



COURT NEWS

Vol. XIII Issue No.1

January - March, 2018



EDITORIAL BOARD

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

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

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy, Judge, Supreme Court of India

COMPILED BY

Ravindra Maithani, Secretary General, Supreme Court of India

Bibhuti Bhushan Bose, Editor, Supreme Court of Reports

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

Also available on website : www.sci.gov.in

LIST OF SUPREME COURT JUDGES

(As on 31-03-2018)

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

CONTENTS

Appointments and Retirements in the Supreme Court of India.....	02
Appointments in the High Courts	03
Transfers between the High Courts.....	03
Vacancies in the Courts.....	04 - 05
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the Supreme Court.....	06
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the High Courts	07
Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Cases in the District and Subordinate Courts	08
Some Supreme Court Judgments / Orders of Public Importance.....	09 - 24
Major activities of National Judicial Academy (NJA).....	25 - 28
Major activities of National Legal Services Authority (NALSA).....	29
Foreign delegation in Supreme Court.....	29
Some Important Visits and Conferences	30 - 32

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

**APPOINTMENTS AND RETIREMENTS IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
(FROM 01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)**

RETIREMENT

Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Retirement
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy	01-03-2018

APPOINTMENTS IN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
1	Calcutta	Shampa Sarkar	12-03-18
		Ravi Krishan Kapur	12-03-18
		Arindam Mukherjee	12-03-18
2	Jharkhand	Rajesh Kumar	06-01-18
		Anubha Rawat Choudhary	06-01-18
		Kailash Prasad Deo	06-01-18
3	Karnataka	Dixit Krishna Shripad	14-02-18
		Shankar Ganapathi Pandit	14-02-18
		Ramakrishna Devdas	14-02-18
		Bhotanhosur Mallikarjuna Shyam Prasad	14-02-18
		Siddappa Sunil Dutt Yadav	14-02-18
4	Kerala	Antony Dominic (As Chief Justice)	09-02-18
5	Manipur	Abhilasha Kumari (As Chief Justice)	22-02-18
6	Meghalaya	Tarun Agarwala (As Chief Justice)	12-02-18
7	Tripura	Ajay Rastogi (As Chief Justice)	01-03-18

TRANSFERS BETWEEN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)

S.No.	From (Name of concerned High Court)	To (Name of concerned High Court)	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Transfer
1.	Madras	Delhi	Rajiv Shakdhar	15-01-18
2.	Meghalaya	Karnataka	Dinesh Maheshwari (Chief Justice)	12-02-18

VACANCIES IN THE COURTS

A) SUPREME COURT OF INDIA (As on 31-03-2018)

Sanctioned Strength	Working strength	Vacancies
31	24	07

B) HIGH COURTS (As on 31-03-2018)

S.No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Allahabad	160	101	59
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	61	30	31
3	Bombay	94	70	24
4	Calcutta	72	33	39
5	Chhatisgarh	22	12	10
6	Delhi	60	37	23
7	Gujarat	52	30	22
8	Gauhati	24	18	6
9	Himachal Pradesh	13	8	5
10	Jammu & Kashmir	17	10	7
11	Jharkhand	25	17	8
12	Karnataka	62	30	32
13	Kerala	47	37	10
14	Madhya Pradesh	53	32	21
15	Madras	75	58	17
16	Manipur	5	2	3
17	Meghalaya	4	1	3
18	Orissa	27	16	11
19	Patna	53	32	21
20	Punjab & Haryana	85	50	35
21	Rajasthan	50	33	17
22	Sikkim	3	3	0
23	Tripura	4	2	2
24	Uttarakhand	11	8	3
Total		1079	670	409

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

C) DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (As on 31-03-2018)

S.No.	State/ Union Territory	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1	Uttar Pradesh	3224	1864	1360
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	987	912	75
3(a)	Maharashtra	2282	2208	74
3(b)	Goa	57	45	12
3(c)	Diu and Daman	4	4	0
3(d)	Silvassa	3	2	1
4	West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar	1013	920	93
5	Chhatisgarh	399	376	23
6	Delhi	799	518	281
7	Gujarat	1496	1116	380
8(a)	Assam	430	350	80
8(b)	Nagaland	34	22	12
8(c)	Mizoram	63	46	17
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	34	22	12
9	Himachal Pradesh	159	148	11
10	Jammu & Kashmir	261	224	37
11	Jharkhand	672	462	210
12	Karnataka	1303	1061	242
13(a)	Kerala	536	479	57
13(b)	Lakshadweep	3	2	1
14	Madhya Pradesh	2021	1315	706
15	Manipur	49	39	10
16	Meghalaya	97	39	58
17(a)	Tamil Nadu	1121	913	208
17(b)	Puducherry	26	12	14
18	Odisha	862	649	213
19	Bihar	1837	1153	684
20(a)	Punjab	674	538	136
20(b)	Haryana	645	496	149
20(c)	Chandigarh	30	30	0
21	Rajasthan	1237	1121	116
22	Sikkim	23	19	4
23	Tripura	107	75	32
24	Uttarakhand	292	231	61
TOTAL		22780	17411	5369

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

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT [01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018]

i) Table I

						Pendency (At the end of 31-12-2017)		
						Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
						33,034	22,554	55,588
Institution (01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)			Disposal (01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)			Pendency (At the end of 31-03-2018)		
Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters	Admission matters	Regular matters	Total matters
5,354	1,801	7,155	5,731	1,553	7,284	32,657	22,802	55,459

Note:

1. Out of the 55,459 pending matters as on 31-03-2018, if connected matters are excluded, the pendency is only of 33,276 matters as on 31-03-2018.
2. Out of the said 55,459 pending matters as on 31-03-2018, 13,648 matters are upto one year old and thus arrears (i.e. cases pending more than a year) are only of 41,811 matters as on 31-03-2018.

ii) Table II

	OPENING BALANCE AS ON 01-01-18	INSTITUTION FROM 01-01-18 TO 31-03-18	DISPOSAL FROM 01-01-18 TO 31-03-18	PENDENCY AT THE END OF 31-03-18
CIVIL CASES	46,017	5,260	4,500	46,777
CRIMINAL CASES	9,571	1,895	2,784	8,682
ALL CASES (TOTAL)	55,588	7,155	7,284	55,459

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE HIGH COURTS (FROM 01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)

Srl. No.	Name of the High Court	Cases brought forward from the previous Year (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) As on 01/01/2018			Freshly instituted Cases during the First Quarter (Jan- Mar 2018) Nos. (Civil/Crl.)			Disposed of Cases during the First Quarter (Jan- Mar 2018) Nos. (Civil/Crl.)			Pending Cases at the end of the First Quarter (Jan -Mar 2018) Nos. (Civil/Crl.) (As on 31/03/2018)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/ 2018	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/ 2018	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/ 2018
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)			
1	Allahabad*	533012	376877	909889	37663	40001	77664	38894	36941	75835	531781	379937	911718	8.54	8.33	0.20
2	Hyderabad (A.P & Telangana)	279887	45721	325608	17193	5997	23190	9925	3900	13825	287155	47818	334973	7.12	4.25	2.88
3	Bombay	219812	54493	274305	18916	7222	26138	17320	6661	23981	221408	55054	276462	9.53	8.74	0.79
4	Calcutta	183462	39186	222648	7156	2552	9708	6468	1967	8435	184150	39771	223921	4.36	3.79	0.57
5	Chhatisgarh	36466	22990	59456	6489	4397	10886	5652	3422	9074	37303	23965	61268	18.31	15.26	3.05
6	Delhi	50502	19782	70284	7458	4081	11539	7499	3841	11340	50461	20022	70483	16.42	16.13	0.28
7	Gujarat*	80261	33429	113690	8456	7250	15706	6801	6744	13545	81916	33935	115851	13.81	11.91	1.90
8	Gauhati*	25360	5564	30924	2660	452	3112	3508	627	4135	24512	5389	29901	10.06	13.37	-3.31
9	Himachal Pradesh	25577	5782	31359	4624	1003	5627	2769	989	3758	27432	5796	33228	17.94	11.98	5.96
10	Jammu & Kashmir	56158	5904	62062	3617	550	4167	3096	530	3626	56679	5924	62603	6.71	5.84	0.87
11	Jharkhand	47211	43777	90988	2321	6870	9191	2909	6492	9401	46623	44155	90778	10.10	10.33	-0.23
12	Karnataka	293768	29957	323725	30537	4840	35377	23434	3791	27225	300871	31006	331877	10.93	8.41	2.52
13	Kerala	138308	38954	177262	17702	6924	24626	16638	6219	22857	139372	39659	179031	13.89	12.89	1.00
14	Madhya Pradesh	191014	116406	307420	17237	17612	34849	13137	15381	28518	195114	118637	313751	11.34	9.28	2.06
15	Madras	266299	36177	302476	22725	17741	40466	26245	16648	42893	262779	37270	300049	13.38	14.18	-0.80
16	Manipur	3476	194	3670	351	18	369	222	27	249	3605	185	3790	10.05	6.78	3.27
17	Meghalaya	670	27	697	88	21	109	71	19	90	687	29	716	15.64	12.91	2.73
18	Orissa*	123256	45080	168336	8198	8802	17000	8129	6587	14716	123325	47295	170620	10.10	8.74	1.36
19	Patna	86780	57887	144667	9211	21858	31069	8620	20553	29173	87371	59192	146563	21.48	20.17	1.31
20	Punjab & Haryana	225430	106108	331538	17366	17258	34624	16129	13265	29394	226667	110101	336768	10.44	8.87	1.58
21	Rajasthan	191644	70299	261943	18301	12859	31160	15904	12796	28700	194041	70362	264403	11.90	10.96	0.94
22	Sikkim	150	60	210	18	14	32	11	9	20	157	65	222	15.24	9.52	5.71
23	Tripura	2314	445	2759	566	85	651	359	72	431	2521	458	2979	23.60	15.62	7.97
24	Uttarakhand	20557	9465	30022	2949	2238	5187	2509	1497	4006	20997	10206	31203	17.28	13.34	3.93
	Total	3081374	1164564	4245938	261802	190645	452447	236249	168978	405227	3106927	1186231	4293158	10.66	9.54	1.11

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

*Opening balance modified by the High Court concerned

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES IN THE DISTRICT & SUBORDINATE COURTS (FROM 01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)

Srl.No	Name of the State/UT	Cases brought forward from the previous Year (Nos.) (Civil/Crl.) As on 01/01/2018			Freshly instituted Cases (Nos.) during the First Quarter (Jan-Mar 2018) (Civil/Crl.)			Disposed of Cases (Nos.) during the First Quarter (Jan-Mar 2018) (Civil/Crl.)			Pending Cases (Nos.) at the end of the First Quarter (Jan-Mar 2018) (Civil/Crl.) (As on 31/03/2018)			% of Institution of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/2018	% of Disposal of Cases w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/2018	% Increase or Decrease in Pendency w.r.t Opening Balance as on 01/01/2018
		CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)	CIVIL	CRL.	(Civ+Crl.)			
1	Uttar Pradesh	1566347	4816576	6382923	136828	752151	888979	126211	620564	746775	1576964	4948163	6525127	13.93	11.70	2.23
2	Andhra Pradesh & Telangana	512799	528065	1040864	66431	123950	190381	63659	122516	186175	515571	529499	1045070	18.29	17.89	0.40
3(a)	Maharashtra	1137730	2202320	3340050	108396	509037	617433	97072	459472	556544	1149054	2251885	3400939	18.49	16.66	1.82
3(b)	Goa	21533	17716	39249	2688	7412	10100	2668	5927	8595	21553	19201	40754	25.73	21.90	3.83
3(c)	Diu and Daman	944	799	1743	179	242	421	173	227	400	950	814	1764	24.15	22.95	1.20
3(d)	Silvassa	1480	2072	3552	115	244	359	169	250	419	1426	2066	3492	10.11	11.80	-1.69
4(a)	West Bengal	482123	1659131	2141254	38535	195208	233743	36297	157397	193694	484361	1696942	2181303	10.92	9.05	1.87
4(b)	Andaman & Nicobar	3405	5822	9227	1121	1887	3008	410	1471	1881	4116	6238	10354	32.60	20.39	12.21
5	Chhatisgarh	59699	217639	277338	8187	40698	48885	9013	45636	54649	58873	212701	271574	17.63	19.70	-2.08
6	Delhi	180846	566858	747704	38460	182168	220628	33252	137697	170949	186054	611329	797383	29.51	22.86	6.64
7	Gujarat	479353	1075850	1555203	44885	249559	294444	67167	271465	338632	457071	1053944	1511015	18.93	21.77	-2.84
8(a)	Assam	68402	208118	276520	10548	79507	90055	9814	76048	85862	69136	211577	280713	32.57	31.05	1.52
8(b)	Nagaland	1984	2765	4749	486	281	767	106	344	450	2364	2702	5066	16.15	9.48	6.68
8(c)	Mizoram	2383	2765	5148	1333	1582	2915	1017	1305	2322	2699	3042	5741	56.62	45.10	11.52
8(d)	Arunachal Pradesh	1889	7989	9878	466	1670	2136	454	1607	2061	1901	8052	9953	21.62	20.86	0.76
9	Himachal Pradesh	106653	127986	234639	18065	64375	82440	14853	57052	71905	109865	135309	245174	35.13	30.64	4.49
10	Jammu & Kashmir	51642	110032	161674	8435	27920	36355	6185	27108	33293	53892	110844	164736	22.49	20.59	1.89
11	Jharkhand	60389	278808	339197	6221	35144	41365	7130	42944	50074	59480	271008	330488	12.19	14.76	-2.57
12	Karnataka	711502	721450	1432952	90834	218742	309576	86096	202463	288559	716240	737729	1453969	21.60	20.14	1.47
13(a)	Kerala	410022	1213190	1623212	58694	203175	261869	58343	179241	237584	410373	1237124	1647497	16.13	14.64	1.50
13(b)	Lakshadweep	149	205	354	15	83	98	5	61	66	159	227	386	27.68	18.64	9.04
14	Madhya Pradesh	291355	1041211	1332566	63509	223287	286796	55435	218423	273858	299429	1046075	1345504	21.52	20.55	0.97
15	Manipur*	3505	3295	6800	481	422	903	418	453	871	3568	3264	6832	13.28	12.81	0.47
16	Meghalaya	3526	11249	14775	239	1570	1809	412	1746	2158	3353	11073	14426	12.24	14.61	-2.36
17(a)	Tamil Nadu**	609947	455931	1065878	85818	132678	218496	88405	130523	218928	606781	458086	1064867	20.50	20.54	-0.09
17(b)	Puducherry	12886	14044	26930	2124	1817	3941	2116	1264	3380	12894	14597	27491	14.63	12.55	2.08
18	Odisha	297618	881264	1178882	18860	90826	109686	18104	59353	77457	298374	912737	1211111	9.30	6.57	2.73
19	Bihar	350129	1873615	2223744	17162	85660	102822	15857	71415	87272	351434	1887860	2239294	4.62	3.92	0.70
20(a)	Punjab	247616	325186	572802	50506	149631	200137	48594	138191	186785	249528	336626	586154	34.94	32.61	2.33
20(b)	Haryana	261418	381976	643394	46517	133439	179956	42053	115228	157281	265882	400187	666069	27.97	24.45	3.52
20(c)	Chandigarh	16281	25414	41695	3388	33725	37113	3084	26903	29987	16585	32236	48821	89.01	71.92	17.09
21	Rajasthan	466172	1169217	1635389	60066	324686	384752	55897	308227	364124	470341	1185676	1656017	23.53	22.27	1.26
22	Sikkim	520	885	1405	115	308	423	134	276	410	501	917	1418	30.11	29.18	0.93
23	Tripura	9584	97505	107089	1131	16714	17845	1458	38273	39731	9257	75946	85203	16.66	37.10	-20.44
24	Uttarakhand	33362	176656	210018	6406	71428	77834	6065	60483	66548	33703	187601	221304	37.06	31.69	5.37
	Total	8465193	20223604	28688797	997244	3961226	4958470	958126	3581553	4539679	8503732	20603277	29107009	17.28	15.82	1.46

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

*Opening balance modified by the High Court concerned

**Closing balance modified by the High Court concerned

SOME SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS / ORDERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (01-01-2018 TO 31-03-2018)

1. On 8th January, 2018, in the case of Nagaiah and another v. Smt. Chowdamma (dead) By Lrs. and another [Civil Appeal No. 22969 of 2017], it was held that the principles arising out of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 and the Hindu Guardianship Act may not be apposite to the next friend appointed under Order XXXII of the Code of Civil Procedure.

It was held that “the appointment of a guardian ad litem to represent the defendant or a next friend to represent the plaintiff in a suit is limited only for the suit and after the discharge of that guardian ad litem /next friend, the right/ duty of guardian as defined under sub-section (b) of Section 4 of the Hindu Guardianship Act (if he has no adverse interest) automatically continues as guardian. In other words, a next friend representing the minor in the suit under Order XXXII, Rule 1 of the Code, will not take away the right of the duly appointed guardian under the Hindu Guardianship Act as long as such guardian does not have an adverse interest or such duly appointed guardian is not removed as per that Act.”

It was further held that “instituting a suit on behalf of minor by a next friend or to represent a minor defendant in the suit by a guardian ad litem is a time-tested procedure which is in place to protect the interests of the minor in civil litigation. The only practical difference between a “next friend” and a “guardian ad litem” is that the next friend is a person who represents a minor who commences a lawsuit; guardian ad litem is a person appointed by the Court to represent a minor who has been a defendant in the suit. Before a minor commences suit, a conscious decision is made concerning the deserving adult (next friend) through whom the suit will be instituted. The guardian ad litem is appointed by Court and whereas the next friend is not. The next friend and the guardian ad litem possess similar powers and responsibilities. Both are subject to control by the Court and may be removed by the Court if the best interest of the minor so requires.”

2. On 9th January, 2018, in the case of Shyam Narayan Chouksey v. Union of India & Others [Writ Petition (Civil) No.855 of 2016], prayer was made for issue of a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents to take appropriate steps for inculcating in the public a proper sense for paying due respect to the National Anthem; to issue a writ, order or direction as to what is required to be done and not to be done when the National Anthem is being played or sung; to specify what will constitute disrespect and abuse of the National Anthem; and to restrain the use of the National Anthem for any commercial exploitation or to gain financial advantage in any manner.

On 30th November, 2016, the Supreme Court had passed an interim order in this regard. Subsequently, in terms of Order/Notification dated 5th December, 2017, an inter-Ministerial Committee was appointed by the Union Government to submit recommendations

for regulating the playing/singing of the National Anthem and to suggest changes in the Prevention of Insults to National Honour Act, 1971 or in the Orders relating to the National Anthem of India.

On consideration of the matter, the Supreme Court held that “one is compelled to show respect whenever and wherever the National Anthem is played. It is the elan vital of the Nation and fundamental grammar of belonging to a nation state. However, the prescription of the place or occasion has to be made by the executive keeping in view the concept of fundamental duties provided under the Constitution and the law.”

The order passed on 30th November, 2016, was modified to the extent “that playing of the National Anthem prior to the screening of feature films in cinema halls is not mandatory, but optional or directory.” The Committee appointed by the Union government was directed to submit its recommendations to the competent authority in terms of the Notification dated 5th December, 2017, for follow up action. The exemption earlier granted to disabled persons was directed to remain in force “till the final decision of the competent authority with regard to each occasion whenever the National Anthem is played or sung.”

3. On 10th January, 2018, in the case of I.C. Sharma v. The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. [Civil Appeal No. 3167 of 2017], the issue for consideration was “under-insurance” and the effect thereof. It was held that “when a group of items is insured under one heading and only some of the items and not all items are lost/stolen then the principle of under-insurance will apply. However, if all or most of the items of value covered under the policy are stolen, then the insurance company is bound to pay the value of the goods insured.”

It was further held that “once the insurance company itself changed its policy from ‘as per list policies’ to ‘policies for consolidated amounts’, then an insured is not expected to give the item-wise details along with the valuation.” Also, “if the insurance company desires that item-wise valuation should be given for items over and above a certain value then it is the duty of the insurance company to advise the insured at the time of issuing the first policy of insurance and at the time of each renewal. The insurance company must at the time of accepting the premium advise the policy holder properly. The insurance company cannot accept the premium without asking for any details and later deny its liability on the ground that such details were not given.”

4. On 11th January, 2018, in the case of Russel Joy v. Union of India & Ors. [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 878 of 2017], the safety and lifespan of Mullaperiyar Dam was in issue. There was an assertion in the petition that as 121 years had expired from the date of the construction of the dam, the decommissioning of the said dam had become essential and there was a need for assessment of the lifespan of the dam regard being had to the safety of the citizens especially the persons residing downstream of the river. In this regard, reference was also made to litigations filed between the State of Kerala and State of Tamil Nadu and the decision in State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala and another, (2014) 12 SCC 696 whereby the Supreme Court apart from issuing other directions had appointed a Supervisory Committee to take measures pertaining to the dam in emergent situations.

It was held that as far as the safety measures of the Mullaperiyar Dam are concerned, the directions given in the said decision in State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala shall be binding on all, however “there has to be a greater degree of disaster management and better preparedness to face any kind of disaster caused by the dam.”

The Supreme Court held that “it is the duty of the States involved to create a sense of confidence in the real sense of the term and ensure that adequate measures have been taken so that in any event safety of the individuals shall not be affected and well preserved and their life and liberty remain protected.” Accordingly, the Central Government was directed to constitute a separate Sub-Committee under Section 9 of the Disaster Management Act, 2005, to exclusively monitor the measures for ensuring a high level of preparedness to face any disaster, which is unpredictable in relation to Mullaperiyar Dam. The State of Kerala as well as the State of Tamil Nadu were also directed to constitute separate Sub-Committees under Section 21 of the 2005 Act, to exclusively monitor the measures for ensuring a high level of preparedness to face any disaster occurring from Mullaperiyar Dam. They were directed to provide for a separate dispensation under the State plan as envisaged under Section 23(4) of the 2005 Act.

The State of Tamil Nadu, which had been directed to cooperate as per the decision in State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala, was also directed to have a Sub-Committee for disaster management and with a specific plan. It was further directed that “constitution of all sub-committees shall be in addition to the existing Committees.” All the States were directed to “work in harmony with the Central Sub-Committee and ensure high level preparedness to face any disaster occurring due to Mullaperiyar Dam, so that life and property are not damaged.”

5. On 12th January, 2018, in the case of Smt. K.A. Annamma v. The Secretary, Cochin Co-operative Hospital Society Ltd. [Civil Appeal No. 197 of 2018], it was held that the Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969 (KCS Act) and the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (ID Act) “both possess and enjoy the concurrent jurisdiction to decide any service dispute arising between the Co-operative Society’s Employee and his/her Employer (Co-operative Society).”

It was further held that “it is the choice of the Employee concerned to choose any one forum out of the two forums available to him/her under the two Acts (the KCS Act and the I.D. Act) to get his/her service dispute decided. It is, however, subject to satisfying the test laid down under the ID Act that the employee concerned is a “workman”, the dispute raised by him/her is an “industrial dispute” and the Co-operative Society (Employer) is an “Industry” as defined under the ID Act.”

6. On 23rd January, 2018, in the case of Lachhman Dass v. Resham Chand Kaler and Anr. [Criminal Appeal No.161 of 2018], it was held that “the law under Section 439 of Cr.P.C is very clear and in the eyes of the law every accused is the same irrespective of their nationality.” In the facts and circumstances of the case, the Supreme Court held that though respondent no.1 was not a citizen of this country (British national), yet the fact remained that he along with other persons had indulged in the criminal activity and there

was no reason “to accord any special consideration for respondent no.1 by virtue of a simple fact that he is a citizen of different country.”

7. On 23rd January, 2018, in the case of M/s Indian Farmers Fertilizer Co-operative Limited v. M/s Bhadra Products [Civil Appeal No.824 of 2018], the question for consideration was whether an award delivered by an Arbitrator, which decides the issue of limitation, can be said to be an interim award, and whether such interim award can then be set aside under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

It was held that as the Arbitrator had disposed of one matter between the parties i.e. the issue of limitation finally, the award in question was an “interim award” within the meaning of Section 2(1)(c) of the Act and being subsumed within the expression “arbitral award” could, therefore, have been challenged under Section 34 of the Act.” However, having said this, the Supreme Court also observed that “piecemeal challenges like piecemeal awards lead to unnecessary delay and additional expense” and that the “Parliament may consider amending Section 34 of the Act so as to consolidate all interim awards together with the final arbitral award, so that one challenge under Section 34 can be made after delivery of the final arbitral award.”

8. On 30th January, 2018, in the case of Authorized Officer, State Bank of Travancore and Another v. Mathew K.C. [Civil Appeal No.1281 of 2018], it was held that “in financial matters grant of ex-parte interim orders can have a deleterious effect and it is not sufficient to say that the aggrieved has the remedy to move for vacating the interim order.”

The Supreme Court observed that “loans by financial institutions are granted from public money generated at the tax payers expense. Such loan does not become the property of the person taking the loan, but retains its character of public money given in a fiduciary capacity as entrustment by the public. Timely repayment also ensures liquidity to facilitate loan to another in need, by circulation of the money and cannot be permitted to be blocked by frivolous litigation by those who can afford the luxury of the same.”

9. On 30th January, 2018, in the case of Latesh @ Dadu Baburao Karlekar v. The State of Maharashtra [Criminal Appeal No. 1301 of 2015], it was held that “merely because the names of the accused are not stated and their names are not specified in the FIR that may not be a ground to doubt the contents of the FIR and the case of the prosecution cannot be thrown out on this count.”

The Supreme Court observed that “the value to be attached to the FIR depends upon facts and circumstances of each case. When a person gives a statement to the police officer, basing on which the FIR is registered. The capacity of reproducing the things differs from person to person. Some people may have the ability to reproduce the things as it is, some may lack the ability to do so. Some times in the state of shock, they may miss the important details, because people tend to react differently when they come across a violent act.”

10. On 30th January, 2018, in the case of Shafhi Mohammad v. The State of Himachal Pradesh [Special Leave Petition (Crl.)No.2302 of 2017], while clarifying the legal position on the subject on the admissibility of the electronic evidence, especially by a party who is not in possession of device from which the document is produced, the Supreme Court held that “such party cannot be required to produce certificate under Section 65B(4) of the Evidence Act. The applicability of requirement of certificate being procedural can be relaxed by Court wherever interest of justice so justifies.”

It was held that “the applicability of procedural requirement under Section 65B(4) of the Evidence Act of furnishing certificate is to be applied only when such electronic evidence is produced by a person who is in a position to produce such certificate being in control of the said device and not of the opposite party. In a case where electronic evidence is produced by a party who is not in possession of a device, applicability of Sections 63 and 65 of the Evidence Act cannot be held to be excluded. In such case, procedure under the said Sections can certainly be invoked. If this is not so permitted, it will be denial of justice to the person who is in possession of authentic evidence/witness but on account of manner of proving, such document is kept out of consideration by the court in absence of certificate under Section 65B(4) of the Evidence Act, which party producing cannot possibly secure. Thus, requirement of certificate under Section 65B(4) is not always mandatory.”

11. On 6th February, 2018, in the case of Naveen Kumar v. Vijay Kumar and Ors. [Civil Appeal No.1427 of 2018], it was held that in view of the definition of the expression ‘owner’ in Section 2(30) of the Motor Vehicles Act, “it is the person in whose name the motor vehicle stands registered who, for the purposes of the Act, would be treated as the ‘owner’. However, where a person is a minor, the guardian of the minor would be treated as the owner. Where a motor vehicle is subject to an agreement of hire purchase, lease or hypothecation, the person in possession of the vehicle under that agreement is treated as the owner. In a situation such as the present where the registered owner has purported to transfer the vehicle but continues to be reflected in the records of the registering authority as the owner of the vehicle, he would not stand absolved of liability.”

The Supreme Court observed that the “Parliament has consciously introduced the definition of the expression ‘owner’ in Section 2(30), making a departure from the provisions of Section 2(19) in the earlier Act of 1939. The principle underlying the provisions of Section 2(30) is that the victim of a motor accident or, in the case of a death, the legal heirs of the deceased victim should not be left in a state of uncertainty. A claimant for compensation ought not to be burdened with following a trail of successive transfers, which are not registered with the registering authority. To hold otherwise would be to defeat the salutary object and purpose of the Act. Hence, the interpretation to be placed must facilitate the fulfilment of the object of the law.”

12. On 6th February, 2018, in the case of Dataram Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. [Criminal Appeal No. 227 of 2018], it was held that “a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody.”

However, the Supreme Court clarified that it “should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”

13. On 7th February, 2018, in the case of *Kandla Export Corporation & Anr. v. M/s OCI Corporation & Anr.* [Civil Appeal Nos. 1661-1663 of 2018], the question for consideration was whether an appeal, not maintainable under Section 50 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, is nonetheless maintainable under Section 13(1) of the Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts Act, 2015.

It was held that Section 50 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is a provision contained in a self-contained code on matters pertaining to arbitration, and which is exhaustive in nature and that “Section 13(1) of the Commercial Courts Act, being a general provision vis-à-vis arbitration relating to appeals arising out of commercial disputes, would obviously not apply to cases covered by Section 50 of the Arbitration Act.”

It was held that “in all arbitration cases of enforcement of foreign awards, it is Section 50 alone that provides an appeal. Having provided for an appeal, the forum of appeal is left “to the Court authorized by law to hear appeals from such orders”. Section 50 properly read would, therefore, mean that if an appeal lies under the said provision, then alone would Section 13(1) of the Commercial Courts Act be attracted as laying down the forum which will hear and decide such an appeal.”

The Supreme Court held that “given the objects of both the statutes, it is clear that arbitration itself is meant to be a speedy resolution of disputes between parties. Equally, enforcement of foreign awards should take place as soon as possible if India is to remain as an equal partner, commercially speaking, in the international community. In point of fact, the *raison d’être* for the enactment of the Commercial Courts Act is that commercial disputes involving high amounts of money should be speedily decided. Given the objects of both the enactments, if we were to provide an additional appeal, when Section 50 does away with an appeal so as to speedily enforce foreign awards, we would be turning the Arbitration Act and the Commercial Courts Act on their heads.”

It was held that “Section 13(1) of the Commercial Courts Act must be construed in accordance with the object sought to be achieved by the Act. Any construction of Section 13 of the Commercial Courts Act, which would lead to further delay, instead of an expeditious enforcement of a foreign award must, therefore, be eschewed. Even on applying the doctrine of harmonious construction of both statutes, it is clear that they are best harmonized by giving effect to the special statute i.e. the Arbitration Act, vis-à-vis the more general statute, namely the Commercial Courts Act, being left to operate in spheres other than arbitration.”

14. On 8th February, 2018, in the case of Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra (Dead) Through Lrs. & Ors. [Civil Appeal No.20982 of 2017], issue relating to interpretation of Section 24 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 came up for consideration.

A three Judge Bench per majority held as follows:-

(i) "The word 'paid' in section 24 of the Act of 2013 has the same meaning as 'tender of payment' in section 31(1) of the Act of 1894. They carry the same meaning and the expression 'deposited' in section 31(2) is not included in the expressions 'paid' in section 24 of the Act of 2013 or in 'tender of payment' used in section 31(1) of the Act of 1894. The words 'paid'/tender' and 'deposited' are different expressions and carry different meanings within their fold. In section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 in the expression 'paid,' it is not necessary that the amount should be deposited in court as provided in section 31(2) of the Act of 1894. Non-deposit of compensation in court under section 31(2) of the Act of 1894 does not result in a lapse of acquisition under section 24(2) of the Act of 2013. Due to the failure of deposit in court, the only consequence at the most in appropriate cases may be of a higher rate of interest on compensation as envisaged under section 34 of the Act of 1894 and not lapse of acquisition. Once the amount of compensation has been unconditionally tendered and it is refused, that would amount to payment and the obligation under section 31(1) stands discharged and that amounts to discharge of obligation of payment under section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 also and it is not open to the person who has refused to accept compensation, to urge that since it has not been deposited in court, acquisition has lapsed. Claimants/landowners after refusal, cannot take advantage of their own wrong and seek protection under the provisions of section 24(2)";

(ii) "The normal mode of taking physical possession under the land acquisition cases is drawing of Panchnama";

(iii) "The provisions of section 24 of the Act of 2013, do not revive barred or stale claims such claims cannot be entertained";

(iv) "Provisions of section 24(2) do not intend to cover the period spent during litigation and when the authorities have been disabled to act under section 24(2) due to the final or interim order of a court or otherwise, such period has to be excluded from the period of five years as provided in section 24(2) of the Act of 2013. There is no conscious omission in section 24(2) for the exclusion of a period of the interim order. There was no necessity to insert such a provision. The omission does not make any substantial difference as to legal position"; and

(v) "The principle of actus curiae neminem gravabit is applicable including the other common law principles for determining the questions under section 24 of the Act of 2013. The period covered by the final/ interim order by which the authorities have been deprived

of taking possession has to be excluded. Section 24(2) has no application where Court has quashed acquisition.”

15. On 9th February, 2018, in the case of Sampurna Behura v. Union of India & Ors. [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 473 of 2005], the Supreme Court gave various directions keeping in mind the need to invigorate the juvenile justice system in the country and urged the Chief Justice of each High Court “to seriously consider establishing child friendly courts and vulnerable witness courts in each district.” It was observed that “inquiries under the JJ Act and trials under other statutes such as the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, trials for sexual offences under the Indian Penal Code and other similar laws require to be conducted with a high degree of sensitivity, care and empathy for the victim.”

16. On 15th February, 2018, in the case of UCO Bank & Ors. v. Rajendra Shankar Shukla [Civil Appeal No.2693 of 2013], the issue for consideration was access to justice in a departmental enquiry.

It was held that “an employee is entitled to subsistence allowance during an inquiry pending against him or her but if that employee is starved of finances by zero payment, it would be unreasonable to expect the employee to meaningfully participate in a departmental inquiry. Access to justice is a valuable right available to every person, even to a criminal, and indeed free legal representation is provided even to a criminal. In the case of a departmental inquiry, the delinquent is at best guilty of a misconduct but that is no ground to deny access to pension (wherever applicable) or subsistence allowance (wherever applicable).”

In the facts and circumstances of the case, it was held that the employee concerned, namely, respondent, “was not given a fair opportunity to defend himself by denying him financial resources.” While observing that respondent “was denied his pension as well as subsistence allowance which prevented him from effectively participating in the disciplinary inquiry”, it was held that on this ground as well, the disciplinary proceedings against respondent were vitiated.

17. On 15th February, 2018, in the case of Sundaram Finance Limited v. Abdul Samad & Anr. [Civil Appeal No.1650 of 2018], the question for consideration was whether an award under the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996 is required to be first filed in the court having jurisdiction over the arbitration proceedings for execution and then to obtain transfer of the decree or whether the award can be straightway filed and executed in the Court where the assets are located.

It was held that “the enforcement of an award through its execution can be filed anywhere in the country where such decree can be executed and there is no requirement for obtaining a transfer of the decree from the Court, which would have jurisdiction over the arbitral proceedings.”

18. On 15th February, 2018, in the case of Auto Cars v. Trimurti Cargo Movers Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. [Civil Appeal No. 2113 of 2018], it was held that “service of summons on the defendants without mentioning therein a specific day, date, year and time cannot be held as “summons duly served” on the defendants within the meaning of Order IX Rule 13 of CPC. In other words, such summons and the service effected pursuant thereto cannot be held to be in conformity with Section 27 read with the statutory format prescribed in Appendix B Process (I and IA) and Order 5 Rule 20(3) of CPC.”

19. On 16th February, 2018, in the case of Adarsh Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. v. Union of India & Ors. [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 129 of 2018], the petitioner, a registered society, sought appropriate directions for prohibiting the respondent Nos. 4 to 7 from releasing/screening/publishing feature film, namely, ‘Aiyaary’ with direct or indirect references to the petitioner society’s land/building/membership. The petitioner contended that the film had projected the society in an unacceptable manner and that was likely to have some impact on the litigations which were pending apart from affecting the reputation of the members of the society.

Taking note of the fact that the film ‘Aiyaary’ has already been given the requisite certificate by the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) under the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and the said Board has also taken the suggestions from the competent authorities of the Army as a measure of caution, the Supreme Court observed that “there can be no shadow of doubt that the Censor Board can grant a certificate and in the said decision making process, it can also consult the persons who can assist it to arrive at the condign conclusion.”

The Supreme Court further observed that “the doctrine of sub-judice may not be elevated to such an extent that some kind of reference or allusion to a member of a society would warrant the negation of the right to freedom of speech and expression which is an extremely cherished right enshrined under the Constitution. The moment the right to freedom of speech and expression is atrophied, not only the right but also the person having the right gets into a semi coma.” Though “the said right is not absolute but any restriction imposed thereon has to be extremely narrow and within reasonable parameters” and in the case at hand, “the grant of certificate by the CBFC, after consulting with the authorities of the Army, should dispel any apprehension of the members or the society.”

Rejecting the plea that the producer and director of the film be directed to add a disclaimer so that no member of the society would ultimately be affected by the film, the Supreme Court held that “whether there is the necessity of “disclaimer” or not has to be decided by the Censor Board which is the statutory authority that grants the certificate. In fact, when a disclaimer is sought to be added, the principle of natural justice is also attracted. To elaborate, the producer or director is to be afforded an opportunity of hearing. The Court should not add any disclaimer for the asking. Addition of a disclaimer is a different concept altogether. It is within the domain of the authority to grant certificate and to ask the director to add a disclaimer in the beginning of the movie to avoid any kind of infraction of guidelines.”

20. On 6th March, 2018, in the case of Jagdish v. Mohan & Ors. [Civil Appeal No. 2217 of 2018], while examining the plea of appellant for enhancement of compensation for injuries suffered by him in a motor accident, a three Judge Bench observed that “the measure of compensation must reflect a genuine attempt of the law to restore the dignity of the being. Our yardsticks of compensation should not be so abysmal as to lead one to question whether our law values human life. If it does, as it must, it must provide a realistic recompense for the pain of loss and the trauma of suffering. Awards of compensation are not law’s doles. In a discourse of rights, they constitute entitlements under law. Our conversations about law must shift from a paternalistic subordination of the individual to an assertion of enforceable rights as intrinsic to human dignity.”

21. On 6th March, 2018, in the case of Bharati Reddy v. The State Of Karnataka & Ors. [Civil Appeal No. 1763 of 2018], it was alleged that the appellant played fraud on the Government and public by submitting a false affidavit before the Tahshildar for issuance of Income and Caste Certificate, on the basis of which she contested the election for the post of Adhyaksha Zilla Panchayat and got elected to the said post, to which she was otherwise not entitled to or qualified for. A three Judge Bench held that “the High Court could not have issued a writ of quo warranto until the Income and Caste Certificate issued in favour of the appellant, on the basis of which she participated in the election for the post of Adhyaksha and got elected, was to be declared void or invalidated by the Caste Scrutiny Committee.”

It was held that unless the High Court “is satisfied that the incumbent was not eligible at all as per the statutory provisions for being appointed or elected to the public office or that he/she has incurred disqualification to continue in the said office, which satisfaction should be founded on the indisputable facts, the High Court ought not to entertain the prayer for issuance of a writ of quo warranto.”

22. On 9th March, 2018, in the case of Kerala State Electricity Board and Anr. v. Kurien E. Kalathil and Anr. [Civil Appeal Nos.3164-3165 of 2017], it was held that “jurisdictional precondition for reference to arbitration under Section 7 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act is that the parties should seek a reference or submission to arbitration.”

It was held that “so far as reference of a dispute to arbitration under Section 89 CPC, the same can be done only when parties agree for settlement of their dispute through arbitration in contradistinction to other methods of alternative dispute resolution mechanism stipulated in Section 89 CPC. Insofar reference of the parties to arbitration, oral consent given by the counsel without a written memo of instructions does not fulfill the requirement under Section 89 CPC. Since referring the parties to arbitration has serious consequences of taking them away from the stream of civil courts and subject them to the rigour of arbitration proceedings, in the absence of arbitration agreement, the court can refer them to arbitration only with written consent of parties either by way of joint memo or joint application; more so, when government or statutory body like the appellant-Board is involved.”

23. On 9th March, 2018, in the case of Common Cause (A Regd. Society) v. Union of

India and Another [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 215 of 2015], a five Judge Constitution Bench “laid down the principles relating to the procedure for execution of Advance Directive and provided the guidelines to give effect to passive euthanasia in both circumstances, namely, where there are advance directives and where there are none, in exercise of the power under Article 142 of the Constitution” and the law stated in Vishaka and Others v. State of Rajasthan and Others, (1997) 6 SCC 241. It was held that “the directive and guidelines shall remain in force till the Parliament brings a legislation in the field.”

It was held that “there is an inherent difference between active euthanasia and passive euthanasia as the former entails a positive affirmative act, while the latter relates to withdrawal of life support measures or withholding of medical treatment meant for artificially prolonging life.” The Bench held that “a competent person who has come of age has the right to refuse specific treatment or all treatment or opt for an alternative treatment, even if such decision entails a risk of death. The ‘Emergency Principle’ or the ‘Principle of Necessity’ has to be given effect to only when it is not practicable to obtain the patient’s consent for treatment and his/her life is in danger. But where a patient has already made a valid Advance Directive which is free from reasonable doubt and specifying that he/she does not wish to be treated, then such directive has to be given effect to.”

It was held that the “right to life and liberty as envisaged under Article 21 of the Constitution is meaningless unless it encompasses within its sphere individual dignity. With the passage of time, this Court has expanded the spectrum of Article 21 to include within it the right to live with dignity as component of right to life and liberty.” “The right to live with dignity also includes the smoothening of the process of dying in case of a terminally ill patient or a person” in persistent vegetative state (PVS) “with no hope of recovery.”

The Bench held that “a failure to legally recognize advance medical directives may amount to non-facilitation of the right to smoothen the dying process and the right to live with dignity.” “Though the sanctity of life has to be kept on the high pedestal yet in cases of terminally ill persons or PVS patients where there is no hope for revival, priority shall be given to the Advance Directive and the right of self-determination.” It was however clarified that “in the absence of Advance Directive, the procedure provided for the said category” shall be applicable. It was held that “when passive euthanasia as a situational palliative measure becomes applicable, the best interest of the patient shall override the State interest.”

24. On 13th March, 2018, in the case of Bar Council of India v. A.K. Balaji and Ors. [Civil Appeal Nos. 7875 – 7879 of 2015], while the examining the issue whether foreign law firms/lawyers are permitted to practice in India, the following questions arose for consideration:

- (i) Whether the expression ‘practise the profession of law’ includes only litigation practice or non-litigation practice also;
- (ii) Whether such practice by foreign law firms or foreign lawyers is permissible

without fulfilling the requirements of Advocates Act and the Bar Council of India Rules;

(iii) If not, whether there is a bar for the said law firms or lawyers to visit India on 'fly in and fly out' basis for giving legal advice regarding foreign law on diverse international legal issues;

(iv) Whether there is no bar to foreign law firms and lawyers from conducting arbitration proceedings and disputes arising out of contracts relating to international commercial arbitration; and

(v) Whether BPO companies providing integrated services are not covered by the Advocates Act or the Bar Council of India rules.

It was correspondingly held as follows:-

Re: (i): "Ethics of the legal profession apply not only when an advocate appears before the Court. The same also apply to regulate practice outside the Court. Adhering to such Ethics is integral to the administration of justice. The professional standards laid down from time to time are required to be followed." Thus, "practice of law includes litigation as well as non litigation."

Re:(ii): "Practicing of law includes not only appearance in courts but also giving of opinion, drafting of instruments, participation in conferences involving legal discussion. These are parts of non-litigation practice which is part of practice of law. Scheme in Chapter-IV of the Advocates Act makes it clear that advocates enrolled with the Bar Council alone are entitled to practice law, except as otherwise provided in any other law. All others can appear only with the permission of the court, authority or person before whom the proceedings are pending. Regulatory mechanism for conduct of advocates applies to non-litigation work also. The prohibition applicable to any person in India, other than advocate enrolled under the Advocates Act, certainly applies to any foreigner also."

Re:(iii): "Visit of any foreign lawyer on fly in and fly out basis may amount to practice of law if it is on regular basis. A casual visit for giving advice may not be covered by the expression 'practice'. Whether a particular visit is casual or frequent so as to amount to practice is a question of fact to be determined from situation to situation. Bar Council of India or Union of India are at liberty to make appropriate rules in this regard." However, "the contention that the Advocates Act applies only if a person is practicing Indian law cannot be accepted. Conversely, plea that a foreign lawyer is entitled to practice foreign law in India without subjecting himself to the regulatory mechanism of the Bar Council of India Rules can also be not accepted." There is no merit "in the contention that the Advocates Act does not deal with companies or firms and only individuals. If prohibition applies to an individual, it equally applies to group of individuals or juridical persons."

Re:(iv): “It is not possible to hold that there is absolutely no bar to a foreign lawyer for conducting arbitrations in India. If the matter is governed by particular rules of an institution or if the matter otherwise falls under Section 32 or 33 of the Advocates Act, there is no bar to conduct such proceedings in prescribed manner. If the matter is governed by an international commercial arbitration agreement, conduct of proceedings may fall under Section 32 or 33 read with the provisions of the Arbitration Act. Even in such cases, Code of Conduct, if any, applicable to the legal profession in India has to be followed. It is for the Bar Council of India or Central Government to make a specific provision in this regard, if considered appropriate.

Re:(v): “The BPO companies providing range of customized and integrated services and functions to its customers may not violate the provisions of the Advocates Act, only if the activities in pith and substance do not amount to practice of law. The manner in which they are styled may not be conclusive.” “If their services do not directly or indirectly amount to practice of law, the Advocates Act may not apply. This is a matter which may have to be dealt with on case to case basis having regard to a fact situation.”

25. On 16th March, 2018, in the case of Bimal Gurung v. Union Of India & Ors. [Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 182 of 2017], it was held that “demonstrations are also a mode of expression of the rights guaranteed” under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, however, “demonstrations whether political, religious or social or other demonstrations which create public, disturbances or operate as nuisances, or create or manifestly threaten some tangible public or private mischief, are not covered by protection under Article 19(1).”

It was held that “Article 19(1) (a) and (b) gives constitutional right to all citizens freedom of speech and expression which includes carrying out public demonstration also but public demonstration when becomes violent and damages the public and private properties and harm lives of people it goes beyond fundamental rights guaranteed under Article 19(1) and becomes an offence punishable under law.”

26. On 20th March, 2018, in the case of Dr. Subhash Kashinath Mahajan v. The State Of Maharashtra and Anr. [Criminal Appeal No.416 of 2018], the question for consideration was whether any unilateral allegation of mala fide can be ground to prosecute officers under the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (the Atrocities Act) who dealt with a matter in official capacity and if such allegation is falsely made what is the protection available against such abuse. Procedural safeguards were examined so that provisions of the Atrocities Act are not abused for extraneous considerations.

It was held that “the under privileged need to be protected against any atrocities to give effect to the Constitutional ideals. The Atrocities Act has been enacted with this objective. At the same time, the said Act cannot be converted into a charter for exploitation or oppression by any unscrupulous person or by police for extraneous reasons against other citizens as has been found on several occasions”. “Any harassment of an innocent

citizen, irrespective of caste or religion, is against the guarantee of the Constitution. This Court must enforce such a guarantee. Law should not result in caste hatred. The preamble to the Constitution, which is the guiding star for interpretation, incorporates the values of liberty, equality and fraternity.”

The Bench was satisfied, in the light of statistics as well as cited decisions and observations of the Standing Committee of Parliament “that there is need to safeguard innocent citizens against false implication and unnecessary arrest for which there is no sanction under the law which is against the constitutional guarantee and law of arrest laid down by this Court.” The Bench stated that it was “conscious that normal rule is to register FIR if any information discloses commission of a cognizable offence”, however, there are “exceptions to this rule.” It was held that “cases under the Atrocities Act also fall in exceptional category where preliminary inquiry must be held” and further that “even if preliminary inquiry is held and case is registered, arrest is not a must”

Accordingly, it was inter alia held as follows:-

1) “There is no absolute bar against grant of anticipatory bail in cases under the Atrocities Act if no prima facie case is made out or where on judicial scrutiny the complaint is found to be prima facie mala fide.”

2) “In view of acknowledged abuse of law of arrest in cases under the Atrocities Act, arrest of a public servant can only be after approval of the appointing authority and of a non-public servant after approval by the S.S.P. which may be granted in appropriate cases if considered necessary for reasons recorded. Such reasons must be scrutinized by the Magistrate for permitting further detention.”

3) “To avoid false implication of an innocent, a preliminary enquiry may be conducted by the DSP concerned to find out whether the allegations make out a case under the Atrocities Act and that the allegations are not frivolous or motivated.”

4) Any violation of aforesaid directions (2) and (3) “will be actionable by way of disciplinary action as well as contempt.”

It was further held that “the above directions are prospective.”

27. On 27th March, 2018, in the case of Shakti Vahini v. Union of India and others [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 231 of 2010], the question for consideration was whether the elders of the family or clan can ever be allowed to proclaim a verdict guided by some notion of passion and eliminate the life of the young who have exercised their choice to get married against the wishes of their elders or contrary to the customary practice of the clan.

Answering the question with an emphatic “No”, a three Judge Bench held that “it is because the sea of liberty and the ingrained sense of dignity do not countenance such treatment inasmuch as the pattern of behaviour is based on some extra-constitutional perception. Class honour, howsoever perceived, cannot smother the choice of an individual which he or she is entitled to enjoy under our compassionate Constitution. And this right of enjoyment of liberty deserves to be continually and zealously guarded so that it can thrive

with strength and flourish with resplendence.” The Bench held that “feudal perception has to melt into oblivion paving the smooth path for liberty” and that “any kind of torture or torment or ill-treatment in the name of honour that tantamounts to atrophy of choice of an individual relating to love and marriage by any assembly, whatsoever nomenclature it assumes, is illegal and cannot be allowed a moment of existence.” It was held that “the consent of the family or the community or the clan is not necessary once the two adult individuals agree to enter into a wedlock.”

To meet the challenges of the agonising effect of honour crime, the Supreme Court observed that there has to be preventive, remedial and punitive measures and, accordingly, stated the broad contours and the modalities with liberty to the executive and the police administration of the concerned States to add further measures to evolve a robust mechanism for the stated purposes.

28. On 28th March, 2018, in the case of Krishnakant Tamrakar v. The State of Madhya Pradesh [Criminal Appeal No.470 of 2018], the Supreme Court considered it appropriate to reflect on some important aspects of speedy justice which were integral to the issue of delay in hearing of criminal appeals by the High Courts. First question was whether, having regard to the nature of jurisdiction of the High Court and the volume of the work, the expectation for speedy disposal of criminal appeals is realistic or there is need for re-engineering of the judicial structure. Secondly, when speedy justice is directly linked to timely appointment of best talent, whether there is need to revisit the existing system of appointment of judges at all levels. Thirdly, what can be the mechanism to plan and oversee the best management practices, including employment of technology, for optimum performance and righteous conduct. Fourth, how uncalled for frequent strikes obstructs access to justice and what steps are required to remedy the situation.

While being “conscious that the above issues are primarily policy matters”, and “the subject matter of restructuring of courts and administration of justice is a matter to be gone into by the executive and the legislature”, the Supreme Court however observed that, since the subject affects fundamental right of speedy justice, it “cannot refuse to look into the problem repeatedly presented to it with a view to draw attention of all concerned, leaving to the concerned authorities to consider and act in the matter.”

Stating “that access to speedy justice is part of fundamental right under Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution”, the Supreme Court held as follows:-

(i) In the light of 124th and 272nd Reports of the Law Commission of India, judgment of the Supreme Court in Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited versus Essar Power Limited (2016) 9 SCC 103, the Minutes of the Arrears Committee of Supreme Court dated 8th April, 2017 and all other relevant considerations, “the concerned authorities may examine whether there is need for any changes in the judicial structure by creating appropriate fora to decongest the Constitutional Courts so as to realistically achieve the constitutional goal of speedy justice.”

(ii) In view of 14th Report of the Law Commission of India, judgment of the Supreme Court in All India Judges' Association versus Union of India (1992) 1 SCC 119, the Minutes of the Arrears Committee of Supreme Court dated 8th April, 2017, and the experience on the subject, "pending consideration of issue of All India Judicial Service, there is need to consider the proposal for central selection mechanism for filling up vacancies in courts other than the Constitutional Courts and also to consider as to how to supplement inadequacies in the present system of appointment of judges to the Constitutional Courts at all levels."

(iii) "There is need to consider in the light of observations hereinabove and all other relevant considerations whether there should be a body of full time experts without affecting independence of judiciary, to assist in identifying, scrutinizing and evaluating candidates at pre-appointment stage and to evaluate performance post appointment. The Government may also consider what changes are required in the process of evaluation of candidates at its level so that no wrong candidate is appointed. What steps are required for ensuring righteous conduct of Judges at later stage is also an issue for consideration."

(iv) "Pending legislative measures to check the malady of frequent uncalled for strikes obstructing access to justice, the Ministry of Law and Justice may compile information and present a quarterly report on strikes/abstaining from work, loss caused and action proposed. The matter can thereafter be considered in the contempt or inherent jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The Court may direct having regard to a fact situation, that the office bearers of the Bar Association/Bar Council who passed the resolution for strikes or abstaining from work or took other steps in that direction are liable to be restrained from appearing before any court for a specified period or till they purge themselves of contempt to the satisfaction of the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court based on an appropriate undertaking/conditions. They may also be liable to be removed from the position of office bearers of the Bar Association forthwith until the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court so permits on an appropriate undertaking being filed by them. This may be in addition to any other action that may be taken for the said illegal acts of obstructing access to justice. The matter may also be considered by the Supreme Court on receipt of a report from the High Courts in this regard. This does not debar report/petition from any other source even before the end of a quarter, if situation so warrants."

Further, the Union of India was directed to file an affidavit in the light of the above observations within three months.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY(NJA) (01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)

West Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions: Challenges & Opportunity: It was held from 13th to 14th January, 2018 and was organized by NJA in collaboration with the High Court of Madhya Pradesh and the Madhya Pradesh State Judicial Academy. The conference was attended by 72 participants.

South Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions: Challenges & Opportunity: It was held from 24th to 25th February, 2018 and was organized by NJA in collaboration with the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad and the Andhra Pradesh Judicial Academy. A total of 94 participants took part in discourses during this Conference.

North Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions: Challenges & Opportunity: It was held from 17th to 18th March, 2018 and was organized by NJA in collaboration with the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the Chandigarh Judicial Academy. A total of 113 participants took part in discourses during this Conference.

National Orientation Programme for Junior Division Judges: It was held from 5th to 11th January, 2018. The sessions were designed to provide a forum for participant officers to share experiences and views with counterparts from other States; to facilitate better appreciation of the judicial role; responsibility of judicial officers in a constitutional democracy; recent developments in juridical thinking and technological advances relevant to accreting performance standards; and to deliberate on several aspects of law and practice relevant to enhancing the quality of performance.

Refresher Course for Labour Courts: It was held from 12th to 14th January, 2018. The objective of the course was to provide a forum for sharing experiences with regard to impediments to speedy and efficacious dispensation of cases and for identifying optimal solutions to contentious issues. The course aimed at facilitating discussions on evolving norms and jurisprudence in respect of labour disputes. The course involved discussions on contract labour, unfair labour practices, reinstatement, back wages, retrenchment, lay off, strikes and lockouts as well.

National Judicial Conference for Newly Elevated High Court Justices on Public Law: It was held from 19th to 21st January, 2018. The conference facilitated deliberations among participant Justices on contemporary topics such as Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in courts and court management techniques to improve efficiency and strengthen justice administration; core constitutional principles such as the concept of Judicial Review, Federal architecture, Separation of Powers, Theory of Basic Structure and Fundamental Rights under our constitutional arrangement.

National Seminar for Principal District and Sessions Judges on Constitutional and Administrative Law: It was held from 19th to 21st January, 2018. The objective of the seminar was to engage participant judges in deliberations on Constitutional and Administrative Law and application of these public law norms during adjudication within their jurisdiction. The Seminar was conceived with a view to root district level judicial officers in the Constitutional vision of justice, acquaint participants with social context judging, and sensitize them to the imperatives of adhering to and applying constitutional and administrative law norms while interpreting and executing the substantive and procedural legislative mandates applicable to causes coming up before their courts. The sessions included deliberations on the role of courts in enforcing constitutional rights and principles of natural justice alongside other seminal principles of public law which substrate all laws.

Colloquium for Superior Court Judges of Egypt (Judges of Cassation Court, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Supreme Constitutional Court): It was held from 22nd to 27th January, 2018 under the Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation program in collaboration with Ministry of External Affairs. The Colloquium substantially focused on constitutional law and interpretation including issues related to Architecture of the Indian Constitutional Arrangement, Approaches to Constitutional Interpretation and Evolving a Constitutional Vision of Justice, Vitalizing Democracy: Role of the Judiciary, A Judge in a Constitutional Democracy and Role of Constitutional Courts in Securing the Rule of Law. The Colloquium also involved discussions on Judicial Accountability, Ethics and Independence of Judiciary, Art, Craft and Science of Judgment Writing, Social Context Judging, Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Court and Case management.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices: It was held from 2nd to 4th February, 2018. The objective was to discuss developments in the area of Constitutional Law, Judicial Review, Supervisory Powers of High Courts over Subordinate Courts and Economic Crimes. Challenges and evolving jurisprudence in the area of designated themes and possible solutions were discussed. The conference facilitated sharing of experiences and insights with counterparts from across India and with panel of distinguished resource persons from the judiciary and other domain experts.

National Seminar for Principal District and Sessions Judges on Court Administration, Management and ICT: It was held from 2nd to 4th February, 2018. The Seminar was structured to facilitate deliberations on contemporary themes like re-engineering court process through technology amalgamation, stress management, court and case management to strengthen court administration. The sessions enabled discussions on effective use of ICT for digitization of records to improve functioning of the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG).

Workshop for Additional District Judges: It was held from 2nd to 4th February, 2018. The workshop provided forum for discussion on areas concerning adjudication at the District level. The sessions involved discussions on issues related to ADR system, Role of Judges in Court and Case Management, Fair Sessions Trial, Electronic Evidence, Cybercrime and Sentencing. The workshop also focused on appellate and revision jurisdiction of District Judges under criminal and civil justice administration.

National Seminar for Principal District and Sessions Judges on Access to Justice and Legal Aid: It was held from 09th to 11th February, 2018. The objective of the seminar was to address challenges which impede access to justice and provide forum for deliberations leading to formulation of strategies to ensure access to justice, despite adverse economic and social conditions. The seminar also provided platform to study current legal aid dispensation protocols with a view to streamline procedure of aid to marginalized sections of society and to study activities of Lok Adalats and the National Legal Service Authority with a view to assess their impact on the justice delivery system.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices on the Regime of Goods and Services Tax: It was held from 9th to 11th February, 2018. The conference was conceived to provide insights into the GST Act, 2017. It provided a forum for discussing normative issues pertaining to the evolution of indirect taxes, from a regime of discrete and multiple taxation to one of substantial uniformity across different tax domains and jurisdictions i.e. Federal and State. It explored and identified potential areas of conflict and litigation resultant from this legislative shift, the constitutional evolution in the area and the litigation and socio judicial implications that may arise thereby.

Workshop for Additional District Judges: It was held from 23rd to 25th February, 2018. The workshop discussed critical areas concerning adjudication at the district level. The sessions facilitated discussions on issues related to challenges in implementation of the ADR system; Sentencing; Role of Judges in Court and Case Management; Electronic Evidence; Cybercrime; and Fair Sessions Trial. The workshop also focused on appellate and revision jurisdiction of District Judges under criminal and civil justice administration.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices: It was held from 9th to 11th March, 2018. The objective was to discuss developments in the area of Constitutional Law, Judicial Review, Supervisory Powers of High Courts over Subordinate Courts and Economic Crimes. Challenges and evolving jurisprudence in the area of designated themes and possible solutions were discussed.

National Seminar for Presidents/ Members of the District Consumer Forum: It was held from 10th to 11th March 2018. The seminar was conceived as capacity building for members of the District Consumer Forum towards facilitating fair, speedy and effective disposal of cases. Sessions focused on critical issues presented for adjudication at the forum level; visit the Charter of the Parent Legislation with a view to comprehend the purposes for creation of the specialised dispute resolution agency and the practices and procedures that must substrate the adjudication process of the forum. The rights and responsibilities of consumers and service providers in the context of accelerating free market environment and recent evolutions in consumer rights were also discussed.

Training Programme for Bangladesh Judicial Officers: It was held from 16th to 22nd March, 2018. The Programme included sessions on judicial skills, Constitutional, civil, criminal, environmental and human rights laws and correlative jurisprudence. The conference acquainted participants with elements of judicial behaviour- ethics, neutrality and professionalism, skills of judging and judgment writing. The programme facilitated

discussions on court & case management and use of ICT in administration of justice.

National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices: It was held from 23rd to 25th March, 2018. The conference was designed to facilitate discussions on issues related to supervision and guidance of district judiciary, tribunalization of justice, judicial review within the democratic framework, contemporary challenges for judicial review, policing governance within separation of powers framework, construing the sounds of Constitution's speech and free and fair elections. The conference also focused on corporate fraud and jurisprudence of the PC & PNDT Act. Identifying challenges and evolving optimal solutions/strategies to effectuate qualitative justice delivery was in the agenda during the conference.

Training of Trainers of SJAs: It was held from 23rd to 25th March, 2018. The objective was to develop methodologies, pedagogies and a standard framework for Judicial training, with assistance drawn from in-house experience and domain experts; to explore new training modules for maximizing learning processes. The programme facilitated discussions and sharing of information on training methodologies, faculty, infrastructure at State Judicial Academies; and interactive sessions for exchange of knowledge and experience regarding challenges and best practices available for enhancing quality of judicial education.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES AUTHORITY (NALSA) (From 01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)

Regional Meets of State Legal Services Authorities (SLSAs): Two Regional Meets of the State Legal Services Authorities were held at Kolkata and Lucknow on 13th January, 2018 and 14th January, 2018 respectively. The themes of the meetings were “Evaluation and Review of the work performance of SLSAs on Legal Aid”, and “National Lok Adalats and implementation of NALSA Schemes & identification of the areas for expansion of the SLSAs activities under the NALSA Schemes”.

National Lok Adalat: NALSA organised a National Lok Adalat on 10th February, 2018 throughout the country.

16th All India Meet of the State Legal Services Authorities: The Meet was held at Guwahati, Assam on 17th and 18th March, 2018. The objective of holding the Meet was to check out strategies for infusing more vibrancy in the legal services institutions all over India and also discuss the ways and means to enable the needy to access justice and realisation of their rights. Various resolutions were passed in the 16th All India Meet.

FOREIGN DELEGATION IN SUPREME COURT (From 01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)

On 24th March, 2018, Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India had a meeting at his Residential Office with a German Delegation headed by Mrs. Elke Budenbender, W/o German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier.

SOME IMPORTANT VISITS AND CONFERENCES (From 01-01-2018 to 31-03-2018)

1. Hon'ble Shri Dipak Misra, Chief Justice of India presided and delivered Address at the Third Foundation Day Lecture of National Law University Odisha, Cuttack on 17th March, 2018.

2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jasti Chelameswar visited (i) Kochi to attend the Inaugural Function of a Three Day National Seminar on "Contours of Right to Privacy: New Dimensions and Emerging Challenges" on 6th January, 2018; (ii) Bengaluru to Inaugurate the Ramaiah Public Policy Centre of Gokula Education Foundation on 20th January, 2018; (iii) Vijayawada (a) to attend Sri Kantamneni Ravindra Rao Memorial Lecture on 28th January, 2018 and (b) to attend the Golden Jubilee Celebrations of Viswabharati School, Gudivada on 24th February, 2018; (iv) Guwahati to attend the First Convocation of the National Law University, Assam on 25th February, 2018 and (v) Vijayawada, to visit Rythu Nestham Foundation (Farmers Training Centre) in Guntur, A.P on 11th March, 2018.

3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madan Bhimaroo Lokur visited (i) Jabalpur to attend the West Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions: Challenges & Opportunities" being organized by NJA in collaboration with the High Court of Madhya Pradesh and the Madhya Pradesh State Judicial Academy from 13th to 14th January, 2018; (ii) Lucknow to inaugurate the First National Conference of the Computer Committees of the High Courts at Judicial Training and Research Institute (JTRI) from 20th and 21st January, 2018; (iii) Hyderabad to attend the Regional Consultation on Effective Implementation of Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 organised by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana in collaboration with the Supreme Court Juvenile Justice Committee and the UNICEF at Dr. Marri Chenna Reddy Human Resources Development Institute, on 17th February, 2018 and (iv) Bhubaneswar to attend the 4th Round Table Regional Conference on Juvenile Justice Issues held at State Judicial Academy, Cuttack on 24th March, 2018.

4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kurian Joseph visited (i) Hyderabad to attend a function on 7th January, 2018; (ii) Kochi to attend 11th Annual Convocation of the National University of Advanced Legal Studies at the NUALS Campus, Kalamassery, on 20th January, 2018; (iii) Coimbatore to attend Silver Jubilee of Trinity Matriculation Higher Secondary School, on 27th January, 2018; (iv) Chennai to attend 4th Regional Conference for Sensitization on Family Court Matters on 3rd February, 2018; (v) Bhopal to Chair National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices on the Regime on Goods and Services Tax organized by the National Judicial Academy, Bhopal on 10th February, 2018; (vi) Greater Noida to attend Third Prof. N.R. Madhava Menon SAARCLAW Moot Competition & Law Students' Conference 2017-18 at Lloyd Law College, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh on 17th February, 2018; (vii) Hyderabad to attend "Annual Conference on Bench and Bar Relationships at the High Court Level" organized by the National Judicial Academy, Bhopal on 24th February, 2018; (viii) Kochi (a) for Inauguration of the Golden Jubilee Celebrations of St. Aloysius College, and (b) to attend "Preserve Nature Protect Wildlife"- Lawyers' Environmental Awareness Forum (Leaf) organized by the Kerala High Court Advocates'

Association, on 26th February, 2018; (ix) Bhopal to Chair National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices organized by the National Judicial Academy, on 24th March, 2018; and (x) Perumbavoor for inauguration of New Court Complex, Perumbavoor on 31st March, 2018.

5. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arjan Kumar Sikri visited (i) Chandigarh to attend the North Zone Regional Conference on Enhancing Excellence of the Judicial Institutions: Challenges & Opportunity organized by National Judicial Academy on 17th March, 2018; (ii) Mumbai to attend the GENNEXT BUSINESS & LAW CONGRESS 2018 organized by the Legal Era Group on 24th March, 2018; and (iii) Goa to attend a seminar on 'International Commercial Law' hosted by the International Law Association, Goa on 30th March, 2018.

6. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sharad Arvind Bobde visited (i) Mumbai to attend Arvind Bobde Memorial Cricket Match, organized by Advocates' Association of Western India, Maharashtra, on 10th February, 2018; (ii) Guwahati to attend the inauguration of the Academic Building of the Judicial Academy, Assam on 24th February, 2018 and First Convocation of the National Law University, Assam on 25th February, 2018; (iii) Amravati to Inaugurate the New Building of Amravati District & Sessions Court, Amravati (Maharashtra) on 10th March, 2018; (iv) Visakhapatnam to deliver the lecture on 17th March, 2018; and (v) Mumbai to inaugurate the Seminar organized by Telecom Disputes Settlements & Appellate Tribunal on "Fundamentals & Future of Dispute Resolution in ABC & T (Airport, Broadcasting, Cyber & Telecom)" on 24th March, 2018.

7. Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. K. Agrawal visited (i) Kozhikode (Kerala) to participate in the International Peace Conference at Jamia Markaz, Karanthur, Kozhikode on 6th January, 2018; and (ii) Aligarh (Uttar Pradesh) to participate in the Sir Syed and Surana and Surana National Criminal Law Moot Court Competition, 2018 on 24th February, 2018.

8. Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.V. Ramana visited Vizianagaram District (Andhra Pradesh) to participate as Chief Guest in the Inaugural Function of the New Three Court Building Complex, on 17th March, 2018.

9. Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.F. Nariman visited Goa to attend All India Seminar on "International Commercial Law" organized by International Law Association from 28th March, 2018 to 1st April, 2018.

10. Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Nageswara Rao visited (i) Visakhapatnam (a) to preside over as Chief Guest in the Prof. S. Venkata Raman Endowment Lecture organized by Andhra University Law College and to (b) attend Loknayak Foundation Literary Award Presentation to Meegada Ramalinga Swamy at Kala Bharthi, Maddilapalem, Visakhapatnam, on 20th January, 2018; (ii) Guntur (Andhra Pradesh) to attend Golden Jubilee Celebrations of PAS College, Pedanandipadu, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh on 3rd February, 2018; (iii) Vijayawada to attend Swarna Bharat Trust Programme on 4th February, 2018; (iv) Mumbai to participate in the "Arvind Bobde Memorial Cricket Match" at Wankhede Stadium, Mumbai organized by Advocates' Association of Western India, Maharashtra on 10th February, 2018; (v) Tirur (Kerala) to inaugurate 'Monitoring Lawyers-An extensive training programme for enhancing the professional skills of Advocacy' organized by the

Bar Association, Tirur, on 18th February, 2018; (vi) Osmanabad to preside over as Chief Guest in the “Inaugural Session of the National Level Moot Court Competition” organized by the Law College, Osmanabad on 24th February, 2018; (vii) Hyderabad to address National Judicial Academy organized Session –5 “Access to Justice: Information and Communication Technology in Courts at Hyderabad” on 25th February, 2018; (viii) Guntur (a) to preside over as Chief Guest at the “5th Anniversary Spoorthi Awards Function” organized by Bommidala Srikrishnamurthy Foundation, on 25th February, 2018; and (b) to deliver lecture at Vasireddy Venkatadri Institute of Technology on 26th February, 2018; (ix) Visakhapatnam (a) to participate in the “Justice Jasti Chelameswar first endowment lecture” at Law College, Visakhapatnam and (b) to preside over as ‘Chief Guest’ in Valedictory Ceremony of DSNLU: Model Assembly of Member States on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) on 17th March, 2018; and (x) Bhopal to deliver lecture on Contemporary Challenges for Judicial Review, Policing Governance within Separation of Powers framework at the National Judicial Conference for High Court Chief Justices on 24th March, 2018.

11. Hon’ble Mr. Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul visited (i) Hyderabad to attend the South Zone Regional Conference on the topic “Access to Justice: Court and Case Management” organized by National Judicial Academy on 25th February, 2018; (ii) Pune to inaugurate 8th Justice P.N. Bhagwati International Moot Court Competition on Human Rights organized by the Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed to be University, New Law College, Pune on 24th March, 2018; and (iii) Goa to chair the Session on “Development in International Commercial and Consumer Laws” at the All India Seminar on “International Commercial Law” organized by International Law Association, Delhi on 30th March, 2018.

12. Hon’ble Mr. Justice Mohan M. Shantanagoudar visited Bengaluru to attend an official function at Karnataka State Judicial Academy, on 24th March, 2018.

13. Hon’ble Mr. Justice Navin Sinha visited (i) Bhopal to participate in a Training Programme for Bangladesh Judicial Officers conducted by the National Judicial Academy at Bhopal on 5th January, 2018; and (ii) Patna for Convocation of Chanakya National Law University, Patna as Distinguished Guest on 10th March, 2018.

14. Hon’ble Mr. Justice Deepak Gupta visited (i) Raipur to attend Executive Council Meeting at the Hidayatullah National Law University, on 1st January, 2018; (ii) Bhopal to attend Colloquium for Superior Courts Judges of Egypt, organized by National Judicial Academy at Bhopal on 26th January, 2018; (iii) Bhubaneswar to attend the 4th Round Table Regional Conference (Eastern Zone) with focus on “Integrated Child Protection Scheme” organized by Orissa High Court Juvenile Justice Committee on 24th March, 2018; and (iv) Shimla to attend a programme at the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla and deliver Lecture on ‘Effective Court Management for Speedy Justice’ on 31st March, 2018.



The
Supreme Court Reports
(WEEKLY)
Official Journal
of Reportable Supreme Court Decisions

[2018] 1 S.C.R. (Part-I)

Highlights of the issue

Slum dwellers in Mumbai - Directions issued for rehabilitation of eligible occupiers/Slum dwellers.

Susme Builders Pvt. Ltd. v. Chief Executive Officer, Slum Rehabilitation Authority ...1

121 year old Mullaperiyar dam in the State of Kerala - Directions issued for Disaster Management.

Russel Joy v. Union of India ...206

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