

*K. G. Balakrishnan*  
*Chief Justice of India*



*5, Krishna Menon Marg,*  
*New Delhi - 110 011*

**FROM THE DESK OF CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA**

I am happy to learn that every issue of Court News is now eagerly awaited not only by lawyers but also by law colleges and enlightened citizens, taking keen interest in the affairs of judiciary and its institutions. They find it an authentic and reliable source of information not only on the functioning of judicial institutions but also on the judgments of public importance delivered by this Court. The suggestions given by them from time to time enable us to make further improvements in the contents as well as presentation of the journal.

On 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2008 we organized a Lok Adalat in Supreme Court for settlement of cases pending in this Court. For the first time, sitting Judges of Supreme Court participated in the Lok Adalat. I am happy to inform you that in majority of the cases we were able to persuade the parties to settle their disputes and arrive at an amicable settlement. Encouraged by the success, we propose to organize the next Lok Adalat on 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2008. I am confident that the next Lok Adalat will be even more fruitful and result in settlement of more cases. I have no doubt that the initiative taken by the Apex Court will encourage High Court Judges to organize and participate in similar Lok Adalats for settlement of the cases pending in the High Courts.

I am confident that this issue, like the previous ones, will be widely welcomed by its readers. Supreme Court Registry will be happy to receive any suggestion for further improvement of the Newsletter.

28<sup>th</sup> July, 2008

  
[K.G. BALAKRISHNAN]

**APPOINTMENT AND RETIREMENT IN SUPREME COURT****APPOINTMENT**

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>
1.	Mr. Justice Cyriac Joseph	07-07-2008

**RETIREMENT**

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>
1.	Mr. Justice H.K. Sema	01-06-2008
2.	Mr. Justice P.P. Naolekar	29-06-2008

## APPOINTMENT IN HIGH COURTS

(From 01-04-08 to 30-06-08)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
1	A.P.	Reddi Kantha Rao	10-04-2008
2	Allahabad	Surendra Singh	05-05-2008
		Arvind Kumar Tripathi	05-05-2008
		Shashi Kant Gupta	05-05-2008
		Bala Krishna Narayana	05-05-2008
		Rajesh Dayal Khare	05-05-2008
		Shabihul Hasnain	05-05-2008
		Abhinava Upadhyaya	05-05-2008
3	Bombay	Ashok Pitamber Bhangale	16-04-2008
		Anand Vasant Nirgude	16-04-2008
		Rajiv Yadunath Ganoo	16-04-2008
		Nandkishor Digambar Deshpande	16-04-2008
		Rekha Prakash Baldota	16-04-2008
		Kailaschand Uttamchand Chandiwal	16-04-2008
		Santosh Champalal Bora	16-04-2008
		Ashutosh Arvind Kumbhakoni	16-04-2008
4	Delhi	Vijay Kumar Shali	08-04-2008
		Man Mohan Singh	08-04-2008
		Rajiv Sahai Endlaw	08-04-2008
		Jag Jivan Ram Midha	08-04-2008
		Rajiv Shakdher	08-04-2008
		Sunil Gaur	08-04-2008
		Mool Chand Garg	08-04-2008

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Name of the High Court</b>	<b>Name of the Hon'ble Judge</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>
5	Jharkhand	Ajit Kumar Sinha	16-06-2008
6	Karnataka	B. Sreenivase Gowda	02-06-2008
		K.N. Keshavanarayana	02-06-2008
		S.N. Satyanarayana	09-06-2008
7	Kerala	M.C. Hari Rani	02-05-2008
8	Madras	M. S. Sathyanarayanan	23-04-2008
9	Patna	R.M. Lodha (As Chief Justice)	12-05-2008
10	Rajasthan	Kishan Swaroop Chaudhari	15-04-2008
		Chand Mal Totla	15-04-2008
		Mahesh Chandra Bhagwati	15-04-2008

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

## TRANSFER BETWEEN HIGH COURTS

(From 01-04-08 to 30-06-08)

S.No.	From	To	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Transfer
1	Rajasthan High Court	Bombay High Court	P.B. Majmudar	25-04-2008
2	Gauhati High Court	H.P. High Court	R.B. Misra	30-04-2008
3	Madras High Court	Delhi High Court	A.P. Shah, CJ	11-05-2008
4	Orissa High Court	Madras High Court	A.K. Ganguly, CJ	19-05-2008

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

## VACANCIES IN COURTS

### A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (As on 09-07-08)

Sanctioned Strength	Working strength	Vacancies
26	24	2

### B) HIGH COURTS ( As on 01-07-08)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned strength	Working strength	Vacancies
1	Allahabad	160	74	86
2	Andhra Pradesh	49	29	20
3	Bombay	75	60	15
4	Calcutta	58	40	18
5	Chhattisgarh	18	7	11
6	Delhi	48	41	7
7	Gauhati	25	20	5
8	Gujarat	42	30	12
9	Himachal Pradesh	11	10	1
10	Jammu & Kashmir	14	10	4
11	Jharkhand	20	9	11
12	Karnataka	41	40	1
13	Kerala	38	25	13
14	Madhya Pradesh	43	41	2
15	Madras	49	45	4
16	Orissa	22	18	4
17	Patna	43	27	16
18	Punjab & Haryana	68	42	26
19	Rajasthan	40	35	5
20	Sikkim	3	2	1
21	Uttaranchal	9	7	2
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>264</b>

- Above statement is compiled on the basis of figures received from the Department of Justice

**C) DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (As on 31-03-08)**

S.No.	Concerned State/Union Territory	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1.	Uttar Pradesh	2172	1637	535
2.	Andhra Pradesh	923	679	244
3a.	Maharashtra	1897	1506	391
3b.	Goa	49	46	3
4.	West Bengal and A&N Islands	706	497	209
5.	Chhatisgarh	268	219	49
6.	Delhi	425	338	87
7.	Gujarat	953	786	167
8a.	Assam	289	254	35
8b.	Meghalaya	10	4	6
8c.	Tripura	80	58	22
8d.	Manipur	34	26	8
8e.	Nagaland	25	23	2
8f.	Mizoram <sup>1</sup>	40	23	17
8g.	Arunachal Pradesh <sup>1</sup>	339	300	39
9.	Himachal Pradesh	126	114	12
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	202	174	28
11.	Jharkhand	526	431	95
12.	Karnataka	865	643	222
13a.	Kerala	429	409	20
13b.	Lakshadweep	3	3	0
14a.	Tamil Nadu	776	663	113
14b.	Puducherry	20	15	5
15.	Madhya Pradesh	1189	900	289
16.	Orissa	495	381	114
17.	Bihar	1363	1136	227
18a.	Punjab	346	312	34
18b.	Haryana	393	298	95
18c.	Chandigarh	20	20	0
19.	Rajasthan	820	761	59
20.	Sikkim	15	8	7
21.	Uttarakhand	266	120	146
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16064</b>	<b>12784</b>	<b>3280</b>

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

1. Judiciary is not yet separated from the Executive.

## INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES

### A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (FROM 01-04-2008 TO 30-06-2008)

						Pendency (At the end of 31-03-2008)		
						Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
						26,863	19,024	45,887
Institution (01-04-2008 to 30-06-2008)			Disposal (01-04-2008 to 30-06-2008)			Pendency (At the end of 30-06-2008)		
Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
13,012	1,535	14,547	11,378	1,201	12,579	28,497	19,358	47,855



**B) HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-01-2008 TO 31-03-2008)**

S. No.	NAME OF HIGH COURT	Civil Cases				Criminal Cases				Total Pendency of Civil and Criminal Cases at the end of 31-03-08
		Opening Balance as on 01-01-08	Institution from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Disposal from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Pendency at the end of 31-03-08	Opening Balance as on 01-01-08	Institution from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Disposal from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Pendency at the end of 31-03-08	
1	Allahabad	609895	37023	28001	618917	209789	25296	15421	219664	838581
2	Andhra Pradesh	137990	14441	10581	141850	15257	3439	1854	16842	158692
3	Bombay	330398	31192	39116	322474	39579	6285	5600	40264	362738
4	Calcutta	243222	15418	13269	245371	40015	5570	5030	40555	285926
5	Chhattisgarh	52130	3184	3059	52255	23211	1545	2127	22629	74884
6	Delhi <sup>1</sup>	60261	6846	6707	60400	15738	3104	5044	13798	74198
7	Gujarat	85862	12397	11806	86453	29532	6417	4821	31128	117581
8	Gauhati	52838	4937	5391	52384	7493	2175	1923	7745	60129
9	Himachal Pradesh	21312	3280	2345	22247	6378	695	650	6423	28670
10	Jammu & Kashmir	44804	4903	4295	45412	1836	448	442	1842	47254
11	Jharkhand	28302	2433	2910	27825	21668	4288	4279	21677	49502
12	Karnataka	89753	13176	13046	89883	16103	2425	3197	15331	105214
13	Kerala	88167	17245	18169	87243	24371	5738	5244	24865	112108
14	Madhya Pradesh	122331	17510	14749	125092	59294	10376	10058	59612	184704
15	Madras	392824	49819	43334	399309	36008	16115	15959	36164	435473
16	Orissa	209481	13400	12171	210710	24076	7826	9206	22696	233406
17	Patna	71749	7867	5245	74371	34693	15707	11104	39296	113667
18	Punjab & Haryana	210171	13495	11088	212559 <sup>2</sup>	47645	10751	11987	46409	258968
19	Rajasthan	164369	14219	13750	164838	53135	7499	8937	51697	216535
20	Sikkim	66	9	16	59	14	3	2	15	74
21	Uttaranchal	15109	1731	2344	14496	5875	676	636	5915	20411
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3031034</b>	<b>284525</b>	<b>261392</b>	<b>3054148</b>	<b>711710</b>	<b>136378</b>	<b>123521</b>	<b>724567</b>	<b>3778715</b>

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

1. Opening figures of the civil and criminal cases modified after physical verification
2. Nineteen RFA transferred to the District and Sessions Judges.

**C) DISTRICT AND SUBORDINATE COURTS (FROM 01-01-2008 TO 31-03-2008)**

S. No.	Concerned State/Union Territory	Civil Cases				Criminal Cases				Total Pendency of Civil and Criminal Cases at the end of 31-03-08
		Opening Balance as on 01-01-08	Institution from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Disposal from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Pendency at the end of 31-03-08	Opening Balance as on 01-01-08	Institution from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Disposal from 01-01-08 to 31-03-08	Pendency at the end of 31-03-08	
1	Uttar Pradesh	1229650	117213	121196	1225667	3644965	486932	452510	3679387	4905054
2	Andhra Pradesh	478046	66178	71810	472414	473608	81670	75776	479502	951916
3(a)	Maharashtra	972625	87430	85940	974115	3073157	349539	350795	3071901	4046016
3(b)	Goa	18750	4714	5196	18268	15181	7768	8081	14868	33136
4	West Bengal and A & N Islands	496463	36799	37940	495322	1698168	257516	196314	1759370	2254692
5	Chhattisgarh	50531	11789	12206	50114	217354	66214	69413	214155	264269
6	Delhi	145043	25086	21883	148246	686664	112756	55519	743901	892147
7	Gujarat	728305	49742	53610	724437	1691747	211978	235412	1668313	2392750
8(a)	Assam	71851	9879	5633	76097	146636	35625	24619	157642	233739
8(b)	Nagaland	1799	221	152	1868	3566	220	205	3581	5449
8(c)	Meghalaya	3903	348	354	3897	6807	1542	330	8019	11916
8(d)	Manipur	3057	447	502	3002	3552	1371	1386	3537	6539
8(e)	Tripura	6146	1270	1242	6174	30557	22390	20717	32230	38404
8(f)	Mizoram	2119	220	117	2222	4743	1401	1119	5025	7247
8(g)	Arunachal Pradesh	461	115	20	556	4828	315	646	4497	5053
9	Himachal Pradesh	62262	11541	11531	62272	80648	21842	23577	78913	141185
10	J & K	60852	11207	9481	62578	104526	37621	36750	105397	167975
11	Jharkhand	44284	3882	4209	43957	228034	22449	28249	222234	266191
12	Karnataka	564276	72092	72915	563453	535001	119736	107945	546792	1110245
13(a)	Kerala	379876	65912	74012	371776	565531	196331	194335	567527	939303
13(b)	Lakshadweep	91	7	14	84	107	16	22	101	185
14	Madhya Pradesh	194535	55137	47797	201875	826048	202645	202835	825858	1027733
15(a)	Tamil Nadu	499018	222931	200166	521783	429028	194702	191464	432266	954049
15(b)	Puducherry	13449	5170	4835	13784	8845	5155	4900	9100	22884
16	Orissa	181721	12123	10828	183016	834805	56355	47538	843622	1026638
17	Bihar <sup>1</sup>	252874	11175	9543	254503	1120549	67390	55768	1132125	1386628
18(a)	Punjab	276798	41779	45933	272644	315287	132415	128770	318932	591576
18(b)	Haryana	220552	35029	35553	220028	335882	60422	65572	330732	550760
18(c)	Chandigarh	20566	2470	2859	20177	82044	27744	42187	67601	87778
19	Rajasthan	286598	46656	38005	295249	842687	175439	164917	853209	1148458
20	Sikkim	203	48	35	216	585	178	163	600	816
21	Uttarakhand	31028	5930	5295	31663	110017	32536	27119	115434	147097
<b>Total</b>		<b>7297732</b>	<b>1014540</b>	<b>990812</b>	<b>7321457</b>	<b>18121157</b>	<b>2990213</b>	<b>2814953</b>	<b>18296371</b>	<b>25617828</b>

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

1. Three Civil Cases transferred to other Courts and in Criminal side, forty two cases amalgamated & four cases transferred to J.J. Board.

## SOME RECENT SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

1. On 11th April, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Jitendra Singh vs Bhanu Kumari & Ors* [C.A. No. 2786 of 2008] held that "the purpose of Section 24 CPC is merely to confer on the Court a discretionary power. A Court acting under Section 24 CPC may or may not in its judicial discretion transfer a particular case. Section 24 does not prescribe any ground for ordering the transfer of a case. In certain cases it may be ordered *suo motu* and it may be done for administrative reasons. But when an application for transfer is made by a party, the court is required to issue notice to the other side and hear the party before directing transfer. To put it differently, the Court must act judicially in ordering a transfer on the application of a party."
2. On 16th April, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Satyawati Sharma (Dead) by LRs vs Union of India & Another* [C.A. No.1897 of 2003] held that "Section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 is violative of the doctrine of equality embodied in Article 14 of the Constitution insofar as it discriminates between the premises let for residential and non-residential purposes when the same are required bona fide by the landlord for occupation for himself or for any member of his family dependent on him and restricts the latter's right to seek eviction of the tenant from the premises let for residential purposes only."

The Bench held that the "ends of justice will be met by striking down the discriminatory portion of Section 14(1)(e) so that the remaining part thereof may read as :-"that the premises are required bona fide by the landlord for himself or for any member of his family dependent on him, if he is the owner thereof, or for any person for whose benefit the premises are held and that the landlord or such person has no other reasonably suitable accommodation." While adopting this course, the Bench kept in view the "well recognized rule that if the offending portion of a statute can be severed without doing violence to the remaining part thereof, then such a course is permissible."

As a sequel to the above, the Bench held that the "Explanation appearing below Section 14(1)(e) of the 1958 Act will have to be treated as redundant." Section 14(1)(e) of the 1958 Act was thus partly struck down.

3. On 21st April, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Surjit Singh vs Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd* [C.A. No. 5354 of 2002] held that "where two relatives are living in the same house a distinction has to be drawn between a telephone line in the name of a person who is economically dependent on another (who may be the husband, father etc.), and the telephone line in the name of a person who has an independent source of income from which he is paying the telephone bills.

In the case of the former, i.e. a person who is economically dependent on another who is paying his telephone bills, the telephone line in the name of such other relative on whom the subscriber is dependent can be disconnected for non-payment of the telephone bills of the nominal subscriber."

4. On 6th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *National Insurance Co. Ltd. vs. Yellamma & Anr* [C.A. No.3317 of 2008] held that "a contract of insurance like any other contract, is a contract between the insured and the insurer. The amount of premium is required to be paid as a consideration for arriving at a concluded contract. If the insurer insists that a cheque should be issued only by the insured and not by a third party, no exception thereto can be taken."
5. On 6th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Sudhir Kumar Rana vs Surinder Singh & Ors* [C.A. No.3321 of 2008] held that "if a person drives a vehicle without a licence, he commits an offence", but the "same, by itself, may not lead to a finding of negligence as regards the accident."
6. On 12th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Mausami Moitra Ganguli vs Jayant Ganguli* [C.A. No.3500 of 2008] held that "while determining the question as to which parent the care and control of a child should be committed, the first and the paramount consideration is the welfare and interest of the child and not the rights of the parents under a statute. Indubitably the provisions of law pertaining to the custody of a child contained in either the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 (Section 17) or the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 (Section 13) also hold out the welfare of the child as a predominant consideration. In fact, no statute, on the subject, can ignore, eschew or obliterate the vital factor of the welfare of the minor."

"Better financial resources of either of the parents or their love for the child may be one of the relevant considerations but cannot be the sole determining factor for the custody of the child", the Bench said.

The Bench emphasized that "a heavy duty is cast on the Court to exercise its judicial discretion judiciously in the background of all the relevant facts and circumstances, bearing in mind the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration."

7. On 12th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *Dev Dutt vs Union of India & Ors* [C.A. No. 7631 of 2002] held that "fairness and transparency in public administration requires that all entries (whether poor, fair, average, good or very good) in the Annual Confidential Report of a public servant, whether in civil, judicial, police or any other State service (except the military), must be communicated to him within a reasonable period so that he can make a representation for its upgradation. This is the correct legal position even though there may be no Rule/G.O. requiring communication of the entry, or even if there is a Rule/G.O. prohibiting it, because the principle of non-arbitrariness in State action as envisaged by Article 14 of the Constitution requires such communication. Article 14 will override all rules or government orders."

The Bench held that when the entry is communicated to the public servant, he "should have a right to make a representation against the entry to the concerned authority, and the concerned authority must decide the representation in a fair manner and within a reasonable period." It further held that "the representation must be decided by an authority higher than the one who gave the entry, otherwise the likelihood is that the representation will be summarily rejected without adequate consideration as it would be an appeal from Caesar to Caesar."

The Bench made it clear that "the above directions will not apply to military officers because the position for them is different", but "they will apply to employees of statutory authorities, public sector corporations and other instrumentalities of the State (in addition to Government servants)."

In the opinion of the Bench, "non-communication of entries in the Annual Confidential Report of a public servant, whether he is in civil, judicial, police or any other service (other than the military), certainly has civil consequences because it may affect his chances for promotion or other benefits. Hence, such non-communication would be arbitrary, and as such violative of Article 14 of the Constitution."

8. On 16th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *United India Insurance Company Limited Vs. Manubhai Dharmasinhbhai Gajera & others* [C.A. Nos.4113-4115 of 2008] examined the question as to whether renewal of a mediclaim policy on payment of the amount of premium would be automatic. The Bench held that "renewal of a medi-claim policy subject to just exceptions should ordinarily be made. But the same does not mean that the renewal is automatic. Keeping in view the terms and conditions of the prospectus and the insurance policy, the parties are not required to go into all the formalities. The very fact that the policy contemplates terms for renewal, subject of course to payment of requisite premium, the same cannot be placed at par with a case of first contract."

Before parting with the case, the Bench observed that keeping in view the role played by the insurance companies, it is essential that the Insurance Regulatory Authority lays down clear guidelines by way of regulations or otherwise.

9. On 16th May, 2008, a two Judge Bench in *A.P.S.R.T.C. & Anr. vs. K. Hemalatha & Ors.* [C.A. Nos.3623-3626 of 2008] held that "when two vehicles are involved in an accident, and one of the drivers claims compensation from the other driver alleging negligence, and the other driver denies negligence or claims that the injured claimant himself was negligent, then it becomes necessary to consider whether the injured claimant was negligent and if so, whether he was solely or partly responsible for the accident and the extent of his responsibility, that is his contributory negligence. Therefore where the injured is himself partly liable, the principle of 'composite negligence' will not apply nor can there be an automatic inference that the negligence was 50:50."

## MAJOR EVENTS AND INITIATIVES

- I. **SUPREME COURT LOK ADALAT:** A Lok Adalat was held in the Supreme Court on 3rd May, 2008 for settlement of cases of specified categories, pending in the Supreme Court. Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India alongwith Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat and Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. Sathasivam conducted the Lok Adalat in Court No.1 while Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan alongwith Hon'ble Mr. Justice Aftab Alam conducted the Lok Adalat in Court No.2. Out of the total 45 matters which came up for settlement, 25 matters were settled in the Lok Adalat. The next Lok Adalat is scheduled to be held in the Supreme Court on 6th September, 2008.
  
- II. **FIRST REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON REPORTING OF COURT PROCEEDINGS BY MEDIA AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE FOR LEGAL CORRESPONDENTS / JOURNALISTS HELD ON 21ST JUNE, 2008 AT KOCHI, ERNAKULAM:** The Workshop was organized at the High Court of Kerala, Ernakulam by the National Legal Services Authority, the Kerala State Legal Services Authority, the India Law Institute, the Press Council of India and the Editor's Guild of India. The Key-note address was delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.N. Ray, Chairman, Press Council of India. Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Chairman, Supreme Court Legal Services Committee delivered the Presidential Address. Delivering the inaugural address, Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of India said that such Workshops on reporting Court Proceedings by Media is a unique experiment to inculcate some ideas to young talented representatives of the print and electronic media. His Lordship further said that the contempt of court provisions are used to uphold the majesty of Courts and not to terrorize the media. The Executive Chairman of the State Legal Services Authority of the High Courts of Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Madras, Jammu and Kashmir, Senior Advocates (Mr. P.H. Parekh, Mr. L. Nageshwara Rao and Mr. Raju Ramachandran), Senior Editors and Journalists/Correspondents attended the Regional Workshop. The Inaugural Session was followed by four technical Sessions on:- a) Freedom of Press/Media in Reporting (Print & Electronic)- Use and Abuse; b) Reasonableness of Restrictions on reporting matters sub judice; c) Trial by Media-Understanding Implications through Case Studies and d) Professional Ethics in Reporting, Problems in Observance and Solutions. Mr. Madhusudan of Indian Express, Bangalore, Mr. Anamulla of Hindu, Madras and other correspondents raised doubts on the following subjects:- a) Contempt of Court Proceedings against Media; b) Regulatory Authority for Media; c) Codification of Code of Conduct for Media; d) Death Sentence / Life Imprisonment; e) Rarest of Rare Case; f) Observation made by Hon'ble Judges and g) Trial by Media. Their queries were met by the Hon'ble Judges. Professor (Dr.) S. Sivakumar, Research Professor, Coordinator, Organising Committee, Indian Law Institute delivered the Vote of Thanks.

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

- a. **INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DAY:** NALSA organized a National Campaign for Prevention of Child Marriage, Child Labour, Foeticide, Dowry and Domestic Violence at the Shramik Referral Centre for People Living with HIV/AIDs, Giri Nagar, Kalkaji, New Delhi on 1st May 2008. Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of India inaugurated the function in the august presence of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA.
- b. **ALL INDIA MEET OF CHAIRPERSONS & SECRETARIES OF STATE LEGAL SERVICES AUTHORITIES & HIGH COURT LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEES:** NALSA organized an All India Meet of Chairpersons and Secretaries of State Legal Services Authorities and High Court Legal Services Authorities in association with the Delhi Legal Services Authority from 2-5-2008 to 4-5-2008 at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on the subjects: 1) Role and Contribution of High Court Legal Services Committees and impending coordination of State Legal Services Authorities and High Court Legal Services Committees for effective implementation of free legal aid programmes for the weaker sections 2) Legal Sanction behind the "Socio-Legal Audit": Role of State Legal Services Authorities, 3) Concept of Social Justice and Social Justice Litigation and its relevance to the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987, 4) Environmental Issues and Legal Services Authorities Regime, 5) Areas of special concern to weaker sections of the society, 6) Consumer Protection-Social Justice Litigation & Role of State Legal Services Authorities.

The Meet was inaugurated by His Lordship Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India on 02-05-2008. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA presented the welcome address and Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Chairman, Supreme Court Legal Services Committee delivered the Concluding Remarks of Inaugural Plenary Session.

The Executive Plenary Session was held on 02-05-2008 on the subject "Role and Contribution of High Court Legal Services Committees and impending coordination of State Legal Services Authorities and High Court Legal Services Committees" for effective implementation of Free Legal Aid programmes for the weaker sections. The Session was chaired by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Executive Chairman, NALSA and it was co-chaired by Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Chairman, Supreme Court Legal Services Committee.

On 3-5-2008, there were four Sessions. The first session was on the subject "Legal Sanction behind the 'Social-Legal Audit' : Role of State Legal Services Authorities in India". Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.V. Raveendran, Judge, Supreme Court of India was the Moderator of the Session.

The second Session was on the subject "Concept of Social Justice and Social Justice Litigation and its relevance to the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987". Hon'ble Mr. Justice C.K. Thakker, Judge, Supreme Court of India was the Moderator of the Session. The third Session was on the subject "Environmental issues and Legal Services Authorities Regime". Hon'ble Mr. Justice Y.K. Sabharwal, Former Chief Justice of India was the Moderator of the Session. The fourth Session was on the subject "Areas of Special concern to weaker sections of the society".

On 4-5-2008, there was a Session on the subject "Consumer Protection-Social Justice Litigation & Role of State Legal Services Authorities". The Valedictory Session held on 4-5-2008 focussed on the Recommendations, Outcome and Suggested Actions. Hon'ble Mr. Justice C.K. Thakker, Judge, Supreme Court of India & Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan, Judge, Supreme Court of India & Executive Chairman, NALSA addressed the Valedictory Session.



## IMPORTANT VISITS AND CONFERENCES

(From 01-04-2008 to 30-06-2008)

### OVERSEAS

1. Hon'ble Shri K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of India alongwith Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat participated in the Fourth Indo-Canadian Legal Forum Meet held from 21st May to 23rd May, 2008 at Ottawa, Canada. The following topics were discussed during the meet:- a) Religion and the Courts; b) Religious Freedom in Canada in the Charter Era; c) National Security and Civil Liberties- an Indian Perspective and d) Conflict between Human Rights and National Security Concerns.
2. Hon'ble Shri K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of India alongwith Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat, Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha, Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Mathur, Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.V. Raveendran and Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. Sathasivam participated in a Symposium on Social Justice held from 31st May, 2008 to 1st June, 2008 at Durban, South Africa and a Conference on "Enforcement of Socio-Economic Rights in South Africa/India " held on 4th June, 2008 at Billville, Cape Town, South Africa.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ashok Bhan participated in the Inaugural Judicial Seminar on Commercial Litigation held at Sydney, Australia from 3rd to 5th April, 2008.

### INLAND

1. Hon'ble Shri K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of India attended the inaugural function of the Diamond Jubilee Celebrations of the Guwahati High Court on 5th April, 2008. His Lordship inaugurated a) the conference of Judicial Officers on Case Management at the High Court Annexe Building, Mumbai on 27th April, 2008, b) the Uttarakhand Judicial & Legal Academy at Nainital on 14th June, 2008 and c) the seminar on "Growing Crimes-Deterrent Punishment" at Andhra Pradesh High Court on 25th June, 2008.
2. Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat addressed the State Level Seminar of CJMs and Judicial Magistrates of Udaipur and NGO's related to Juvenile Justice Act at Udaipur on 5th April, 2008.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha addressed the North Zone Mediation and Conciliation Meet organized by the Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh from 17th May to 18th May, 2008. His Lordship also addressed the Workshop on "Subject laws both Central as well as State which infringe upon the domain of the Panchayati Raj Institutions" organized by the Rural Litigation & Entitlement Kendra, Dehradun from 24th May to 25th May, 2008.

4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Sirpurkar addressed the National Seminar organized by Jharkhand State Bar Council and Bar Council of India at Ranchi from 2nd May to 4th May, 2008.
5. A delegation from the Indonesian National Commission for Human Rights visited Supreme Court of India on 8th May, 2008 and had a meeting with the Secretary General.