ID of the accused. If e-mail ID is available with the Bank where the accused has an account, such Bank, on being required, should furnish such e-mail ID to the payee of the cheque. In every summons, issued to the accused, it may be indicated that if the accused deposits the specified amount, which should be assessed by the Court having regard to the cheque amount and interest/cost, by a specified date, the accused need not appear unless required and proceedings may be closed subject to any valid objection of the complainant . If the accused complies with such summons and informs the Court and the complainant by e-mail, the Court can ascertain the objection, if any, of the complainant and close the proceedings unless it becomes necessary to proceed with the case. In such a situation, the accused’s presence can be required, unless the presence is otherwise exempted subject to such conditions as may be considered appropriate. The accused, who wants to contest the case, must be required to disclose specific defence for such contest. It is open to the Court to ask specific questions to the accused at that stage. In case the trial is to proceed, it will be open to the Court to explore the possibility of settlement. It will also be open to the Court to consider the provisions of plea bargaining. Subject to this, the trial can be on day to day basis and endeavour must be to conclude it within six months. The guilty must be punished at the earliest as per law and the one who obeys the law need not be held up in proceedings for long unnecessarily.”

It was further held that “it will be open to the High Courts to consider and lay down category of cases where proceedings or part thereof can be conducted online by designated courts or otherwise. The High Courts may also consider issuing any further updated directions for dealing with Section 138 cases in the light of judgments of” the Supreme Court.

5. On 9th October, 2017, in the case of *Santhini v. Vijaya Venketesh* [Transfer Petition (Civil) No.1278 of 2016], issues pertaining to transfer of matrimonial disputes and use of video conferencing in resolving family conflicts through settlement process were examined.

Per majority, it was held that (i) in view of the scheme of the Family Courts Act, 1984 and in particular Section 11, the hearing of matrimonial disputes may have to be conducted in camera; (ii) after the settlement fails and when a joint application is filed or both the parties file their respective consent memorandum for hearing of the case through videoconferencing before the concerned Family Court, it may exercise the discretion to allow the said prayer; (iii) after the settlement fails, if the Family Court feels it appropriate having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case that

videoconferencing will sub-serve the cause of justice, it may so direct; and (iv) in a transfer petition, video conferencing cannot be directed. It was further held that these directions shall apply prospectively.

6. On 11th October, 2017, in the case of *Independent Thought v. Union of India and Anr.* [Writ Petition (Civil) No.382 of 2013], the question for consideration was whether sexual intercourse between a man and his wife being a girl between 15 and 18 years of age is rape. It was held that “sexual intercourse with a girl below 18 years of age is rape regardless of whether she is married or not” and that Exception 2 to Section 375 of IPC “creates an unnecessary and artificial distinction between a married girl child and an unmarried girl child and has no rational nexus with any unclear objective sought to be achieved.”

It was held that the said artificial distinction “is arbitrary and discriminatory and is definitely not in the best interest of the girl child. The artificial distinction is contrary to the philosophy and ethos of Article 15(3) of the Constitution as well as contrary to Article 21 of the Constitution and our commitments in international conventions. It is also contrary to the philosophy behind some statutes, the bodily integrity of the girl child and her reproductive choice.”

Accordingly, it was observed that the only pragmatic option available is to read Exception 2 to Section 375 of the IPC “in a purposive manner to make it in consonance with the POCSO Act, the spirit of other pro-child legislations and the human rights of a married girl child”. It was held that there is absolutely no other option but to harmonize the system of laws relating to children and require Exception 2 to Section 375 of the IPC to now “meaningfully read as: “Sexual intercourse or sexual acts by a man with his own wife, the wife not being under eighteen years of age, is not rape.”

7. On 12th October, 2017, in the case of *Ms. Indira Jaising v. Supreme Court of India through Secretary General and Ors.* [Writ petition (C) No. 454 of 2015], a three Judge Bench held that “the exercise of the power vested in the Supreme Court and the High Courts to designate an Advocate as a Senior Advocate is circumscribed by the requirement of due satisfaction that the concerned advocate fulfills the three conditions stipulated under Section 16 of the Advocates Act, 1961, i.e., (1) ability; (2) standing at the bar; and/or (3) special knowledge or experience in law that the person seeking designation has acquired. It is not an uncontrolled, unguided, uncanalised power though in a given case its exercise may partake such a character. However, the possibility of misuse cannot be a ground for holding a provision of the Statute to be constitutionally fragile. The consequences spelt out by the intervener, namely, (1) indulgence perceived to be shown by the Courts to Senior Advocates; (2) the effect of designation on the litigant public on account of high fees charged; (3) its baneful effect on the junior members of the bar; and (4) the element of anti-competitiveness, etc. are untoward consequences occasioned by human failures. Possible consequences arising from a wrong/improper exercise of power cannot be a ground to invalidate the provisions of Section 16 of the Act.”

It was held that “so long as the basis of the classification is founded on reasonable parameters which can be introduced by way of uniform guidelines/norms to be laid down by this Court”, the power of designation conferred by Section 16 of the Act cannot be said to be constitutionally impermissible.

However, it was also held that “the credentials of every advocate who seeks to be designated as a Senior Advocate or whom the Full Court suo motu decides to confer the honour must be subject to an utmost strict process of scrutiny leaving no scope for any doubt or dissatisfaction in the matter.” Accordingly, the Supreme Court laid down norms/guidelines to henceforth “govern the exercise of designation of Senior Advocates by the Supreme Court and all High Courts in the country.”

The Bench, however, also observed that it was “not oblivious of the fact that the guidelines enumerated above may not be exhaustive of the matter and may require reconsideration by suitable additions/deletions in the light of the experience to be gained over a period of time” and this is a course of action that it has left open for consideration by the Supreme Court “at such point of time that the same becomes necessary.”

8. On 12th October, 2017, in the case of *Himangni Enterprises v. Kamaljeet Singh Ahluwalia* [Civil Appeal No. 16850 of 2017], an application had been filed by the appellant under Section 8 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 in a pending civil suit filed by the respondent seeking appellant's eviction from the premises in question, which was located in Delhi. The application was rejected by the two Courts below. On appeal to the Supreme Court, it was held that “the Courts below were right in dismissing the appellant's application filed under Section 8 of the Act and thereby were justified in holding that the civil suit filed by the respondent was maintainable for grant of reliefs claimed in the plaint despite parties agreeing to get the disputes arising therefrom to be decided by the arbitrator.”

Rejecting the contention of the appellant that the provisions of the Delhi Rent Act, 1955 were not applicable to the premises by virtue of Section 3(c) of the Act, the Supreme Court held that “the Delhi Rent Act, which deals with the cases relating to rent and eviction of the premises, is a special Act. Though it contains a provision (Section 3) by virtue of it, the provisions of the Act do not apply to certain premises but that does not mean that the Arbitration Act, ipso facto, would be applicable to such premises conferring jurisdiction on the arbitrator to decide the eviction/rent disputes. In such a situation, the rights of the parties and the demised premises would be governed by the Transfer of Property Act and the civil suit would be triable by the Civil Court and not by the arbitrator. In other words, though by virtue of Section 3 of the Act, the provisions of the Act are not applicable to certain premises but no sooner the exemption is withdrawn or ceased to have its application to a particular premises, the Act becomes applicable to such premises. In this view of the matter, it cannot be contended that the provisions of the Arbitration Act would, therefore, apply to such premises.” Accordingly, the Civil Court concerned which was seized of the suit was directed to proceed with the trial of the suit on merits.

9. On 13th October, 2017, in the case of *Bimal Kishore Paliwal & Ors. v. Commissioner of Wealth Tax* [Civil Appeal No.3836 of 2011], the provisions of Section 7 of the Wealth Tax Act, 1957, in regard to valuation of an asset, were examined. It was held that the proposition laid down by the Supreme Court that if two reasonable constructions of a taxing statute are possible, the construction which favours the assessee must be adopted, cannot be read to mean that where there are more than one methods of valuation of an asset of an assessee, the method under which the valuation is in favour of assessee has to be accepted.

10. On 24th October, 2017, in the case of *International Asset Reconstruction Company of India Ltd. v. The Official Liquidator of Aldrich Pharmaceuticals Ltd. and Others* [Civil Appeal No. 16962 of 2017], the question for consideration was whether Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, can be invoked to condone the prescribed period of 30 days, under Section 30(1) of the Recovery of Debts and Bankruptcy Act, 1993, for preferring an appeal before the Tribunal, against an order of the Recovery officer.

A three Judge Bench held that “Section 5 of the Limitation Act provides that the appeal or application, with the exception of Order XXI, CPC may be admitted after the prescribed period, if the applicant satisfies the court that he has sufficient cause for not preferring the application within time. The pre-requisite, therefore, is the pendency of a proceeding before a court.” It was held that the proceedings under the Recovery of Debts and Bankruptcy Act (RDB Act) “being before a statutory Tribunal, it cannot be placed at par with proceedings before a court. The Tribunal shall therefore have no powers to condone delay, unless expressly conferred by the Statute creating it.”

It was held that “the scheme of the RDB Act manifestly provides that the Legislature has provided for application of the Limitation Act to original proceedings before the Tribunal under Section 19 only. The appellate tribunal has been conferred the power to condone delay beyond 45 days under Section 20(3) of the Act. The proceedings before the Recovery officer are not before a Tribunal. Section 24 is limited in its application to proceedings before the Tribunal originating under Section 19 only. The exclusion of any provision for extension of time by the Tribunal in preferring an appeal under Section 30 of the Act makes it manifest that the legislative intent for exclusion was express. The application of Section 5 of the Limitation Act by resort to Section 29(2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 therefore does not arise. The prescribed period of 30 days under Section 30(1) of the RDB Act for preferring an appeal against the order of the Recovery officer therefore cannot be condoned by application of Section 5 of the Limitation Act.”

11. On 25th October, 2017, in the case of *Suresh Kumar Wadhwa v. State of M.P. & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No.7665 of 2009], keeping in view the provisions of Section 74 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 it was held that “in order to forfeit the sum deposited by the contracting party as "earnest money" or "security" for the due performance of the contract, it is necessary that the contract must contain a stipulation of forfeiture. In other words, a right to forfeit being a contractual right and penal in nature, the parties to a contract must agree to stipulate a term in the contract in that behalf. A fortiori, if there is

no stipulation in the contract of forfeiture, there is no such right available to the party to forfeit the sum.”

12. On 26th October, 2017, in the case of *Sumaina Sharma & Ors. v. State of Jammu and Kashmir & Ors.* [Civil Appeal Nos. 4594-4595 of 2017], the question in consideration was whether the private respondents, who were promotee Excise and Taxation Officers (ETOs), could be granted retrospective promotion from the dates when the vacancies occurred in the promotion quota.

It was held that “the normal rule is that a person is entitled to seniority only from the date when the said person actually joins the post. True it is, that there are exceptions and sometimes “in service” candidates can be granted promotion from a date anterior to their being regularly promoted/appointed. However, this can be done only if the rules enable retrospective appointment and on fulfilling the other requirement of the rules.”

In the case at hand, it was held that “the promotees could not have been given the benefit of retrospective promotion and seniority from a date when they were not even born in the cadre and not working against the post” and “this retrospective promotion also violates the provisions of Rule 9 of the Excise Rules.”

13. On 27th October, 2017, in the case of *Bijender & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Anr.* [Civil Appeal No.2846 of 2017], keeping in view the nature, extent, size, surrounding and location of the acquired land in question, it was held that “since the acquired land was a large chunk of land having its frontage abutting the roadside, the Belting System was rightly applied to the acquired land for determination of its fair market rate.”

The Supreme Court observed that “where large pieces of land having different locations are acquired, Belting System is considered apposite for determining the market value of the lands”.

14. On 31st October, 2017, in the case of *National Insurance Company Limited v. Pranay Sethi and Ors.* [Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 25590 of 2014], the issue for consideration was: addition to income in regard to future prospects for determination of compensation where the deceased had a permanent job or where the deceased was self-employed / on a fixed salary without provision for annual increments.

A five Judge Constitution Bench held that “while determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax.” It was further held that “in case the deceased was self-employed or on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was

between the age of 40 to 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.”

On the issue pertaining to award of compensation under conventional heads, the Bench held that “reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs. 15,000/-, Rs. 40,000/- and Rs. 15,000/- respectively” however “the aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years.”

On apposite multiplier and multiplicand, the Bench held that “the age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier” and the selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in Sarla Verma case read with paragraph 42 of that judgment and further that for determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the courts shall be guided by paragraphs 30 to 32 of Sarla Verma case.

15. On 3rd November, 2017, in the case of *Orissa Lift Irrigation Corp. Ltd. v. Rabi Sankar Patro & Ors.* [Civil Appeal Nos. 17869-17870 of 2017], it was observed that “commercialization of education seriously affects creditability of standards in education, eroding power and essence of knowledge and seriously affecting excellence and merit”.

The Supreme Court stated that the present case displayed “lack of effective oversight and regulatory mechanism for the Deemed to be Universities” and that the UGC had completely failed to remedy the situation” and thus, interest of justice requires that the following issues also need to be addressed: “(i) Action for failure of system, inter alia, on account of misconduct of some of the functionaries who failed to uphold the law and granted approvals contrary to the policy and the rules; (ii) Manning of the UGC; (iii) Appropriate oversight and regulatory mechanism especially for distance education degrees especially those relating to technical education by the Deemed to be Universities in future; (iv) Review of the Deemed to be Universities status granted to the Deemed to be Universities in the past in the light of this Judgment and in the light of their working.”

While observing that the above issues need immediate steps to be taken by the Union of India” and that “review of oversight and regulatory mechanism is of utmost priority for the future of technical and professional education at the hands of Deemed Universities”, various directions were issued by the Supreme Court.

16. On 3rd November, 2017, in the case of *Chand Devi Daga & Ors. v. Manju K. Humatani & Ors.* [Criminal Appeal No. 1860 of 2017], the Supreme Court upheld a High Court judgment that allowed the legal heirs of the complainant to prosecute a Criminal Miscellaneous petition before the High Court. The original complainant had died during pendency of the Criminal Misc. Petition before the High Court which was filed since the complaint had been rejected by the Magistrate and a criminal revision challenging the said order had also been dismissed.

It was held that “even in case of trial of summons case it is not necessary or mandatory that after death of complainant the complaint is to be rejected, in exercise of the power under proviso to Section 256(1) of CrPC, the Magistrate can proceed with the complaint. More so, the present is a case where offence was alleged under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B and 201 read with 34 IPC for which procedure for trial of summons case was not applicable and there is no provision in Chapter XIX “Trial of warrant-cases by Magistrates” containing a provision that in the event of death of complainant the complaint is to be rejected. The Magistrate under Section 249 has power to discharge a case where the complainant is absent. The discharge under Section 249, however, is hedged with condition “the offence may be lawfully compounded or is not a cognizable offence”. It was further held that had the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 intended “that in case of death of complainant in a warrant case the complaint is to be rejected, the provision would have indicated any such intention which is clearly absent.”

17. On 10th November, 2017, in the case of *Campaign for Judicial Accountability and Reforms v. Union of India and another* [Writ Petition (Criminal) No.169 of 2017], a five Judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court held that “no Judge can take up the matter on his own, unless allocated by the Chief Justice of India, as he is the master of the roster.” As far as the composition of Benches is concerned, it was held that “the principles stated in Prakash Chand case, which was stated in the context of the High Court, shall squarely apply to the Supreme Court and “there cannot be any kind of command or order directing the Chief Justice of India to constitute a particular Bench.”

It was observed that this has been also the convention of this Court, and “the convention is followed because of the principles of law and because of judicial discipline and decorum. Once the Chief Justice is stated to be the master of the roster, he alone has the prerogative to constitute Benches. Needless to say, neither a two-Judge Bench nor a three-Judge Bench can allocate the matter to themselves or direct the composition for constitution of a Bench. To elaborate, there cannot be any direction to the Chief Justice of India as to who shall be sitting on the Bench or who shall take up the matter as that touches the composition of the Bench.” “Such an order cannot be passed. It is not countenanced in law and not permissible.”

18. On 23rd November, 2017, in the case of *Nikesh Tarachand Shah v. Union of India & Anr.* [Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 67 of 2017], the Supreme Court examined the constitutional validity of Section 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 which imposed two conditions for grant of bail where an offence punishable for a term of imprisonment of more than 3 years under Part A of the Schedule to the Act was involved. The conditions were that the Public Prosecutor must be given an opportunity to oppose any application for release on bail and the Court must be satisfied, where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence, and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

It was held that Section 45(1) of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, insofar as it imposes two further conditions for release on bail, was “unconstitutional as it violates Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.” The Supreme Court observed that “Section 45 is a drastic provision which turns on its head the presumption of innocence which is fundamental to a person accused of any offence” and that “indiscriminate application of the provisions of Section 45 will certainly violate Article 21 of the Constitution”.

19. On 24th November, 2017, in the case of *United India Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Sunil Kumar & Anr.* [Civil Appeal No. 9694 of 2013], a three-Judge Bench held that in a proceeding under Section 163A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, it is not open for the Insurer to raise any defence of negligence on the part of the victim.

It was held that “grant of compensation under Section 163-A of the Act on the basis of the structured formula is in the nature of a final award and the adjudication thereunder is required to be made without any requirement of any proof of negligence of the driver/owner of the vehicle(s) involved in the accident. This is made explicit by Section 163A(2). Though the aforesaid section of the Act does not specifically exclude a possible defence of the Insurer based on the negligence of the claimant as contemplated by Section 140(4), to permit such defence to be introduced by the Insurer and/or to understand the provisions of Section 163A of the Act to be contemplating any such situation would go contrary to the very legislative object behind introduction of Section 163A of the Act, namely, final compensation within a limited time frame on the basis of the structured formula to overcome situations where the claims of compensation on the basis of fault liability was taking an unduly long time. In fact, to understand Section 163A of the Act to permit the Insurer to raise the defence of negligence would be to bring a proceeding under Section 163A of the Act at par with the proceeding under Section 166 of the Act which would not only be self-contradictory but also defeat the very legislative intention.”

20. On 30th November, 2017, in the case of *Dr. S. Rajaseekaran (II) v. Union of India & Ors.* [Writ Petition No. 295 of 2012], keeping in mind issues of road safety and the interest of those who may be unfortunate victims of road accidents, various directions were issued by the Supreme Court, as follows:-

“1. Road Safety Policy: Most of the State Governments and Union Territories have already framed a Road Safety Policy. Those that have not framed such a policy namely Assam, Nagaland, Tripura, Delhi, Lakshadweep, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Andaman and Nicobar Islands, must now formulate the Road Safety Policy by 31st January, 2018. All States and Union Territories are expected to implement the Road Safety Policy with all due earnestness and seriousness.

2. State Road Safety Council: All States have already constituted a Road Safety Council in terms of Section 215 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The Union Territories of Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Andaman and Nicobar Islands have not constituted the Road Safety Council as yet. We direct these Union

Territories to constitute the State Road Safety Council on or before 31st January, 2018. The responsibility and functions of the Council will be as recommended by the Committee on Road Safety. The State Road Safety Councils should periodically review the laws and take appropriate remedial steps wherever necessary.

3. Lead Agency: Only a few States have established the Lead Agency as recommended by the Committee on Road Safety in its communication of 23rd December, 2014. The States and Union Territories that have not done so should establish the Lead Agency on or before 31st January, 2018 in terms of the recommendations made by the Committee on Road Safety. It may be mentioned that the Lead Agency will act as the Secretariat of the State Road Safety Council and coordinate all activities such as licensing issues including issues of driving licences, registration of vehicles, road safety and features of vehicles, along with other allied matters including emission norms and other activities as mentioned in the communication dated 23rd December, 2014.

4. Road Safety Fund: Some of the States have already established a Road Safety Fund. Those States and Union Territories that have not yet established the Road Safety Fund should do so not later than 31st March, 2018 and report back to the Committee on Road Safety. The corpus of the Road Safety Fund will be from the fines collected for traffic violations and the Fund will be utilized for meeting expenses relating to road safety.

5. Road Safety Action Plan: The purpose of a Road Safety Action Plan is to reduce the number of road accidents, as well as the fatality rate.” The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) of the Government of India “has already requested all the States and Union Territories to prepare a Road Safety Action Plan but it appears that the response to this has been somewhat lukewarm. The State Governments and Union Territories are therefore directed to urgently prepare a Road Safety Action Plan by 31st March, 2018 and put it into action after giving it due publicity.

6. District Road Safety Committee: A District Road Safety Committee is required to be set up by the State Government for every district in terms of Section 215(3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. As suggested by the learned *Amicus* and agreed to by the MoRTH, the District Road Safety Committee should be put in place by 31st January, 2018 and should be headed by the Collector of the District and should include amongst others the Superintendent of Police, Health Officers, Engineers of the Public Works Department, representatives of the National Highways Authority of India, the Road Transport Officer of the District and members of civil society from the District. The District Road Safety Committee must hold regular and periodic meetings to review road safety issues and take corrective measures.

7. Engineering Improvement: It appears that one of the main reasons for road accidents is the poor quality of roads, improper design, etc. The MoRTH is of the opinion that the protocol for road design and identification of black spots needs to be

reviewed and enforced. Accordingly, it is directed that the MoRTH should publish a protocol for identification and rectification of black spots and take necessary steps for improving the design of roads to make them safe.

8. Traffic Calming Measures: It is suggested by the learned *Amicus* that traffic calming measures must be adopted at accident prone areas. This is agreed to by the MoRTH. However, such measures will need to be studied and then put in place. This is an on-going exercise which must be carried out by the Road Safety Committee with the assistance of the MoRTH and other stakeholders.

9. Road Safety Audits: There is agreement, in principle, between the learned *Amicus* and the MoRTH to carry out Road Safety Audits. However, there appears to be a dearth of qualified auditors in Road Safety Engineering. The MoRTH supports the idea of capacity building. It is, therefore, directed that necessary steps be taken by the Committee on Road Safety as well as by the MoRTH to work in this direction since there can be little doubt that an audit of road safety is essential to reduce the possibility of road accidents through corrective measures.

10. Engineering Design of New Roads: The MoRTH is of the view, and the learned *Amicus* is also in agreement, that the Road Safety Audit as mentioned above should include the design stage audit of new road projects of 5 kms or more, rather than being based on the cost of the project. It is ordered accordingly.

11. Working Group on Engineering: The Working Group on Engineering (Roads) has already submitted a Report which is available with the Road Safety Committee as well as the MoRTH. This Working Group was constituted pursuant to the decision taken in the meeting of the 12th National Road Safety Council held on 25th March, 2011. The recommendations of the Working Group should be implemented in the terms prayed for by the learned *Amicus* as well as those accepted by the MoRTH. These will, of course, be in the nature of interim directions since the National Road Safety Board is likely to be created as proposed in the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2017.

12. Drivers' Training: This is the subject matter of the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2017 and no orders are required to be passed in this regard.

13. Lane Driving: The MoRTH has already issued Motor Vehicles (Driving) Regulations, 2017 vide G.S.R. 634 (E) dated 23rd June, 2017. The Notification should be implemented by the State Governments and Union Territories strictly.

14. Road Safety Equipment: The Bureau of Police Research and Training has already prepared a Report on the subject and has submitted it to the Road Safety Committee in September, 2015. The recommendations in the Report should be implemented including acquisition of cameras and surveillance equipments in detecting traffic and identifying violators. It is also necessary to set up special patrol

forces along the National Highways and State Highways for which necessary steps must be taken by the State Governments and Union Territories.

15. Alcohol and Road Safety: The MoRTH has already written to the States to comply with orders of this Court in this regard. The MoRTH may issue further advisories in this regard on a quarterly basis during the calendar year 2018 so as to serve as a reminder to the State Governments and Union Territories to implement the directions of this Court.

16. Road Safety Education: The learned *Amicus* as well as MoRTH are in agreement that road safety education and counselling should be incorporated in the curriculum by the State Boards by 1st April, 2018. It is directed that the State Governments may seriously consider this recommendation and include Road Safety Education and Counseling as a part of the school curriculum at the earliest.

17. Speed Governors: Guidelines in this regard have already been issued by the MoRTH. The MoRTH has agreed to upload the Unique Identification Number of the speed governors in the VAHAN database. This should be followed up by the MoRTH with expedition.

18. Emergency Medical Care: There is agreement that at least one Trauma Care Centre should be set up in every district with necessary facilities and an ambulance. The State Governments and Union Territories should take up this recommendation at the earliest since it is on record that treatment soon after a road accident is crucial for saving the life of the victim." In this context, it may also be mentioned that this Court has issued certain directions in *Pt. Parmanand Katara v. Union of India* (1989) 4 SCC 286 "which should be followed.

19. Universal Accident Helpline Number: "The MoRTH has stated that there is already a call centre number, that is, 108 provided by the National Health Mission. Due publicity must be given to this so that an ambulance can be activated at the earliest whenever necessary.

20. Permanent Road Safety Cell: All State Governments and Union Territories have already been requested by the MoRTH to set up Road Safety Cells. The State Governments and Union Territories should establish Permanent Road Safety Cells by 31st January, 2018.

21. Data Collection: The MoRTH has already taken steps for recording accident data and reports through computerised data entry. The State and Union Territories have been asked to take further action in this regard and make the data public for the information of all stakeholders. This needs to be followed up and no further orders are necessary in this regard.

22. GPS: The MoRTH has already notified vide G.S.R. No. 1095 (E) dated 28th November, 2016 mandating the fitment of vehicle location tracking devices in all

public service vehicles subject to some exceptions. Since this has cost implications, the MoRTH may assist the State Governments and Union Territories to ensure that to the maximum extent possible and within the shortest time frame, location tracking devices must be fitted in all public service vehicles as notified.

23. Bus/Truck–Body Building Code: This has already been notified by the MoRTH with regard to buses vide G.S.R. No. 287 (E) dated 27th April, 2014 and with regard to trucks vide G.S.R. No. 1034(E) dated 2nd November, 2016. No further orders are necessary in this regard.

24. ABS, Air Bags and Headlights: The MoRTH has already notified for fitment of ABS in motor cycles vide G.S.R. No. 310(E) dated 16th March, 2016 and for four wheelers vide G.S.R. No. 120(E) dated 10th February, 2017. As far as air bags are concerned a standard AIS-145 has already been notified. As regards automated headlights, the MoRTH has notified vide G.S.R. No. 188(E) dated 22nd February, 2016 for fitment of “Automated Headlights On” in two wheelers manufactured on or after 1st April, 2017. No further orders are required in this regard except the faithful implementation of the various notifications issued by the MoRTH.

25. Crash Test: This too has been notified by the MoRTH and the test for all light motor vehicles is required to be conducted by the testing agency notified under Rule 126 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989. No further orders are required in this regard except the faithful implementation of the notifications and crash standards issued by the MoRTH.”

Further, it was clarified that the said directions were “in addition to and supplement the directions already given in *S.Rajasekaran v. Union of India* (2014) 6 SCC 36 and further that “if there is any doubt or clarity required in implementing the directions given, the concerned State Government or Union Territory is at liberty to move the Committee on Road Safety.”

21. On 15th December, 2017, in the case of *Rajive Raturi v. Union of India and Others* [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 243 of 2005], a petition was filed in public interest on behalf of disabled persons / differently-abled persons for proper and adequate access to public places. The petition sought providing all accessibility requirements to meet the needs of visually disabled persons in respect of safe access to roads and transport facilities.

Upon consideration, the Supreme Court observed that ten action points enumerated by the petitioner, “for providing proper access to public facilities to the persons suffering from visually disability, are now statutorily recognised” under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and that it has now become “a statutory obligation on the part of the Central Government as well as the State Governments to do the needful by the target dates.” Further observing that “though, Central Government has taken various measures, many State Governments have not responded at all” and that “in *Justice Sunanda Bhandare Foundation* case as well, this Court has given various directions from time to time”, the Supreme Court gave various directions in the case at hand.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY(NJA) (01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)

Regional Conferences of the Academy: The South Zone Regional Conference was held on 7th and 8th October, 2017 and was organized by NJA in collaboration with the High Court of Kerala and the Kerala State Judicial Academy. The conference was attended by 78 participants. The North Zone Regional Conference was held on 25th and 26th November, 2017 and was organized by NJA in association with the Allahabad High Court, Lucknow Bench and the Judicial Training & Research Institute, Uttar Pradesh. A total of 82 participants took part in discourses during this Conference. The East Zone I Regional Conference was held on 16th and 17th December, 2017 and was organized by Academy in association with the High Court of Chhattisgarh and Chhattisgarh State Judicial Academy. A total of 96 participants took part in discourses during this Conference.

Workshop for Additional District Judges was held from 6th to 8th October, 2017. The workshop explored adjudicatory challenges in implementation of ADR system in Subordinate Courts. Issues pertaining to civil justice administration and advantages of court & case management formed part of deliberations. The workshop covered the advances and bottlenecks in law and practices relating to cybercrimes and issues and practices pertaining to collection, preservation and appreciation of electronic evidences.

Training Programme for Bangladesh Judicial Officers was held from 10th to 16th October, 2017. The Programme included sessions on judicial skills, constitutional, civil, criminal, environmental and human rights laws and correlative jurisprudence. The conference also aimed to acquaint participants with elements of judicial behaviour-ethics, neutrality and professionalism, skills of judging and judgment writing.

National Judicial Conference for Newly Elevated High Court Justices on Public Law was held from 13th to 15th October, 2017. The conference facilitated deliberations among participant justices on contemporary topics such as Information and Communications Technology in courts and Court Management Techniques to improve efficiency and strengthening of justice administration; core Constitutional principles such as the concept of Judicial Review, Federal architecture, Separation of Powers, Doctrine of Basic Structure and Fundamental Rights under our Constitutional arrangement. The Conference included interactive sessions and round table discussions on designated themes among participant justices.

Refresher Course for First Level Commercial Courts was held from 13th to 15th October, 2017. The refresher course aimed to strengthen the capacity of First Level Commercial Court presiding officers by way of discussions and deliberations on disputes regarding Construction and Infrastructure Contracts; Intellectual Property Rights; Distribution and Licensing agreements; and Insurance and Re-Insurance

agreements. The refresher course also focused on contours of jurisdiction of commercial courts, commercial courts vis-à-vis arbitration; and procedures relating to collection, disclosure of data and case management.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices was held from 27th to 29th October, 2017. The objective was to discuss developments in the area of Constitutional law, Judicial Review, Supervisory powers of High Courts over Subordinate Courts, Intellectual Property Law and Economic Crimes.

Workshop on Counter Terrorism in Collaboration with CEELI Institute/FJC for High Court Justices was held from 27th to 29th October, 2017. The workshop was organized to facilitate dialogue and to share the experiences between the US and Indian Judges engaged in adjudication of cases involving terrorism and other national security challenges posed by the accelerating global phenomenon, with special reference to and emphasis on principles evolved in the relevant Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) Good Practice Memorandum; and to sensitize Indian Judges in contemporaneous best practices and jurisprudence pertaining to counter terrorism control norms, adjudication protocols and allied areas.

National Seminar for Members of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal was held on 28th & 29th October, 2017. The seminar addressed issues like- Constitutional authority to tax and basis of taxation; interpretation of tax statutes: core principles; endemic pathologies in assessment proceedings and role of the Tribunal; Judicial discretion; and the art, science and craft of reasoned adjudication. The seminar also intended to apprise participants with principles of appreciation of evidence including electronic evidence in taxation proceedings.

Training Programme for Bangladesh Judicial Officers was held from 10th-16th November, 2017. The Programme included sessions on judicial skills, constitutional, civil, criminal, environmental and human rights laws and correlative jurisprudence. The conference aimed to acquaint participants with elements of judicial behaviour- ethics, neutrality and professionalism, skills of judging and judgment writing. The programme also facilitated discussions on court & case management and use of ICT in administration of justice.

National Orientation Programme for Junior Division Judges was held from 10th to 16th November, 2017. The sessions were designed to provide a forum for participant officers to share experiences and views with counterparts from other States; to facilitate better appreciation of the judicial role; responsibility of judicial officers in a constitutional democracy; recent developments in juridical thinking and technological advances relevant to accreting our performance standards; and to deliberate on several aspects of law and practice relevant to enhancing the quality of their performance.

Workshop for Additional District Judges was organized from 10th to 12th November, 2017. The sessions involved discussions on issues related to challenges in implementation of the ADR system, Sentencing, Role of Judges in Court and Case

Management, Electronic Evidence, Cybercrime, and Fair Sessions Trial. The workshop focused on appellate and revision jurisdiction of District Judges under criminal and civil justice administration.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices on Intellectual Property Rights was held from 17th to 19th November, 2017. The conference aimed to sensitize judges on Intellectual Property Rights, to facilitate effective adjudication of IPR disputes, strengthening enforcement and combating Economic Crimes. Several sessions addressed the IPRs regime, emerging issues on IP regime in India and Globally, India's IP related treaty obligations, Role of judiciary, Landmark judgements, Challenges of IPR in digital age and Resolution of IPR disputes via commercial Courts & ADR.

Workshop for Magistrates on Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 was held from 17th to 19th November, 2017. The Workshop aimed to acquaint participating Magistrates with the changes brought by the 2015 Act and the 2016 Rules, general principles of care and protection of children incorporated in the Act, presumption and determination of juvenility, issues and concerns relating to bail or placement, etc.

Refresher Course for NDPS Courts was held from 24th to 26th November, 2017. The seminar aimed to discuss core objectives and purposes of establishing NDPS Courts. The participants discussed aspects regarding the legal framework on drug addiction and drug trafficking and the effectiveness and limitations of statutory provisions dealing with drug abuse; special focus was on provisions relating to search and seizure, presumption of culpable mental state, and determination of drug quantity.

Conference of Registrars dealing with Court Procedures and Process Reengineering was held from 24th to 26th November, 2017. The Conference covered various aspects of Procedures and Process of the High Courts viz. Writ Jurisdiction, Civil and Criminal Appellate Jurisdiction and Civil Original side, Revisional Jurisdiction and matters covered U/S 482 Cr.P.C, Listing and Mentioning of Matters. The Conference also provided a forum to discuss best practices and procedures of various High Courts dealing with Adjournments and Backlog. Use of ICT in enhancing the efficacy of judicial institutions was also deliberated.

Training Programme for Senior Law Officers of the State Bank of India was held from 28th to 30th November, 2017. The programme was conceived and designed by the Academy at the request of and in consultation with senior Management of the SBI. The programme was structured to provide a working knowledge of legal and procedural aspects relating to the banking sector to Law Officers and other senior management personnel.

National Orientation Programme for Junior Division Judges was held from 8th to 14th December, 2017. The sessions were designed to provide a forum for participant officers to share experiences and views with counterparts from other States; to facilitate better appreciation of the judicial role; responsibility of judicial officers in a Constitutional

democracy; recent developments in juridical thinking and technological advances relevant to accreting our performance standards; and to deliberate on several aspects of law and practice relevant to enhancing the quality of their performance.

National Seminar for Members of the Debt Recovery Tribunal was held on 9th and 10th December, 2017. The objectives of the Seminar were to provide a forum for Members to discuss, deliberate and share experiences, knowledge and best practices in exercise of jurisdiction and to revisit, with the help of domain experts, evolving horizons of the relevant law and jurisprudence.

Refresher Course for Presiding Officers of MACT was held from 15th to 17th December, 2017. The objective was to provide a forum for deliberations on vital issues relevant to adjudication of Motor Accident Claims including issues relating to liability of third party insurer, assessment of liability, determination of compensation in case of injury and death, role of presiding officers of MACT in expeditious settlement of claims and challenges in enforcement of awards of MACT.

National Seminar for Members of the Central Administrative Tribunal was held on 16th & 17th December, 2017. The objectives of the seminar were to explore the scope, contours and limits of judicial review in the Tribunal; and to deliberate on Constitutional and Administrative Law principles relevant to adjudication. The seminar also facilitated discussions on processes and procedures that ought to be integrated into CAT working as a consequence of the move towards e-Courts by introduction of Information and Communications Technology into administration of justice.

Refresher Course for Human Rights Courts was held from 22nd to 24th December, 2017. The refresher course was designed to assess/audit the working of Human Rights Courts within the framework of the Act and identify and evolve strategies for meeting the challenges and bottlenecks encountered while adjudicating the cases arising thereunder. The programme provided insights for capacity building through deliberations focused on human rights in the international perspective; human rights courts under the protection of Human Rights Act, 1993; ambiguity in provisions of the Act; issues relating to the functioning of the Human Rights Courts; and related issues.

Court Excellence Enhancement Programme was held from 22nd - 24th December, 2017. The programme was an attempt to bring all stakeholders on one platform with a view to gain insights through discourses on challenges and constraints in achieving excellence in Court, by engaging all stakeholders of the Court such as the Chief Judicial Magistrate, members of the Bar, Public Prosecutors and ministerial staff (reader and clerk). The programme provided a comprehensive framework for enhancing performance of Courts in the country. Stakeholders from twelve high courts participated in this programme.

FOREIGN DELEGATIONS IN SUPREME COURT (From 01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)

1. On 02-11-2017, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India had a meeting with Rt. Hon'ble Lady Justice Arden DBE, Judge, Court of Appeal U.K.

2. On 09-11-2017, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India had a meeting with Mr. Chungtong Opassiriwit, Judge of the Supreme Administrative Court of Thailand and Mr. Prapot Klaisuban, President of a Chamber of the Khon Kaen Administrative, Khon Kaen Province, Thailand.

3. On 28-11-2017, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India, Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Gogoi, Hon'le Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph had a meeting with a 7-Member Delegation headed by Hon'ble Mr. Nguyen Hoa Binh, Chief Justice of Vietnam.

4. On 22-12-2017, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India had a meeting with a 3-Member Malian Delegation headed by Hon'ble Abderhamane Niang, President of the High Court of Justice of Mali.

SOME MAJOR EVENTS

(From 01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)

CONSTITUTION DAY CELEBRATIONS – 2017: Hon'ble the President of India, Shri Ram Nath Kovind inaugurated the Second Constitution Day celebrations by the Supreme Court of India on 26th November, 2017 at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi in the august presence of Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India, Hon'ble Judges, Supreme Court of India, Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad, Hon'ble Union Minister for Law and Justice and Electronics & Information Technology, Shri K.K. Venugopal, Attorney General for India, Shri Justice R.C. Lahoti, former Chief Justice of India, Mr. R.S. Suri, President, Supreme Court Bar Association and many other dignitaries of judicial and academic backgrounds. On this day, two books namely "The Constitution at 67" and "Indian Judiciary: Annual Report, 2016-2017" compiled and published by Supreme Court of India were released. There were addresses by Hon'ble the President of India, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India, Hon'ble Judges of the Supreme Court, Hon'ble Union Law Minister, Attorney General for India, Shri R.C. Lahoti, former Chief Justice of India and President, Supreme Court Bar Association. Shri R. C. Lahoti, Former Chief Justice of India delivered a lecture throwing light on the theme "Constitutional Values" to add to the Constitution Day Lecture Series started by Supreme Court of India in its first celebration of Constitution Day on 26th November, 2016. The function was commenced and concluded with the National Anthem.

SOME IMPORTANT VISITS AND CONFERENCES (From 01-10-2017 to 31-12-2017)

ABROAD:

Hon'ble Shri Dipak Misra, Chief Justice of India participated, as head of delegation, in the Sixth Indo-Canada Legal Forum Meet held from 15th to 18th October, 2017 at Ottawa in Canada. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph, Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. K. Agrawal and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Uday Umesh Lalit also participated, in the said Sixth Indo-Canada Legal Forum Meet from 15th to 18th October, 2017.

INLAND:

1. Hon'ble Shri Dipak Misra, Chief Justice of India (i) delivered address, as Guest of Honour, at the Valedictory Function of the Golden Jubilee of the Kerala High Court on 28th October, 2017; (ii) delivered keynote address at the Annual Conference of the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration on 4th November, 2017; (iii) attended, Felicitation by the Orissa High Court Bar Association on 11th November, 2017; inaugurated, Museum of the High Court of Orissa; and, attended Felicitation by the High Court of Orissa on 12th November, 2017; (iv) delivered, convocation address at the National Law University, Odisha on 18th November, 2017 and attended, Foundation Stone Laying ceremony of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal Building at Cuttack on 19th November, 2017; (v) delivered, address at the 20th National Tax Convention – 2017 organized by the All India Federation of Tax Practitioners; laid Foundation Stone of M. P. State Judicial Academy Building; addressed Judicial Officers of the District Judiciary through Video Linkage from the M.P. State Judicial Academy; and was felicitated by the Senior Advocates' Council and High Court Advocates' Bar Association, Jabalpur on 2nd December, 2017; (vi) delivered, Convocation address at the West Bengal University of Juridical Sciences at Kolkata on 10th December, 2017 and (vii) inaugurated, (a) as Chief Guest, Seminar on "Effective Investigation, Speedy Trial and Timely Justice" jointly organized by the Government of Bihar and Bihar Judicial Academy at Adhweshan Bhawan, Patna and (b) Arbitrations Centre at Patna High Court on 17th December, 2017.

2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar visited (i) Hyderabad to attend Manthan Samvaad at Shilpakala Vedika, Hi Tech City Madhapur, Hyderabad on 2nd October, 2017; (ii) Kerala to attend the Valedictory Ceremony of the Diamond Jubilee Celebrations of High Court of Kerala on 28th October, 2017; (iii) Hyderabad to inaugurate one-day National Seminar on 'Legal Education and Profession : A Convergence' organized by ICFAL Law School, Hyderabad on 4th November, 2017; and

(iv) Vijayawada to attend “4th Akkineni International Awards Gala” in Eluru, W. Godavari Distt. on 16th December, 2017.

3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur visited (i) Pune to attend the Regional Conference of National Green Tribunal on 7th October, 2017; (ii) Cochin to attend the Regional Conference on 8th October, 2017; (iii) Chennai to participate and inaugurate the programme of “Mediation Training for Referral Judges” and to deliver an inaugural address and also to inaugurate the Digitization Centre, High Court of Madras on 28th October, 2017; (iv) Ahmedabad in connection with Advance Training Skills for Trainers Programme organized by MCPC on 19th November, 2017; and (v) Mussoorie to address the Officer Trainees of the 92nd Foundation Course on “Democracy : Constitution of Judiciary” at the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA) on 1st December, 2017.

4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph visited (i) Kochi (a) to Chair the South Zone Regional Conference on “Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions : Challenges & Opportunities : organized by the National Judicial Academy, Bhopal at Kochi on 8th October, 2017 and (b) to attend Diamond Jubilee Celebrations of the High Court of Kerala on 28th October, 2017; (ii) Bhopal to attend “Workshop for Additional District Judges” organized by the National Judicial Academy, Bhopal on 12th November, 2017; (iii) Kerala for (a) Inauguration of the District Court Complex, Trichur and (b) Inauguration of the distribution of benefit under Legal Profession Development Scheme for Junior Lawyers & Two days Professional Development Programme organized by the Bar Council of India and Bar Council of Kerala on 18th November, 2017; (iv) Chennai for (a) Inauguration of the State Consultation on Sensitization of Family Court Matters organized by the Tamil Nadu State Judicial Academy and to address the participating Judges, Lawyers and Mediators on the “Role of Family Court Judges” and (b) deliver keynote address at the Enrollment Function and Inauguration of Online Verification System at New Auditorium, High Court of Madras on 2nd December, 2017; (v) Gangtok (a) for inauguration of the High Court of Sikkim Museum at old Chief Justice Bungalow, Forest Colony, Balwakhani, Gangtok on 8th December, 2017, (b) as Chief Guest at the Third Regional Conference on ‘Sensitization of Family Court Matters’ [High Courts of Gauhati (Assam, Nagaland, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh), Manipur, Meghalaya, Sikkim, Tripura, Orissa and Calcutta] on 9th December, 2017 and (c) to address the Members of the Bar Association of Sikkim at High Court of Sikkim Auditorium, Gangtok on 10th December, 2017.

5. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arjan Kumar Sikri visited (i) Pune to attend the Surana & Surana National Trial Advocacy Moot Court Competition and Judgment Writing Competition organized by the New Law College, Pune (Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University) on 8th October, 2017; (ii) Bhopal to attend the National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices organized by the National Judicial Academy on 28th October, 2017; (iii) Mumbai to attend the 2nd Annual Conference of the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration on 4th November, 2017; (iv) Ahmedabad to attend the 3rd International Conference on Law and Economics organized by the Gujarat National Law University in collaboration with IIM, Ahmedabad and IIT Kanpur on 18th November, 2017; (v) Punjab to attend the

International Conference on 'India 2030 – A Geo-Political Perspective' at Cordia College, Sanghol, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab on 1st December, 2017; and (vi) Mumbai to attend the National Conference on Disability, Accessibility, Inclusion and Wellbeing organized by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai on 16th December, 2017.

6. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sharad Arvind Bobde visited (i) Nagpur to attend the First Justice S. M. Daud Memorial Lecture at MNLU, Nagpur on 7th October, 2017 and (ii) Bhopal to attend the Annual Convocation of the National Law Institute University, Bhopal on 4th November, 2017.

7. Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. K. Agrawal (i) visited Jaipur to inaugurate 3rd Manipal – Ranka National Moot Court Competition, 2017 at Manipal University, Jaipur on 1st October, 2017 and to grace unveiling of marble statue of Mahatma Gandhi at Rajasthan High Court, Jaipur on 2nd October, 2017; (ii) visited NOIDA (U.P.) to Judge the Final Round of 7th Amity International Moot Court Competition, 2017 at Amity Law School, NOIDA on 28th October, 2017; (iii) attended 8th Annual Prakash Mehrotra Memorial Lecture as a Guest of Honour at Auditorium, Nehru memorial Museum & Library Teen Murti House, New Delhi on 2nd November, 2017; (iv) participated in the International conference on Environment – 2017 at Malvalankar Auditorium, Constitution Club of India, New Delhi on 3rd November, 2017; (v) visited Kanchipuram (Tamil Nadu) - to participate in the 21st Convocation of SCSVMV University at Kanchipuram on 18th November, 2017; (vi) participated in the National Law Day, 2017 at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on 25-26th November, 2017; (vii) participated in the Human Rights Day, 2017 organized by International Institute of Human Rights Society at IIC, Max Mueller Marg, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi on 10th December, 2017; (viii) participated in the Human Rights Day organized by National Human Rights Commission at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on 10th December, 2017; and (ix) visited Allahabad to participate in the Foundation Stone Laying Ceremony of 'Nyaya Gram' at the premises of High Court of Allahabad, Allahabad on 16th December, 2017.

8. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Mishra visited (i) Mumbai to preside over the valedictory session of "National Conference on Environment, 2017" by National Green Tribunal held at NCPA, Nariman Point, Mumbai on 3rd November, 2017; and (ii) Kolkata to attend the 12th Convocation of the West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata on 10th December, 2017.

9. Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. M. Khanwilkar visited Pune to attend Regional Conference on Environment – 2017 on 8th October, 2017.

10. Hon'ble Dr. Justice D. Y. Chandrachud (i) delivered a lecture at the Regional Conference organized by National Green Tribunal on the topic "Indian Environmentalism" on 8th October, 2017 at Pune; and (ii) attended the inaugural session organized by National Green Tribunal at National Centre for the Performing Arts on 2nd December, 2017 at Mumbai.

11. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhushan visited (i) Kochi to attend the Valedictory Ceremony of the Diamond Jubilee Celebrations of the High Court of Kerala on 28th October, 2017; (ii) Meerut to attend a function organized by Meerut Bar Association on 9th December, 2017; and (iii) Allahabad to attend Foundation Stone Laying Ceremony of New Judges Residential Complex and New Building of Judicial Academy on 16th December, 2017.

12. Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Nageswara Rao visited (i) Bengaluru to participate in the felicitation function organized in the honour of Shri B. V. Acharya, Senior Advocate on his completion of 60 years of practice at the Bar at Palace Grounds, Bengaluru on 28th October, 2017; and (ii) Hyderabad to deliver a lecture on the subject "Salient features of the Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts Act, 2015" to the Principal District Judges, who attended the Judicial Academy to participate in a Specialized Training Programme on resolving Commercial Disputes at A.P. Judicial Academy, Secunderabad on 4th November, 2017.

13. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul attended the 8th Emerging Markets Finance Conference, 2017 (In collaboration with Vanderbilt Law School) held in Mumbai between 17th to 21st December, 2017.

14. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mohan M. Shantanagoudar visited (i) Pune to attend the Regional Conference on Environment – 2017 organized by National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Branch on 8th October, 2017 and (ii) Kerala to attend Diamond Jubilee function of High Court of Kerala on 28th October, 2017.

15. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Navin Sinha visited (i) Bhopal to participate in the Workshop for Additional District Judges conducted by National Judicial Academy on 7th October, 2017 and (ii) Lucknow to participate in North Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions to address the gathering and guide deliberations in Sessions Nos.5 and 6 on the Theme "Access to Justice" organized by the National Judicial Academy in collaboration with the Allahabad High Court and the Judicial Training & Research Institute, Lucknow on 26th November, 2017.

16. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Deepak Gupta visited (i) Lucknow to attend North Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions : Challenges & Opportunity, organized by National Judicial Academy at Lucknow on 25th November, 2017 and (ii) Bhopal to attend National Orientation Programme for Junior Division Judges, organized by National Judicial Academy at Bhopal on 9th December, 2017.



The

Supreme Court Reports

(WEEKLY)

Official Journal
of Reportable Supreme Court Decisions

[2017] 1 S.C.R. (Part-I)

Highlights of the issue

High Court, whether empowered to punish for contempt of Supreme Court.

Vitusah Oberoi v. Court of Its Own Motion ...25

Purpose and intention behind the enactment of s. 123(3) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 – Discussed.

Abhiram Singh v. C.D. Commachen (D) by LRs. ...158

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