COURT NEWS

Vol. VII Issue No. 2 April - June, 2012

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha, Judge, Supreme Court of India
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra, Judge, Supreme Court of India

COMPILED BY

A.I.S. Cheema, 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

CONTENTS

Appointments and Retirements in Supreme Court of India	02
Appointments in High Courts	03
Transfers between High Courts	03
Vacancies in Courts	04-05
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in Supreme Court	06
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in High Courts and in District and Subordinate Courts	07-08
Some Supreme Court Judgments of Public Importance	09-15
Some Recent Major Events and Initiatives	16-18
Some Important Visits and Conferences	19-20

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 SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (FROM 01-04-2012 TO 30-06-2012)

APPOINTMENTS

S.No.	Name of Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
1	Hon'ble Mr. Justice F.M. Ibrahim Kalifulla	02-04-2012
2	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Gogoi	23-04-2012
3	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur	04-06-2012

RETIREMENT

S.No.	Name of Hon'ble Judge	Date of Retirement
1	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dalveer Bhandari	27-04-2012 *

* Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dalveer Bhandari vacated the office of Judge, Supreme Court of India in the afternoon of 27th April, 2012 on His Lordship's election as Judge, International Court of Justice, the Hague.

APPOINTMENTS IN HIGH COURTS
(From 01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
1	Allahabad	Vishnu Chandra Gupta	17-04-12
		Mohd. Tahir	17-04-12
		Mushaffey Ahmad	17-04-12
		Arvind Kumar Tripathi	17-04-12
		Saeed-Uz-Zaman Siddiqui	17-04-12
		Aditya Nath Mittal	17-04-12
		Mahendra Dayal	17-04-12
		Virendra Vikram Singh	17-04-12
		Het Singh Yadav	17-04-12
		Anil Kumar Sharma	17-04-12
		Anurag Kumar	17-04-12
2	Andhra Pradesh	C. Praveen Kumar	29-06-12
		M.S. Ramachandra Rao	29-06-12
3	Calcutta	Dipak Saha Ray	09-04-12
		Anindita Roy Saraswati	09-04-12
		Tarun Kumar Das	09-04-12
		Murari Prasad Shrivastava	09-04-12
		Subal Baidya	09-04-12
		Asim Kumar Mondal	09-04-12
		Toufique Uddin	09-04-12
4	Jammu & Kashmir	M.M. Kumar (As Chief Justice)	08-06-12
5	Patna	Chakradhari Sharan Singh	05-04-12
6	Punjab & Haryana	R.P. Nagrath	15-06-12
		Sat Paul Bangarh	15-06-12
		Rekha Mittal	15-06-12
		Inderjit Singh	15-06-12

TRANSFERS BETWEEN HIGH COURTS
(From 01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)

S.No.	From	To	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Transfer
1	Punjab & Haryana	Calcutta	K.S. Ahluwalia	19-04-12
2	Rajasthan	Chhattisgarh	A.M. Sapre	23-04-12
3	Bombay	Gujarat	P.B. Majmudar	22-05-12
4	Punjab & Haryana	Jharkhand	Alok Singh	13-06-12
5	Calcutta	Andhra Pradesh	P.C. Ghose	25-06-12

- Above statements are compiled on the basis of information received from the High Courts

VACANCIES IN COURTS

A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (As on 30-06-2012)

Sanctioned Strength	Working strength	Vacancies
31	27	04

B) HIGH COURTS (As on 30-06-2012)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Allahabad	160	86	74
2	Andhra Pradesh	49	33	16
3	Bombay	75	60	15
4	Calcutta	58	44	14
5	Chhatisgarh	18	12	6
6	Delhi	48	36	12
7	Gujarat	42	29	13
8	Gauhati	24	23	1
9	Himachal Pradesh	11	11	0
10	Jammu & Kashmir	14	7	7
11	Jharkhand	20	12	8
12	Karnataka	50	39	11
13	Kerala	38	31	7
14	Madhya Pradesh	43	34	9
15	Madras	60	53	7
16	Orissa	22	14	8
17	Patna	43	37	6
18	Punjab & Haryana	68	42	26
19	Rajasthan	40	23	17
20	Sikkim	3	2	1
21	Uttarakhand	9	8	1
	TOTAL	**895**	**636**	**259**

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

C) DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (As on 31-03-2012)

S.No.	State / Union Territory	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Uttar Pradesh	2102	1834	268
2	Andhra Pradesh	834	717	117
3(a)	Maharashtra	2016	1831	185
3(b)	Goa	49	42	7
3(c)	Diu and Daman & Silvasa	7	7	0
4	West Bengal	933	777	156
5	Chhatisgarh	276	238	38
6	Delhi	623	465	158
7	Gujarat	1727	875	852
8(a)	Assam	356	248	108
8(b)	Nagaland	29	23	6
8(c)	Meghalya	36	14	22
8(d)	Manipur	31	26	5
8(e)	Tripura	92	65	27
8(f)	Mizoram	65	33	32
8(g)	Arunachal Pradesh	2	2	0
9	Himachal Pradesh	132	115	17
10	Jammu & Kashmir	206	189	17
11	Jharkhand	499	410	89
12	Karnataka	945	771	174
13(a)	Kerala	411	375	36
13(b)	Lakshadweep	3	2	1
14	Madhya Pradesh	1321	1170	151
15(a)	Tamil Nadu	866	743	123
15(b)	Puducherry	20	13	7
16	Orissa	625	546	79
17	Bihar	1458	951	507
18(a)	Punjab	493	377	116
18(b)	Haryana	476	352	124
18(c)	Chandigarh	20	20	0
19	Rajasthan	922	742	180
20	Sikkim	13	9	4
21	Uttarakhand	278	152	126
	TOTAL	**17866**	**14134**	**3732**

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

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN SUPREME COURT

[01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012]

i) Table I

						Pendency (At the end of 31-03-2012)		
						Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
						33,353	26,463	59,816
Institution (01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)			**Disposal (01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)**			**Pendency (At the end of 30-06-2012)**		
Admission matters	**Regular matters**	**Total matters**	**Admission matters**	**Regular matters**	**Total matters**	**Admission matters**	**Regular matters**	**Total matters**
13,926	1,261	15,187	10,446	706	11,152	36,833	27,018	63,851

Note:

1. Out of the 63,851 pending matters as on 30-06-2012, if connected matters are excluded, the pendency is only of 36,667 matters as on 30-06-2012.

2. Out of the said 63,851 pending matters, 21,958 matters are upto one year old and thus arrears (i.e. cases pending more than a year) are only of 41,893 matters as on 30-06-2012.

ii) Table II

	Opening Balance As On 01-04-12	**Institution From 01-04-12 To 30-06-12**	**Disposal From 01-04-12 To 30-06-12**	**Pendency at the end of 30-06-12**
CIVIL CASES	48,743	11,371	8,136	51,978
CRIMINAL CASES	11,073	3,816	3,016	11,873
ALL CASES (TOTAL)	59,816	15,187	11,152	63,851

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN HIGH COURTS AND IN DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS

A) HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-01-12 TO 31-03-12)

S. No.	Name of the High Court	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter			Pending cases at the end of this Quarter			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12
		CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)			
1	Allahabad	671127	334400	1005527	33945	28200	62145	34601	24538	59139	670471	338062	1008533	6.18	5.88	0.30
2	Andhra Pradesh	171371	26843	198214	14710	4226	18936	13725	4196	17921	172356	26873	199229	9.55	9.04	0.51
3	Bombay	316893	45992	362885	31076	8810	39886	31981	7842	39823	315988	46960	362948	10.99	10.97	0.02
4	Calcutta	303375	43779	347154	16515	8283	24798	13823	7869	21692	306067	44193	350260	7.14	6.25	0.89
5	Chhatisgarh	36191	16976	53167	3654	3232	6886	4800	2989	7789	35045	17219	52264	12.95	14.65	-1.70
6	Delhi[1]	50159	13716	63875	7157	2916	10073	8411	2525	10936	48905	14107	63012	15.77	17.12	-1.35
7	Gujarat	55207	27025	82232	8816	5977	14793	11053	6443	17496	52970	26559	79529	17.99	21.28	-3.29
8	Gauhati	44245	9010	53255	5652	3033	8685	6528	3513	10041	43369	8530	51899	16.31	18.85	-2.55
9	Himachal Pradesh	43593	5948	49541	6009	736	6745	6820	723	7543	42782	5961	48743	13.61	15.23	-1.61
10	Jammu & Kashmir	77697	4526	82223	6590	639	7229	3842	312	4154	80445	4853	85298	8.79	5.05	3.74
11	Jharkhand[2]	31082	28465	59547	2626	4932	7558	2991	5603	8594	30717	27794	58511	12.69	14.43	-1.74
12	Karnataka	156461	15627	172088	26382	3710	30092	27153	3564	30717	155690	15773	171463	17.49	17.85	-0.36
13	Kerala	96852	31925	128777	14992	4800	19792	19502	5630	25132	92342	31095	123437	15.37	19.52	-4.15
14	Madhya Pradesh	154843	74493	229336	19511	12134	31645	15404	10427	25831	158950	76200	235150	13.80	11.26	2.54
15	Madras	415836	57900	473736	51438	20546	71984	45168	16704	61872	422106	61742	483848	15.19	13.06	2.13
16	Orissa	271242	30072	301314	15825	12295	28120	10547	11359	21906	276520	31008	307528	9.33	7.27	2.06
17	Patna	70723	48241	118964	9412	15286	24698	12160	16173	28333	67975	47354	115329	20.76	23.82	-3.06
18	Punjab & Haryana	192193	51473	243666	15314	12886	28200	16157	11976	28133	191350	52383	243733	11.57	11.55	0.03
19	Rajasthan	221898	59408	281306	21511	11387	32898	20310	14317	34627	223099	56478	279577	11.69	12.31	-0.61
20	Sikkim	52	15	67	16	8	24	14	8	22	54	15	69	35.82	32.84	2.99
21	Uttarakhand	13109	6154	19263	2299	1556	3855	1416	1195	2611	13992	6515	20507	20.01	13.55	6.46
	TOTAL	**3394149**	**931988**	**4326137**	**313450**	**165592**	**479042**	**306406**	**157906**	**464312**	**3401193**	**939674**	**4340867**	**11.07**	**10.73**	**0.34**

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

1. Consequent upon physical verification of cases the opening balance of civil and criminal cases has been modified.
2. Variation in the figures has occurred on account of physical verification of the records.

B) DISTRICT AND SUBORDINATE COURTS (FROM 01-01-12 TO 31-03-12)

S. No.	Name of the State / UT	Cases brought forward from the previous Quarter			Freshly instituted Cases during this Quarter			Disposed of Cases during this Quarter			Pending cases at the end of this Quarter			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 1-1-12
		CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(CIV. + CRL.)			
1	Uttar Pradesh	1345023	4453025	5798048	116066	453757	569823	114354	455245	569599	1346735	4451537	5798272	9.83	9.82	0.00
2	Andhra Pradesh	450031	495706	945737	65687	85504	151191	68242	111066	179308	447476	470144	917620	15.99	18.96	-2.97
3(a)	Maharashtra	975750	2300204	3275954	143654	315837	459491	147459	443560	591019	971945	2172481	3144426	14.03	18.04	-4.01
3(b)	Goa	17837	12220	30057	2871	5181	8052	2690	5367	8057	18018	12034	30052	26.79	26.81	-0.02
3(c)	Diu and Daman & Silvasa	1736	3241	4977	373	510	883	283	580	863	1826	3171	4997	17.74	17.34	0.40
4(a)	West Bengal	520001	2109654	2629655	31591	200031	231622	31112	191228	222340	520480	2118457	2638937	8.81	8.46	0.35
4(b)	Andaman & Nicobar	2290	12924	15214	232	2958	3190	263	4757	5020	2259	11125	13384	20.97	33.00	-12.03
5	Chhatisgarh	56982	214424	271406	7537	27819	35356	6647	33895	40542	57872	208348	266220	13.03	14.94	-1.91
6	Delhi	157607	600871	758478	12242	214918	227160	25873	269999	295872	143976	545790	689766	29.95	39.01	-9.06
7	Gujarat	677072	1505954	2183026	67084	265317	332401	72863	244999	317862	671293	1526272	2197565	15.23	14.56	0.67
8(a)	Assam	72863	186733	259596	9061	42919	51980	8064	39308	47372	73860	190344	264204	20.02	18.25	1.78
8(b)	Nagaland	1706	2699	4405	302	366	668	409	534	943	1599	2531	4130	15.16	21.41	-6.24
8(c)	Meghalya	1333	1848	3181	288	570	858	104	578	682	1517	1840	3357	26.97	21.44	5.53
8(d)	Manipur[1]	5848	7992	13840	805	2266	3071	738	1935	2673	5915	8323	14238	22.19	19.31	2.88
8(e)	Tripura	7315	40936	48251	2005	34730	36735	1742	39290	41032	7578	36376	43954	76.13	85.04	-8.91
8(f)	Mizoram	1454	2958	4412	825	1634	2459	491	1954	2445	1788	2638	4426	55.73	55.42	0.32
8(g)	Arunachal Pradesh	930	5375	6305	288	1492	1780	312	1625	1937	906	5242	6148	28.23	30.72	-2.49
9	Himachal Pradesh	75214	114335	189549	15374	54228	69602	13985	50148	64133	76603	118415	195018	36.72	33.83	2.89
10	Jammu & Kashmir	73901	132407	206308	12284	47089	59373	11488	46605	58093	74697	132891	207588	28.78	28.16	0.62
11	Jharkhand[2]	58810	239716	298526	5464	30845	36309	4140	32160	36300	60106	238134	298240	12.16	12.16	-0.10
12	Karnataka	561096	567900	1128996	83582	183999	267581	85848	195449	281297	558830	556450	1115280	23.70	24.92	-1.21
13(a)	Kerala	380854	679202	1060056	74336	204747	279083	69764	198070	267834	385426	685879	1071305	26.33	25.27	1.06
13(b)	Lakshadweep	76	163	239	11	15	26	12	13	25	75	165	240	10.88	10.46	0.42
14	Madhya Pradesh	224450	864745	1089195	49420	234066	283486	39058	204191	243249	234812	894620	1129432	26.03	22.33	3.69
15(a)	Tamil Nadu	715702	467547	1183249	248211	170502	418713	235849	172572	408421	728064	465477	1193541	35.39	34.52	0.87
15(b)	Puducherry	13490	13215	26705	5018	4224	9242	4989	3817	8806	13519	13622	27141	34.61	32.98	1.63
16	Orissa	213809	939708	1153517	12579	76452	89031	11433	71633	83066	214955	944527	1159482	7.72	7.20	0.52
17	Bihar[3]	258195	1349111	1607306	15812	85551	101363	13103	67252	80355	260900	1367391	1628291	6.31	5.00	1.31
18(a)	Punjab	275422	277780	553202	37886	80447	118333	41314	85249	126563	271994	272978	544972	21.39	22.88	-1.49
18(b)	Haryana	240800	348012	588812	40227	103035	143262	36727	100614	137341	244300	350433	594733	24.33	23.33	1.01
18(c)	Chandigarh	23399	36717	60116	2936	22540	25476	2716	24986	27702	23619	34271	57890	42.38	46.08	-3.70
19	Rajasthan	400112	1051256	1451368	51236	217513	268749	50509	236641	287150	400839	1032128	1432967	18.52	19.78	-1.27
20	Sikkim	436	758	1194	96	348	444	79	249	328	453	857	1310	37.19	27.47	9.72
21	Uttarakhand	32186	113548	145734	6880	44163	51043	7316	36821	44137	31750	120890	152640	35.02	30.29	4.74
	Total	**7843730**	**19152884**	**26996614**	**1122263**	**3215573**	**4337836**	**1109976**	**3372390**	**4482366**	**7855985**	**18995781**	**26851766**	**16.07**	**16.60**	**-0.54**

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

1. Figures after physical verification as furnished by the Registry of Imphal Bench.
2. Variation in the figures has occurred on account of physical verification of the records
3. 5 Civil and 19 Criminal Cases transferred/amalgamated as well as 1 Civil Case received in one Judicial District during the quarter.

SOME SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)

1. On 4th April, 2012, in *Bhushan Kumar & Anr. v. State (NCT of Delhi) & Anr.*[Criminal Appeal No.612 of 2012], it was held that "a summon is a process issued by a Court calling upon a person to appear before a Magistrate. It is used for the purpose of notifying an individual of his legal obligation to appear before the Magistrate as a response to violation of law." The Bench held that "the summons will announce to the person to whom it is directed that a legal proceeding has been started against that person and the date and time on which the person must appear in Court. A person who is summoned is legally bound to appear before the Court on the given date and time. Willful disobedience is liable to be punished under Section 174 IPC. It is a ground for contempt of court."

2. On 12th April, 2012, in *Society for Un-aided Private Schools of Rajasthan v. U.O.I. & Anr.* [Writ Petition (Civil) No.95 of 2010], a three Judge Bench (per majority) held that the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 is constitutionally valid and shall apply to the following: (i) a school established, owned or controlled by the appropriate Government or a local authority; (ii) an aided school including aided minority school(s) receiving aid or grants to meet whole or part of its expenses from the appropriate Government or the local authority; (iii) a school belonging to specified category; and (iv) an unaided non-minority school not receiving any kind of aid or grants to meet its expenses from the appropriate Government or the local authority." However, the Bench (per majority) further held that "the said 2009 Act and in particular Sections 12(1)(c) and 18(3) infringes the fundamental freedom guaranteed to unaided minority schools under Article 30(1)" and, consequently, applying the "principle of severability, the said 2009 Act shall not apply to such schools."

3. On 13th April, 2012, in *Om Prakash v. State of Rajasthan & Anr.* [Criminal Appeal No. 651 of 2012] it was held that "when an accused commits a grave and heinous offence and thereafter attempts to take statutory shelter under the guise of being a minor, a casual or cavalier approach while recording as to whether an accused is a juvenile or not cannot be permitted as the courts are enjoined upon to perform their duties with the object of protecting the confidence of common man in the institution entrusted with the administration of justice. Hence, while the courts must be sensitive in dealing with the juvenile who is involved in cases of serious nature like sexual molestation, rape, gang rape, murder and host of other offences, the accused cannot be allowed to abuse the statutory protection by attempting to prove himself as a minor when the documentary evidence to prove his minority gives rise to a reasonable doubt about his assertion of minority. Under such circumstance, the medical evidence based on scientific investigation will have to be given due weight and precedence over the evidence based on school administration records which give rise to hypothesis and speculation about the age of the accused." The Bench held that the benefit of benevolent legislation under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 offers "protection to a genuine child accused/juvenile who does not put the court into any dilemma as to whether he is a juvenile or not by adducing evidence in support of his plea of minority but in absence of the same, reliance placed merely on shaky evidence like the school

admission register which is not proved or oral evidence based on conjectures leading to further ambiguity, cannot be relied upon in preference to the medical evidence for assessing the age of the accused." The Bench further held that the Juvenile Justice Act which is meant to treat a child accused with care and sensitivity offering him a chance to reform and settle into the mainstream of society, "cannot be allowed to be used as a ploy to dupe the course of justice while conducting trial and treatment of heinous offences."

4. On 17th April, 2012, in *United India Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Laxmamma & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No. 3589 of 2012], the question that arose for consideration was: whether the appellant, United India Insurance Company Limited (insurer) was absolved of its obligations to the third party under the policy of insurance because the cheque given by the owner of the vehicle towards the premium got dishonoured and subsequent to the accident, the insurer cancelled the policy of insurance. The Bench held that "where the policy of insurance is issued by an authorized insurer on receipt of cheque towards payment of premium and such cheque is returned dishonoured, the liability of authorized insurer to indemnify third parties in respect of the liability which that policy covered subsists and it has to satisfy award of compensation by reason of the provisions of Sections 147(5) and 149(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 unless the policy of insurance is cancelled by the authorized insurer and intimation of such cancellation has reached the insured before the accident. In other words, where the policy of insurance is issued by an authorized insurer to cover a vehicle on receipt of the cheque paid towards premium and the cheque gets dishonored and before the accident of the vehicle occurs, such insurance company cancels the policy of insurance and sends intimation thereof to the owner, the insurance company's liability to indemnify the third parties which that policy covered ceases and the insurance company is not liable to satisfy awards of compensation in respect thereof."

5. On 19th April, 2012 in *Brij Mohan Lal v. Union of India & Ors.* [Transferred case (Civil) No. 22 of 2001], it was held that "wherever the right which is being affected is a basic or a fundamental right, the State cannot be permitted to advance an argument of financial constraints in such matters. The policy of the State has to be in the larger public interest and free of arbitrariness. Adhocism and uncertainty are the twin factors which are bound to adversely affect any State policy and its results." The Bench held that "the State cannot in, an ad hoc manner, create new systems while simultaneously giving up or demolishing the existing systems when the latter have even statistically shown achievement of results."

6. On 23rd April, 2012 in *C.N. Ramappa Gowda v. C.C. Chandregowda (Dead) by Lrs. & Anr.* [Civil Appeal No.3710 of 2012] it was held that "it is only when the Court for recorded reasons is fully satisfied that there is no fact which needs to be proved at the instance of the plaintiff in view of the deemed admission by the defendant, the Court can conveniently pass a judgement and decree against the defendant who has not filed the written statement. But, if the plaint itself indicates that there are disputed questions of fact involved in the case arising from the plaint itself giving rise to two versions, it would not be safe for the Court to record an ex-parte judgement without directing the plaintiff to prove the facts so as to settle the factual controversy. In that event, the ex-parte judgement although may appear to have decided the suit expeditiously, it ultimately gives rise to several layers of appeal after appeal which ultimately compounds the delay in finally disposing of the suit giving rise to multiplicity of proceeding which hardly promotes the cause of speedy trial. However, if the Court is clearly of the view that the plaintiff's case even without any evidence is prima facie unimpeachable

and the defendant's approach is clearly a dilatory tactic to delay the passing of a decree, it would be justified in appropriate cases to pass even an uncontested decree. What would be the nature of such a case ultimately will have to be left to the wisdom and just exercise of discretion by the trial court who is seized of the trial of the suit."

7. On 27th April, 2012, in *P.A. Mohammed Riyas v. M.K. Raghavan & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No.10262 of 2010], it was held that "where the Election Petitioner alleges any corrupt practice, the Petition shall also be accompanied by an affidavit in the prescribed form in support of the allegation of such corrupt practice and the particulars thereof and the schedule or annexures to the Petition shall also be signed by the Petitioner and verified in the same manner as the Petition. In other words, when corrupt practices are alleged in an Election Petition, the source of such allegations has to be disclosed and the same has to be supported by an affidavit in support thereof." In the case at hand, the Bench held that "although allegations as to corrupt practices alleged to have been employed by the Respondent had been mentioned in the body of the Petition, the Petition itself had not been verified in the manner specified in Order VI Rule 15 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Sub-Section (4) of Section 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 defines "corrupt practice" and the publication of various statements against the Respondent which were not supported by affidavit, could not, therefore, have been taken into consideration by the High Court while considering the Election Petition. In the absence of proper verification, it has to be accepted that the Election Petition was incomplete as it did not contain a complete cause of action."

8. On 27th April, 2012, in *Mehrawal Khewaji Trust (Regd.), Faridkot & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No.4005 pf 2012], it was held that "when the land is being compulsorily taken away from a person, he is entitled to the highest value which similar land in the locality is shown to have fetched in a bona fide transaction entered into between a willing purchaser and a willing seller near about the time of the acquisition." The Bench held it "to be only fair that where sale deeds pertaining to different transactions are relied on behalf of the Government, the transaction representing the highest value should be preferred to the rest unless there are strong circumstances justifying a different course. It is not desirable to take an average of various sale deeds placed before the authority/court for fixing fair compensation."

9. On 27th April, 2012, in *Sri Marcel Martins v. M. Printer & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No.6645 of 2003], it was held that "while the expression "fiduciary capacity" may not be capable of a precise definition, it implies a relationship that is analogous to the relationship between a trustee and the beneficiaries of the trust. The expression is in fact wider in its import for it extends to all such situations as place the parties in positions that are founded on confidence and trust on the one part and good faith on the other." The Bench held that "in determining whether a relationship is based on trust or confidence, relevant to determining whether they stand in a fiduciary capacity, the Court shall have to take into consideration the factual context in which the question arises for it is only in the factual backdrop that the existence or otherwise of a fiduciary relationship can be deduced in a given case."

10. On 27th April, 2012, in *Avishek Goenka v. Union of India & Anr.* [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 265 of 2011], a three Judge Bench prohibited "the use of black films of any Visual Light Transmission (VLT) percentage or any other material upon the safety glasses, windscreens (front and rear) and side glasses of all vehicles throughout the country." The Bench held that the "the manufacturer of the vehicle may manufacture the vehicles with tinted glasses

which have Visual Light Transmission (VLT) of safety glasses windscreen (front and rear) as 70 per cent VLT and side glasses as 40 per cent VLT, respectively" but "no black film or any other material can be pasted on the windscreens and side glasses of a vehicle."

11. On 27th April, 2012, in *U.P. Power Corporation Ltd. v. Rajesh Kumar & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No. 2608 of 2011], issue pertaining to reservation in promotion with consequential seniority for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes as engrafted under the provisions of the Constitution, and its implementation was examined. In this regard, the following principles were carved out by the Bench:- (a) "Vesting of the power by an enabling provision may be constitutionally valid and yet 'exercise of power' by the State in a given case may be arbitrary, particularly, if the State fails to identify and measure backwardness and inadequacy keeping in mind the efficiency of service as required under Article 335"; (b) "Article 16(4) which protects the interests of certain sections of the society has to be balanced against Article 16(1) which protects the interests of every citizen of the entire society. They should be harmonized because they are restatements of the principle of equality under Article 14"; (c) "Each post gets marked for the particular category of candidates to be appointed against it and any subsequent vacancy has to be filled by that category candidate"; (d) "The appropriate Government has to apply the cadre strength as a unit in the operation of the roster in order to ascertain whether a given class/group is adequately represented in the service. The cadre strength as a unit also ensures that the upper ceiling-limit of 50% is not violated. Further roster has to be post-specific and not vacancy based"; (e) "The State has to form its opinion on the quantifiable data regarding adequacy of representation. Clause (4A) of Article 16 is an enabling provision. It gives freedom to the State to provide for reservation in matters of promotion. Clause (4A) of Article 16 applies only to SCs and STs. The said clause is carved out of Article 16(4A). Therefore, Clause (4A) will be governed by the two compelling reasons - "backwardness" and "inadequacy of representation", as mentioned in Article 16(4). If the said two reasons do not exist, then the enabling provision cannot be enforced." f) "If the ceiling-limit on the carry-over of unfilled vacancies is removed, the other alternative time-factor comes in and in that event, the time-scale has to be imposed in the interest of efficiency in administration as mandated by Article 335. If the time-scale is not kept, then posts will continue to remain vacant for years which would be detrimental to the administration. Therefore, in each case, the appropriate Government will now have to introduce the duration depending upon the fact-situation." (g) "If the appropriate Government enacts a law providing for reservation without keeping in mind the parameters in Article 16(4) and Article 335, then this Court will certainly set aside and strike down such legislation." (h) "The constitutional limitation under Article 335 is relaxed and not obliterated." "Be it reservation or evaluation, excessiveness in either would result in violation of the constitutional mandate. This exercise, however, will depend on the facts of each case." (i) "The concepts of efficiency, backwardness and inadequacy of representation are required to be identified and measured. That exercise depends on the availability of data. That exercise depends on numerous factors. It is for this reason that the enabling provisions are required to be made because each competing claim seeks to achieve certain goals. How best one should optimize these conflicting claims can only be done by the administration in the context of local prevailing conditions in public employment." (j) "Article 16(4), therefore, creates a field which enables a State to provide for reservation provided there exists backwardness of a class and inadequacy of representation in employment. These are compelling reasons.They do not exist in Article 16(1). It is only when these reasons are satisfied that a State gets the power to provide for reservation in the matter of employment."

12. On 3rd May, 2012, in *Arjun v. State of Maharashtra* [Criminal Appeal No. 356 of 2007], it was held that the "plea of right of private defence cannot be based on surmises and speculation. While considering whether the right of private defence is available to an accused, it is not relevant whether he may have a chance to inflict severe and mortal injury on the aggressor. In order to find whether the right of private defence is available to an accused, the entire incident must be examined with care and viewed in its proper setting."

13. On 8th May, 2012, in *Sahadevan & Anr. v. State of Tamil Nadu* [Criminal Appeal No. 1405 of 2008] the Bench while analysing the scope of extending the benefit of a judgment of acquittal to a non-appealing accused held that "where the Court finds that the prosecution evidence suffers from serious contradictions, is unreliable, is ex facie neither cogent nor true and the prosecution has failed to discharge the established onus of proving the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt, the Court will be well within its jurisdiction to return the finding of acquittal and even suo moto extend the benefit to a non-appealing accused as well, more so, where the Court even disbelieves the very occurrence of the crime itself. Of course, the role attributed to each of the accused and other attendant circumstances would be relevant considerations for the Court to apply its discretion judiciously. There can be varied reasons for a non-appealing accused in not approaching the appellate Court. If, for compelling and inevitable reasons, like lack of finances, absence of any person to pursue his remedy and lack of proper assistance in the jail, an accused is unable to file appeal, then it would amount to denial of access to justice to such accused. The concept of fair trial would take within its ambit the right to be heard by the appellate Court. It is hardly possible to believe that an accused would, out of choice, give up his right to appeal, especially in a crime where a sentence of imprisonment for life is prescribed and awarded. Fairness in the administration of justice system and access to justice would be the relevant considerations for this Court to examine whether a non-appealing accused could or could not be extended the benefit of the judgment of acquittal." The Bench further held that "where the court disbelieves the entire incident of the occurrence or where the role of the accused who has not appealed is identical to that of the other appealing accused or where the ends of justice demand, the Court would not hesitate and, in fact, is duty bound, to dispense justice in accordance with law." It held that the "powers of this Court, in terms of Articles 136 and 142 on the one hand and the rights of an accused under Article 21 of the Constitution on the other, are wide enough to deliver complete justice to the parties."

14. On 10th May, 2012, in *M/s Narne Construction P. Ltd. etc. etc. v. Union of India & Ors.* etc. [Civil Appeal No.4432-4450 of 2012], it was held that "the activities of the appellant-company in the present case involving offer of plots for sale to its customers/members with an assurance of development of infrastructure/amenities, lay-out approvals etc. was a 'service' within the meaning of clause (o) of Section 2(1) of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and would, therefore, be amenable to the jurisdiction of the fora established under the statute." The Bench held that "having regard to the nature of the transaction between the appellant-company and its customers which involved much more than a simple transfer of a piece of immovable property it is clear that the same constituted 'service' within the meaning of the Act. It was not a case where the appellant-company was selling the given property with all advantages and/or disadvantages on "as is where is" basis." The Bench held that "it is a case where a clear cut assurance was made to the purchasers as to the nature and the extent of development that would be carried out by the appellant-company as a part of the package under which sale of fully developed plots with assured facilities was to be made in favour of

the purchasers for valuable consideration. To the extent the transfer of the site with developments in the manner and to the extent indicated earlier was a part of the transaction, the appellant-company had indeed undertaken to provide a service. Any deficiency or defect in such service would make it accountable before the competent consumer forum at the instance of consumers like the respondents."

15. On 11th May, 2012, in *State of M.P. v. Rakesh Kohli & Anr.* [Civil Appeal No.684 of 2004], the constitutionality of Clause (d), Article 45 of Schedule 1-A of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 [brought in by the Indian Stamp (Madhya Pradesh Amendment) Act, 2002] was considered. Examining the contention that the distinction carved out in Article 45, Clause (d) between an agent who was a blood relation and who was an outsider was legally impermissible and that the provision violated Article 14 of the Constitution as it sought to create unreasonable classification, the Bench held that "by creating two categories, namely, an agent who is a blood relation, i.e. father, mother, wife or husband, son or daughter, brother or sister and an agent other than the kith and kin, without consideration, the Legislature has sought to curb inappropriate mode of transfer of immovable properties." The Bench held that "ordinarily, where executant himself is unable, for any reason, to execute the document, he would appoint his kith and kin as his power of attorney to complete the transaction on his behalf. If one does not have any kith or kin who he can appoint as power of attorney, he may execute the conveyance himself. The legislative idea behind Clause (d), Article 45 of Schedule 1-A is to curb tendency of transferring immovable properties through power of attorney and inappropriate documentation. By making a provision like this, the State Government has sought to collect stamp duty on such indirect and inappropriate mode of transfer by providing that power of attorney given to a person other than kith or kin, without consideration, authorizing such person to sell immovable property situated in Madhya Pradesh will attract stamp duty at two per cent on the market value of the property which is subject matter of power of attorney. In effect, by bringing in this law, the Madhya Pradesh State Legislature has sought to levy stamp duty on such ostensible document, the real intention of which is the transfer of immovable property. The classification, thus, cannot be said to be without any rationale. It has a direct nexus to the object of the 1899 Act. The conclusion of the High Court, therefore, that the impugned provision is arbitrary, unreasonable and irrational is unsustainable."

16. On 11th May, 2012, in *Registrar General, Patna High Court v. Pandey Gajendra Prasad & Ors.* [Civil Appeal No.4553 of 2012], in regard to recording of ACRs of judicial officers, it was observed that "there is an urgent need for reforms on this subject, not only to bring about uniformity but also to infuse objectivity and standardisation." The Bench observed that "ACRs play a vital and significant role in the assessment, evaluation and formulation of opinion on the profile of a judicial officer, particularly, in matters relating to disciplinary action against a judicial officer. The ACRs of such officer hold supreme importance in ascertaining his conduct, and therefore, the same have to be reported carefully with due diligence and caution" The Bench observed that "the present system of recording the ACRs leaves much to be desired and needs to be revamped. Experience has shown that it is deficient in several ways, being not comprehensive enough to truly reflect the level of work, conduct and performance of each individual on one hand and unable to check subjectivity on the other. This undoubtedly breeds discontent in a section of the judicial service besides eroding proper and effective superintendence and control of the High Court over subordinate judiciary. The process of evaluation of a judicial officer is intended to contain a balanced

information about his performance during the entire evaluation period, but it has been noticed that many a times, the ACRs are recorded casually in a hurry after a long lapse of time (in some cases even after the expiry of one year from the period to which it relates), indicating only the grading in the final column. It needs no elaboration that such hurried assessment cannot but, be either on the basis of the assessment/grading of the preceding year(s) or on personal subjective views of the Inspecting Judge(s), which is unfair to the judicial officer."

17. On 21st May, 2012, in *State of Rajasthan v. Darshan Singh @ Darshan Lal* [Criminal Appeal No.870 of 2007], issue pertaining to admissibility and credibility of a deaf and dumb witness arose for consideration. The Bench held that "a dumb person need not be prevented from being a credible and reliable witness merely due to his/her physical disability. Such a person though unable to speak may convey himself through writing if literate or through signs and gestures if he is unable to read and write." The Bench further held that "a deaf and dumb person is a competent witness. If in the opinion of the Court, oath can be administered to him/her, it should be so done. Such a witness, if able to read and write, it is desirable to record his statement giving him questions in writing and seeking answers in writing. In case the witness is not able to read and write, his statement can be recorded in sign language with the aid of interpreter, if found necessary. In case the interpreter is provided, he should be a person of the same surrounding but should not have any interest in the case and he should be administered oath."

18. On 25th May, 2012, in *Vijay Kumar Kaul and Others v.Union of India and Others* [Civil Appeal No. 4986-4989 of 2007], it was held that "a litigant who invokes the jurisdiction of a court for claiming seniority, it is obligatory on his part to come to the court at the earliest or at least within a reasonable span of time. The belated approach is impermissible as in the meantime interest of third parties gets ripened and further interference after enormous delay is likely to usher in a state of anarchy." It was further held that the "acts done during the interregnum are to be kept in mind and should not be lightly brushed aside."

SOME RECENT MAJOR EVENTS AND INITIATIVES (01-04-2012 to 30-06-2012)

I. **DELEGATION FROM THE STATE OF DELAWARE, U.S.A.:** Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India met a delegation from the State of Delaware, U.S.A. led by Justice Randy Holland from the Delaware Supreme Court on 23.4.2012.

II. **BANGLADESHI PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION:** Mr. A.I.S. Cheema, Secretary General, Mr. Ravindra Maithani, Registrar (J-1) and Mr. M.A. Sayeed, Registrar (A-J) met a 9 member Bangladeshi Parliamentary Delegation led by Mr. Fazie Rabbi, Hon'ble MP and Chairman on 12.4.2012.

III. **MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY (NJA):**

- Forty five programmes were held during the last two months of the academic year 2011-12 viz. April - May. Three hundred and eighty four participants benefitted from the said programmes.

- Two programmes, one held in the month of April and the other in May worked towards strengthening the institutional framework of the judicial system. The National Conference for Senior District Judges held from April 21-23, 2012 identified specific techniques and tools for effective court management for enhancing quality, responsiveness & timeliness in decision making & judging. A national training programme for the faculty of State Judicial Academies was organized from May 4 - 8, 2012. One of the important aims of this programme was to have a comprehensive discussion on the range of methodologies and pedagogical techniques that may be used for training and education programmes for judges. Special emphasis was laid on the necessity of adopting inter-disciplinary approaches in judicial education.

- A "National Conference of High Court Justices on Enhancing Quality, Efficiency and Timeliness of Adjudication: Sharing of Experiences" was held on April 14-15, 2012. This conference provided an occasion for High Court Judges to share their experiences concerning efforts that can be adopted for improving quality of adjudication. Discussions were also conducted on issues such as measures to effectively combat corruption and to ensure better supervision of subordinate courts.

- The Adjudication Management Programme which focused on improving the quality, efficiency and timeliness of adjudication had Adjudication of Juvenile Justice Cases as its core topic and was held from April 13-16, 2012. Twenty three presiding officers of the Juvenile Justice Boards from across the country reviewed the social and psychological background of cases involving juveniles. To take the discussions forward, relevant court and case management methods, substantive and procedural law, judging and decision making skills and issues relating to evaluation of quality and timeliness were presented before them. The need to ensure speedy disposals of cases involving children, adoption and rehabilitation under JJ Act, 2000 etc were also stressed upon.

- The Regional Conference of the North Zone held on April 27-29, 2012 on Protection of Human Rights was organized at Delhi in association with the Delhi High Court and Delhi State Judicial Academy. Eighty four district judges from Delhi, Punjab & Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir participated in this programme. The conference explored the role of the District Judiciary in protecting human rights.

- Taking forward its flagship project the Court Excellence Enhancement Project (CEEP), meeting of another set of 10 courts was organized on May 11 - 13, 2012. The discussion focused on various issues and challenges relating to Court/Trial Process, Court/Case Management, Judicial System Management, Infrastructure, Role of Presiding Officer/Judge, Bar, Police, Prosecution, Ministerial Staff.

- The Court wise Action Plan was developed by the respective courts and participants agreed to take steps and implement the same in their respective Courts. This process would be subjected to review in future.

IV. MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES AUTHORITY (NALSA):

a. Observation of International Labour Day - 1st May, 2012: On the directions of NALSA, the State Legal Services Authorities observed "International Labour Day" on 1st May, 2012. Various programmes like legal literacy classes for labourers, lok adalats for settlement of disputes pertaining to workers/MGNREGA, sensitization workshops etc. were organized on this occasion.

b. Setting of Legal Aid Clinic in State Jail, Rongyek, Sikkim - 13th May, 2012: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA inaugurated the Legal Aid Clinic in the State Jail, Rongyek, Sikkim on 13th May, 2012 in the august presence of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chief Justice, High Court of Sikkim and Patron-in-Chief, Sikkim State Legal Services Authority and Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.P. Wangdi, Judge, High Court of Sikkim and Executive Chairman, Sikkim State Legal Services Authority. Another Legal Aid Clinic was inaugurated by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA at the ADR Centre at Pentok Mangan, Sikkim on 13th May, 2012.

c. Interaction with Panchayat Members and Public Hearing - 13th May, 2012: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA along with Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chief Justice, High Court of Sikkim and Patron-in-Chief, Sikkim State Legal Services Authority and Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.P. Wangdi, Judge, High Court of Sikkim and Executive Chairman, Sikkim State Legal Services Authority interacted with the Panchayat Members, District Officers and general public on 13th May, 2012 in the presence of Shri Sonam Gyatso, Hon'ble Minister of Energy and Power, Govt. of Sikkim.

d. Special Lok Adalat - 22nd May, 2012 (Pre-Litigation Matters of Universities of Jharkhand) & Appraisal of District Legal Services Authorities Through Video Conferencing: National Legal Services Authority, Jharkhand State Legal Services Authority and Jharkhand High Court Legal Services Committee organised a Special Lok Adalat (Pre-

Litigation matters of Universities of Jharkhand) and Appraisal of District Legal Services Authorities through Video Conferencing on 22nd May, 2012. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA inaugurated the Lok Adalat. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prakash Tatia, Chief Justice, Jharkhand High Court and Patron-in-Chief, JHALSA presided over the function in the august presence of Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.K. Merathia, Judge, Jharkhand High Court and Executive Chairman, JHALSA and Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.N. Patel, Judge, Jharkhand High Court and Chairman, Jharkhand HCLSC.

e. **Video Conferencing Facility Installed in NALSA Office:** NALSA has set up a studio type big video conferencing facility through which interaction can be had with other institutions.

f. **Observation of World Environment Day - 5th June, 2012:** On the directions of NALSA, the State Legal Services Authorities observed World Environment Day on 5th June, 2012.

g. **Legal Literacy Camp - 5th June, 2012:** A Legal Literacy Camp was organised for children, women and persons belong to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe on 5th June, 2012 at Government Kirti Inter College, Uttarkashi, Uttarakhand. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA in the august presence of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Barin Ghosh, Chief Justice High Court of Uttarakhand and Patron-in-Chief, Uttarakhand State Legal Services Authority and other Hon'ble Judges of Uttarakhand High Court.

h. **Foundation Stone of ADR Centre- 5th June, 2012:** Foundation Stone of ADR Centre at Uttarkashi was laid down by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA on 5th June, 2012 in the august presence of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Barin Ghosh, Chief Justice High Court of Uttarakhand and Patron-in-Chief, Uttarakhand State Legal Services Authority and other Hon'ble Judges of Uttarakhand High Court.

I. **Observation of World Day against Child Labour - 12th June, 2012:** On the directions of NALSA, the State Legal Services Authorities observed World Day against Child Labour on 12th June, 2012.

SOME IMPORTANT VISITS AND CONFERENCES
(From 01-04-12 to 30-06-12)

ABROAD:

1. Hon'ble Shri S. H. Kapadia, CJI visited (a) Canada for the purpose of discussing issues relating to the Law and Administration of Justice during the week commencing June 11, 2012 and (b) London (U. K.) to attend the Indo-British Legal Forum Meet held during the period June 18-20, 2012.
2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir visited (a) Islamabad (Pakistan) to attend the International Judicial Conference organized by the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan under the auspices of National Judicial (Policy Making) Committee on April 13-15, 2012 and (b) London (U. K.) to attend the Indo-British Legal Forum Meet held during the period June 18-20, 2012.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. K. Jain visited London to attend the Indo-British Legal Forum Meet held during the period June 18-20, 2012.
4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Aftab Alam visited a) Seoul (South Korea) to attend the Inaugural Congress of the Association of Asian Constitutional Courts and Equivalent Institutions (AACC) held on May 20-24, 2012 and b) Paris to attend a research Seminar on "Law of Language" organized by the Indian-European Advanced Research Network (IEARN) on June 14-15, 2012 at Nantes and meeting with the members of the Conseil D'Etat in the Palais-Royal in Paris on June 13, 2012.

INLAND:

1. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir visited Sokeythang (Sikkim) to attend the Foundation Stone laying ceremony of Sikkim Judicial Academy Complex on 14th May, 2012.
2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. Sathasivam visited a) Erode (i) to participate in Erode Bar Function and (ii) to Inaugurate the Combined Court Buildings & Judicial Officers' Quarters at Bhavani and deliver Address on 21st April, 2012 and b) Chennai to attend Law Association function on 21st June, 2012.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Deepak Verma visited a) Ratlam (M.P.) to attend the Golden Jubilee Celebration function of Dr. Kailasnath Katju Law College, Ratlam as a Chief Guest on 21st April, 2012 and b) Indore (M.P.) (i) to attend the inauguration of Extension Block of High Court Premises on 18th May, 2012 and (ii) to attend the Symposium-cum-Panel Discussion on "Doctor and Law" held at Sri Aurobindo Institute of Medical Sciences as a Chief Guest on 19th May, 2012.
4. Hon'ble Dr. Justice B. S. Chauhan visited a) Muzaffarnagar to attend a function organized by the District Bar Association on 6th April, 2012 and b) Meerut to attend a function at District Bar Association on 19th May, 2012.
5. Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. K. Patnaik visited a) Imphal (i) to attend cultural programme followed by State Dinner at 1st MR on 6th April, 2012 and (ii) to attend inaugural ceremony for commencement of working of the High Court from the new building on 7th April, 2012; b) Indore to attend the Inaugural function of the Golden Jubilee of Extension Block of the High Court

Building at High Court Premises, Indore on 18th May, 2012 and c) Bhubaneswar (i) to attend a Book Release Function at Bhubaneswar on 13th June, 2012 and (ii) to attend a Function of Orissa Civil Liberty Forum at Hotel Marrion on 16th June, 2012.

6. Hon'ble Mr. Justice T. S. Thakur visited Srinagar to attend the Seminar organized by TDSAT during the period from 5th to 8th April, 2012; participated in the 2nd International Competition Law Conference at New Delhi and visited Shillong to attend a Seminar on Juvenile Justice organized by Meghalaya State Legal Services Authority on 2nd June, 2012.

7. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Swatanter Kumar visited a) Uttan, Bhayander, Distt. Thane, Mumbai to attend the West Zone Regional Conference on Mediation at Maharashtra Judicial Academy on 14th April, 2012; b) Chandigarh to attend the Function at the Bar Council of Punjab & Haryana on 5th May, 2012 and c) Rohtak to attend a State Level Essay/Poetry Competition organized by HALSA at Tagore Auditorium of Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak as a Chief Guest on 20th May, 2012.

8. Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Gyan Sudha Misra visited a) Nahariagun (Itanagar) to attend Cultural programme on 5th April, 2012 and b) Imphal (i) in connection with the Inauguration of Legal Aid Clinic and Interaction with Village Chieftains, NGOs and Government Officials and workshop on Role of Legal Services Authorities in access to Justice and Juvenile Justice and other Programme of Legal Services Authority, (ii) in connection with the inauguration of Legal Aid Center at a village near Imphal, (iii) to attend Workshop on the role of Legal Services Authority in access to Justice and Juvenile Justice at MFGC Hall at Pilot Gate and (iv) in connection with inauguration of functioning of High Court from the new building during the period from 5th to 7th April, 2012.

9. Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar visited a) Imphal to attend the Inauguration programme at the New High Court Complex of Imphal Bench on 7th April, 2012; b) Hyderabad to attend the function at NT Rama Rao Kalamandir, Potti Sri Ramulu Telugu University, Hyderabad on 5th May, 2012 and c) Chennai to attend the Celebrations of 150th year of Judicial Establishment of High Court of Madras from 6th June, 2012.

10. Hon'ble Mr. Justice F. M. I. Kalifulla visited Srinagar to attend the programme on Regulatory Framework and Dispute Resolution in Telecom, Broadcasting and Cable Services Sectors at Sher-I Kashmir International Conference Centre on 7th April, 2012.

LIST OF SUPREME COURT JUDGES
(As on 30-06-2012)

S.No.	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement
01.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.H. Kapadia, Chief Justice of India (CJI)	18-12-2003 As CJI: 12-05-2010	29-09-2012
02.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Altamas Kabir	09-09-2005	19-07-2013
03.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.K. Jain	10-04-2006	25-01-2013
04.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. Sathasivam	21-08-2007	27-04-2014
05.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Singhvi	12-11-2007	12-12-2013
06.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Aftab Alam	12-11-2007	19-04-2013
07.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha	17-12-2008	28-09-2014
08.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.L. Dattu	17-12-2008	03-12-2015
09.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Deepak Verma	11-05-2009	28-08-2012
10.	Hon'ble Dr. Justice B.S. Chauhan	11-05-2009	02-07-2014
11.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Patnaik	17-11-2009	03-06-2014
12.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice T.S. Thakur	17-11-2009	04-01-2017
13.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Radhakrishnan	17-11-2009	15-05-2014
14.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.S. Nijjar	17-11-2009	07-06-2014
15.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Swatanter Kumar	18-12-2009	31-12-2012
16.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice C.K. Prasad	08-02-2010	15-07-2014
17.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.L. Gokhale	30-04-2010	10-03-2014
18.	Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Gyan Sudha Misra	30-04-2010	28-04-2014
19.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil R. Dave	30-04-2010	19-11-2016
20.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya	13-09-2011	15-03-2015
21.	Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Ranjana P. Desai	13-09-2011	30-10-2014
22.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar	13-09-2011	28-08-2017
23.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra	10-10-2011	03-10-2018
24.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice J. Chelameswar	10-10-2011	23-06-2018
25.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice F.M. Ibrahim Kalifulla	02-04-2012	23-07-2016
26.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Gogoi	23-04-2012	18-11-2019
27.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan B. Lokur	04-06-2012	31-12-2018