

ITEM NO.1 Court 5 (Video Conferencing) **CORRECTED**
SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SMW (C)No.4/2020

IN RE: CONTAGION OF COVID 19 VIRUS IN CHILDREN PROTECTION

(with applns. for Appropriate orders/directions, exemption from filling affidavit, exemption from paying court fee, intervention and intervention/impleadment)

WITH

W.P.(Cr1.) No. 274/2020 (PIL-W)

IA No.97311/2020 - GRANT OF INTERIM RELIEF)

Date : 01-12-2020 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NAGESWARA RAO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA

By Courts Motion
Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, A.C.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, S.G.
Mrs. Swarupama Chaturvedi, AOR
Ms. Neha Rai, Adv.

Union of India Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
Mr. B.V. Balram Das, AOR
Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.
Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, Adv.
Mr. G.S. Makker, Adv.
Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, Adv.
Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Srishti Agnihotri, AOR
Mr. Abhishek Jebaraj, Adv.
Ms. Kriti Awasthi, Adv.
Ms. Sanjana Grace Thomas, Adv.
Ms. Anmol Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Nupur Raut, Adv.

State of Chhatis- Mr. S. C. Verma, Adv. (Adv. Genl.)
garh Mr. Saurabh Ajay Gupta, Adv. (AAG)
Mr. Sumeer Sodhi AOR
Mr. Arjun Nanda, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Tiwari Adv.

State of W.B.	Mr. Suhaan Mukerji, Adv. Ms. Liz Mathew, Adv. Mr. Vishaal Prasad, Adv. Mr. Nikhil Parikshith, Adv. Mr. Abhishek Manchanda, Adv. Mr. Amit Verma, Adv. PLR Chambers & Co.
State of Mizoram	Mr. Siddhesh Kotwal, Adv. Mr. Divyansh Tiwari, Adv. Ms. Ana Upadhyay, Adv. Ms. Arshiya Ghose, Adv. Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
State of Haryana	Ms. Bansuri Swaraj, Adv. Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR Mr. Shekhar Raj Sharma, Adv. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
U.T. of J&K	Ms. Shashi Juneja, Adv. Ms. Pinky Behera, Adv.
State of Karnataka	Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR
State of Assam	Mr. Nalin Kohli, AAG Ms. Diksha Rai, Adv. Ms. Palak Mahajan, Adv.
State of Assam	Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv. Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR
State of A.P.	Mr. Mahfooz A. Nazki, Adv. Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv. Mr. Shaik Mohamad Haneef, Adv. Mr. T.vijaya Bhaskar Reddy, Adv. Mr. Amitabh Sinha, Adv. Mr. Shrey Sharma, Adv.
U.T. of Andaman & Nicobar	Mr. K.V. Jagdishvaran, Adv. Ms. G. Indira, Adv.
State of Bihar	Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR. Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.
State of H.P.	Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, AOR
State of Arunachal Pradesh	Ms. Eliza Bar, Adv. Mr. Pai Amit, Adv.

State of Manipur	Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv. Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.
	Mr. Mahesh Thakur, AOR Mr. Sharan Thakur, Adv. Mr. Siddhartha Thakur, Adv.
State of Orissa	Mr. Sibho Sankar Mishra, AOR
U.T. of Puducherry	Mr. V.G. Pragasam, AOR Mr. S. Prabhu Ramasubramanian, Adv.
State of Goa	Mr. Arun R. Pedneker, Adv. Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, AOR
State of Kerala	Ms. Priyanka Prakash, Adv. Ms. Beena Prakash, Adv. Mr. G. Prakash, Adv.
State of Odisha	Dr. Anindita Pujari, AOR Mr. Deval Singh, Adv. Mr. Om Narayan, Adv.
State of Tripura	Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, Adv. Mr. Kabir Shankar Bose, Adv. Mr. Rahul Raj Mishra, Adv.
State of Gujarat	Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, Adv. Ms. Vishakha, Adv.
State of Meghalaya	Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv. Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, Adv. Mr. U. Mishra, Adv. Ms. Tarini K. Nayak, Adv.
	Mr. Shaurya Sahay, Adv. Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv.
State of Punjab	Ms. Jaspreet Gogia, AOR Mr. Karanvir Gogia, Adv. Ms. Shivangi Singhal, Adv.
State of Rajasthan	Dr. Manish Singhvi, Sr. Adv. Mr. Sandeep Jha, Adv.
State of U.P.	Ms. Garima Prashad, Adv
State of Telengana	Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR Ms. Swati Bhardwaj, Adv.
State of T.N.	Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AAG

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
 Mr. RajaRajeswaran.S,Adv.
 Mr. Aditya Chada,Adv.

State of Nagaland Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR

NCT Delhi Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
 Ms. Sanjana Nangia, Adv
 Ms. Abhilasha Bharti, Adv

State of Mah. Mr. Rahul Chitnis, Adv.
 Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
 Mr. Geo Joseph,Adv.

State of Jharkhand/
 Impleadment Ms. Pragya Baghel, Adv
 Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR

State of Uttarakhand Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
 Mr. Ashutosh Sharma,Adv.

State of Sikkim Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Anand Kumar Dubey, Adv.
 Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

State of M.P. Mr. Pashupati Nath Razdan, Adv.
 Mr. Pulkit Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, AOR
 Ms. Eliza Bar,Adv.

Mr. Reginald Valsalan, Adv.

Mr. Kapil Joshi, Adv.
 Ms. Manju Sharma Jaitley, Adv.

Ms. Sneha Kalita, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
 Mr. Sibbo Sankar Mishra, AOR
 Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, AOR
 Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, AOR
 Ms. Diksha Rai, AOR
 Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
 Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
 Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, AOR
 Mr. V. G. Pragasam, AOR
 Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
 Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR
 Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, AOR
 Mrs. Swarupama Chaturvedi, AOR

Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR
Ms. Garima Prashad, AOR
Mr. S.. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Mr. Mahesh Thakur, AOR
Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR
Ms. G. Indira, AOR
M/S. Knc, AOR
Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, AOR
Mr. Sumeer Sodhi, AOR
Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR
Mr. Pashupathi Nath Razdan, AOR
Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, AOR
Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR
Mr. Pai Amit, AOR
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, AOR
Ms. Pinky Behera, AOR
Ms. Anindita Pujari, AOR
Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
Ms. Jaspreet Gogia, AOR
Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR
Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

On 9.10.2020, this Court took note of the letter dated 25.09.2020 issued by the Senior Consultant, Legal Division, National Commission for Protection for Children Rights (NCPCR) to all District Magistrates/Collectors of the State of Karnataka directing repatriation and restoration of the children placed in the children protection homes.

The learned Amicus Curiae brought to our notice that a general direction for repatriation of children from the children protection homes without an individual assessment is contrary to the provisions of

the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015. He submitted that individual assessment of each child has to be considered before repatriating him to parental care.

The NCPCR responded to the notice issued by this Court on 9.10.2020 by filing an affidavit. The NCPCR has made it clear that Section 40 (3) of the Juvenile Justice Act shall be scrupulously followed before repatriating children from children protection homes to parental care.

The learned Solicitor General of India brought to our notice an order dated 8.10.2020 passed by the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human and Child Development by which the general directions issued by the NCPCR to the District Authorities to repatriate children to parental care have been set aside. He also referred to a letter written by the NCPCR to the Union of India on 3.11.2020 in which it was pointed out that the children from children protection homes shall not be sent to parental care without an individual assessment of each child keeping in mind the objectives of the Juvenile Justice Act.

In view of the submissions made by the learned Solicitor General of India appearing for the

NCPCR, we trust and hope that repatriation of children from the children protection homes to their parental care shall be made after following the provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act.

List the matter on 15.12.2020 for consideration of other issues.

W.P.(Cr1.) No. 274/2020:

The above writ petition has been filed for issuance of a direction to record the evidence of child victims/witnesses of human trafficking through video conferencing from a government facility within the local jurisdiction of the residence of the child victim/witness concerned. This direction is mainly sought in view of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, the petitioner is also interested in the said facility being continued even after the Covid-19 pandemic abates.

The learned Amicus Curiae after conferring with Ms.Anitha Shenoy, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted certain proposals for recording the testimonies of the child witnesses in human trafficking through Video Conferencing.

The first stage of the proposal given by the

learned Amicus Curiae relates to the infrastructure being made available for the purpose of Video Conferencing. Necessary equipment for Video Conferencing including a desktop or a laptop connected to the internet with functioning broad-band connection and anti-virus software on such devices, with waiting area with a rest room to maintain the privacy of the children and other related facilities are amongst the suggestions made by the learned Amicus Curiae.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, learned senior counsel for the petitioner commended acceptance of the suggestions made by the Amicus Curiae and that directions should be given to the State Governments to initiate the process by making available the necessary infrastructure. The learned Amicus Curiae has selected certain cases for the proposed Pilot Project, the details of which have been given in the note submitted by him for the purpose of today's hearing. In these cases, children residing in the States of Bihar, West Bengal and Assam have been identified. For example, in the case arising out of FIR No.463/2016 pending in the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Saket Court, New Delhi, trafficked children are residing in the Districts of Araria, Purnia, Kishanganj, Supaul

and Kathiar in the State of Bihar. The remote point for recording their evidence through video conferencing is required to be set up at Araria. It is very difficult for the children to travel to Delhi to depose in court during the pandemic. Creation of a facility for recording the depositions of children/victims of trafficking by Video Conferencing would save the children of arduous journeys to distance places where the courts are situated.

We have heard Mr.Manish Kumar, learned counsel for Bihar, Ms. Diksha Rai, learned counsel for the State of Bihar and Mr.Nikhil Parikshith, learned counsel for the State of West Bengal. We find merit in the suggestions made by the Amicus in providing the required infrastructure in certain places to enable the children/ victims of human trafficking to depose from their places of residence by avoiding long journeys. The facility can continue not only during the pandemic but even after it abates. Sufficient care has to be taken to rule out any external influence or pressure on the child victim/witness when they depose through video conferencing. This Court proposes the appointment of retired judicial officers as Co-ordinators. The learned Amicus Curiae suggested that

he may be permitted to consult the State Legal Service Authorities of the States of Assam, Bihar and West Bengal to find out about the availability of the retired judicial officers who will be willing to take up the responsibilities of Co-ordinators to supervise the recording of the evidence of child victims/witnesses through video conferencing. The learned Amicus Curiae is permitted to consult the State Legal Services Authorities and submit a report before the next date of hearing.

Mr. Manish Kumar, learned counsel for the State of Bihar submitted that the infrastructure is already available in the State of Bihar. He submitted that the Probation Officer has been conferred with certain functions and duties under the Juvenile Justice Act and the Rules made thereunder, and this Court should ensure that there is no over-lapping of the duties entrusted to a Coordinator by this Court and the duties of the Probation Officers under the Juvenile Justice Act.

The learned counsel appearing for the States of Assam and West Bengal sought time for getting instructions. Learned counsel for the above 3 states and the advocate on record for the State of Rajasthan

are directed to instruct the State Governments to initiate the process of providing the required infrastructure for the video conferencing facilities immediately.

The State of Assam, West Bengal and Rajasthan shall provide the necessary infrastructure with all the required facilities at Gauhati, Kolkata and Jaipur respectively.

List this matter on 21.01.2021.

In the meanwhile, all the State Governments shall provide information relating to the number of child victims/witnesses of human trafficking who are required to travel to other States to give evidence. One district may be identified by each State Government/ Union Territory for establishing Video Conferencing facility for recording evidence of children/ victims of human trafficking. The State Governments are directed to file the Status Reports within four weeks from today.

(B.Parvathi)
Court Master

(Anand Prakash)
Court Master

ITEM NO.1 Court 5 (Video Conferencing) SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SMW (C)No.4/2020

IN RE: CONTAGION OF COVID 19 VIRUS IN CHILDREN PROTECTION

(with applns. for Appropriate orders/directions, exemption from filling affidavit, exemption from paying court fee, intervention and intervention/impleadment)

WITH

W.P.(Cr1.) No. 274/2020 (PIL-W)

IA No.97311/2020 - GRANT OF INTERIM RELIEF)

Date : 01-12-2020 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NAGESWARA RAO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA

By Courts Motion
Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, A.C.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, S.G.
Mrs. Swarupama Chaturvedi, AOR
Ms. Neha Rai, Adv.

Union of India

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
Mr. B.V. Balram Das, AOR
Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.
Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, Adv.
Mr. G.S. Makker, Adv.
Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, Adv.
Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Srishti Agnihotri, AOR
Mr. Abhishek Jebaraj, Adv.
Ms. Kriti Awasthi, Adv.
Ms. Sanjana Grace Thomas, Adv.
Ms. Anmol Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Nupur Raut, Adv.

State of Chhatis- garh	Mr. S. C. Verma, Adv. (Adv. Genl.) Mr. Saurabh Ajay Gupta, Adv. (AAG) Mr. Sumeer Sodhi AOR Mr. Arjun Nanda, Adv. Mr. Ashish Tiwari Adv.
State of W.B.	Mr. Suhaan Mukerji, Adv. Ms. Liz Mathew, Adv. Mr. Vishaal Prasad, Adv. Mr. Nikhil Parikshith, Adv. Mr. Abhishek Manchanda, Adv. Mr. Amit Verma, Adv. PLR Chambers & Co.
State of Mizoram	Mr. Siddhesh Kotwal, Adv. Mr. Divyansh Tiwari, Adv. Ms. Ana Upadhyay, Adv. Ms. Arshiya Ghose, Adv. Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
State of Haryana	Ms. Bansuri Swaraj, Adv. Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR Mr. Shekhar Raj Sharma, Adv. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
U.T. of J&K	Ms. Shashi Juneja, Adv. Ms. Pinky Behera, Adv.
State of Karnataka	Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR
State of Assam	Mr. Nalin Kohli, AAG Ms. Diksha Rai, Adv. Ms. Palak Mahajan, Adv.
State of Assam	Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv. Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR
State of A.P.	Mr. Mahfooz A. Nazki, Adv. Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv. Mr. Shaik Mohamad Haneef, Adv. Mr. T.vijaya Bhaskar Reddy, Adv. Mr. Amitabh Sinha, Adv. Mr. Shrey Sharma, Adv.
U.T. of Andaman & Nicobar	Mr. K.V. Jagdishvaran, Adv. Ms. G. Indira, Adv.
State of Bihar	Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR.

	Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.
State of H.P.	Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, AOR
State of Arunachal Pradesh	Ms. Eliza Bar, Adv. Mr. Pai Amit, Adv.
State of Manipur	Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv. Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv. Mr. Mahesh Thakur, AOR Mr. Sharan Thakur, Adv. Mr. Siddhartha Thakur, Adv.
State of Orissa	Mr. Sibbo Sankar Mishra, AOR
U.T. of Puducherry	Mr. V.G. Pragasam, AOR Mr. S. Prabhu Ramasubramanian, Adv.
State of Goa	Mr. Arun R. Pedneker, Adv. Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, AOR
State of Kerala	Ms. Priyanka Prakash, Adv. Ms. Beena Prakash, Adv. Mr. G. Prakash, Adv.
State of Odisha	Dr. Anindita Pujari, AOR Mr. Deval Singh, Adv. Mr. Om Narayan, Adv.
State of Tripura	Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, Adv. Mr. Kabir Shankar Bose, Adv. Mr. Rahul Raj Mishra, Adv.
State of Gujarat	Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, Adv. Ms. Vishakha, Adv.
State of Meghalaya	Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv. Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, Adv. Mr. U. Mishra, Adv. Ms. Tarini K. Nayak, Adv. Mr. Shaurya Sahay, Adv. Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv.
State of Punjab	Ms. Jaspreet Gogia, AOR Mr. Karanvir Gogia, Adv. Ms. Shivangi Singhal, Adv.
State of Rajasthan	Dr. Manish Singhvi, Sr. Adv. Mr. Sandeep Jha, Adv.

State of U.P. Ms. Garima Prashad, Adv

State of Telengana Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Ms. Swati Bhardwaj, Adv.

State of T.N. Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AAG
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
Mr. RajaRajeswaran.S,Adv.
Mr. Aditya Chada,Adv.

State of Nagaland Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR

NCT Delhi Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
Ms. Sanjana Nangia, Adv
Ms. Abhilasha Bharti, Adv

State of Mah. Mr. Rahul Chitnis, Adv.
Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
Mr. Geo Joseph,Adv.

State of Jharkhand/
Impleadment Ms. Pragya Baghel, Adv
Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR

State of Uttarakhand Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
Mr. Ashutosh Sharma,Adv.

State of Sikkim Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Anand Kumar Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

State of M.P. Mr. Pashupati Nath Razdan, Adv.
Mr. Pulkit Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, AOR
Ms. Eliza Bar,Adv.

Mr. Reginald Valsalan, Adv.

Mr. Kapil Joshi, Adv.
Ms. Manju Sharma Jaitley, Adv.

Ms. Sneha Kalita, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
Mr. Sibho Sankar Mishra, AOR
Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, AOR
Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, AOR
Ms. Diksha Rai, AOR

Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, AOR
Mr. V. G. Pragasam, AOR
Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR
Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, AOR
Mrs. Swarupama Chaturvedi, AOR
Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR
Ms. Garima Prashad, AOR
Mr. S.. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Mr. Mahesh Thakur, AOR
Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR
Ms. G. Indira, AOR
M/S. Knc, AOR
Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, AOR
Mr. Sumeer Sodhi, AOR
Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR
Mr. Pashupathi Nath Razdan, AOR
Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, AOR
Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR
Mr. Pai Amit, AOR
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, AOR
Ms. Pinky Behera, AOR
Ms. Anindita Pujari, AOR
Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
Ms. Jaspreet Gogia, AOR
Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR
Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

On 9.10.2020, this Court took note of the letter dated 25.09.2020 issued by the Senior Consultant, Legal Division, National Commission for Protection for Children Rights (NCPCR) to all District Magistrates/Collectors of the State of Karnataka directing repatriation and restoration of the children

placed in the children protection homes.

The learned Amicus Curiae brought to our notice that a general direction for repatriation of children from the children protection homes without an individual assessment is contrary to the provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015. He submitted that individual assessment of each child has to be considered before repatriating him to parental care.

The NCPCR responded to the notice issued by this Court on 9.10.2020 by filing an affidavit. The NCPCR has made it clear that Section 40 (3) of the Juvenile Justice Act shall be scrupulously followed before repatriating children from children protection homes to parental care.

The learned Solicitor General of India brought to our notice an order dated 8.10.2020 passed by the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human and Child Development by which the general directions issued by the NCPCR to the District Authorities to repatriate children to parental care have been set aside. He also referred to a letter written by the NCPCR to the Union of India on 3.11.2020 in which it was pointed out that the

children from children protection homes shall not be sent to parental care without an individual assessment of each child keeping in mind the objectives of the Juvenile Justice Act.

In view of the submissions made by the learned Solicitor General of India appearing for the NCPCR, we trust and hope that repatriation of children from the children protection homes to their parental care shall be made after following the provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act.

List the matter on 15.12.2020 for consideration of other issues.

W.P.(Cr1.) No. 274/2020:

The above writ petition has been filed for issuance of a direction to record the evidence of child victims/witnesses of human trafficking through video conferencing from a government facility within the local jurisdiction of the residence of the child victim/witness concerned. This direction is mainly sought in view of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, the petitioner is also interested in the said facility being continued even after the Covid-19 pandemic abates.

The learned Amicus Curiae after conferring with Ms.Anitha Shenoy, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted certain proposals for recording the testimonies of the child witnesses in human trafficking through Video Conferencing.

The first stage of the proposal given by the learned Amicus Curiae relates to the infrastructure being made available for the purpose of Video Conferencing. Necessary equipment for Video Conferencing including a desktop or a laptop connected to the internet with functioning broad-band connection and anti-virus software on such devices, with waiting area with a rest room to maintain the privacy of the children and other related facilities are amongst the suggestions made by the learned Amicus Curiae.

Ms.Anitha Shenoy, learned senior counsel for the petitioner commended acceptance of the suggestions made by the Amicus Curiae and that directions should be given to the State Governments to initiate the process by making available the necessary infrastructure. The learned Amicus Curiae has selected certain cases for the proposed Pilot Project, the details of which have been given in the note submitted

by him for the purpose of today's hearing. In these cases, children residing in the States of Bihar, West Bengal and Assam have been identified. For example, in the case arising out of FIR No.463/2016 pending in the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Saket Court, New Delhi, trafficked children are residing in the Districts of Araria, Purnia, Kishanganj, Supaul and Kathiar in the State of Bihar. The remote point for recording their evidence through video conferencing is required to be set up at Araria. It is very difficult for the children to travel to Delhi to depose in court during the pandemic. Creation of a facility for recording the depositions of children/victims of trafficking by Video Conferencing would save the children of arduous journeys to distance places where the courts are situated.

We have heard Mr. Manish Kumar, learned counsel for Bihar, Ms. Diksha Rai, learned counsel for the State of Bihar and Mr. Nikhil Parikshith, learned counsel for the State of West Bengal. We find merit in the suggestions made by the Amicus in providing the required infrastructure in certain places to enable the children/victims of human trafficking to depose from their places of residence by avoiding long

journeys. The facility can continue not only during the pandemic but even after it abates. Sufficient care has to be taken to rule out any external influence or pressure on the child victim/witness when they depose through video conferencing. This Court proposes the appointment of retired judicial officers as Co-ordinators. The learned Amicus Curiae suggested that he may be permitted to consult the State Legal Service Authorities of the States of Assam, Bihar and West Bengal to find out about the availability of the retired judicial officers who will be willing to take up the responsibilities of Co-ordinators to supervise the recording of the evidence of child victims/witnesses through video conferencing. The learned Amicus Curiae is permitted to consult the State Legal Services Authorities and submit a report before the next date of hearing.

Mr. Manish Kumar, learned counsel for the State of Bihar submitted that the infrastructure is already available in the State of Bihar. He submitted that the Probation Officer has been conferred with certain functions and duties under the Juvenile Justice Act and the Rules made thereunder, and this Court should ensure that there is no over-lapping of the duties

entrusted to a Coordinator by this Court and the duties of the Probation Officers under the Juvenile Justice Act.

The learned counsel appearing for the State of Assam and West Bengal sought time for getting instructions. Learned counsel for the above 3 states and the advocate on record for the State of Rajasthan are directed to instruct the State Governments to initiate the process of providing the required infrastructure for the video conferencing facilities immediately.

The State of Assam, West Bengal and Rajasthan shall provide the necessary infrastructure with all the required facilities at Gauhati, Kolkata and Jaipur respectively.

List this matter on 21.01.2021.

In the meanwhile, all the State Governments shall provide information relating to the number of child victims/witnesses of human trafficking who are required to depose in courts at places other than those residing outside the States.

***** as suggest by Mr. Gaurav Agrawal may be corrected as

child victims/witnesses of human trafficking who are required to depose in courts at places of the residence which is far away from the place where the court is situated.

One district may be identified by each State Government/ Union Territory for establishing Video Conferencing facility for recording evidence of children/ victims of human trafficking. The State Governments are directed to file the Status Reports within four weeks from today.

(B.Parvathi)
Court Master

(Anand Prakash)
Court Master

