

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. SESSION-1

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Role of Registrar (Vigilance/Intelligence) in ensuring Judicial Accountability | 01 |
| A. High Courts Rules on Functions of Registrar (Vigilance/Intelligence) | 02 |
| B. Chief Justices Conferences' Resolution on Vigilance Cell | 13 |
| C. <i>Corruption and the Judicial System</i> : Dr. G. Mohan Gopal | 15 |
| D. <i>Strengthening the Court System to combat corruption</i> | 21 |
| By: Justice R.K. Abichandani | |
| E. <i>Independence of Judiciary-some Latent Dangers</i> : Justice J.S. Verma | 25 |
| F. <i>Judicial Independence: Is it Threatened?</i> : Justice J.S. Verma | 33 |
| G. News paper item published in <i>The Telegraph</i> | 42 |
| H. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System Government of India, on Accountability | 44 |
| I. Quality of the Judiciary and Integrity in Ancient India | 46 |
| J. Kautilya on Corruption in Judiciary and need for 'Vigilance' | 47 |

III. SESSION-2

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Verification of character and antecedents of the Judicial Officers prior to their appointment/promotion | 48 |
| Verification of Antecedents of Selected Candidate: Important Case Laws | 49 |
| <i>K.Vijaya Lakshmi v. Govt. of A.P.Tr.Sec.Home & Anr.</i> 2013-(005)-SCC-0489-SC | 50 |
| <i>Lerner v. Casey</i> , http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/357/468.html | 50 |
| <i>Delhi Administration v. Sushil Kumar</i> (1996) 11 SCC 605 | 51 |
| <i>Ajit Kumar S/O Shri Balwant Singh v. Govt. of N.C.T.D.</i> MANU/CA/0634/2007 | 52 |
| <i>Narender Kumar v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi</i> http://www.ejurix.com/Welcome.aspx , 2014-(CR1)-GJX-1547-DEL | 53 |
| Other relevant Judicial Decisions | 53 |
| A. Moral Turpitude explained | 53 |
| <i>Durga Singh v. The State of Punjab</i> AIR 1957 PH 97 | 53 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ✓ Consequences of false attestation | 53 |
| <i>Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Case</i> (2003) 3 SCC 437 | 53 |
| ✓ Whether private individual can seek writ remedy against the Judicial Officers having doubtful character and antecedents, and also on the ground of non-disclosure of criminal record. | 54 |
| <i>Powrasamithi v. Rajan Thattil</i> 2005 (1) KLT 927 | 54 |
| B. High Courts control over District and Grassroots Judiciary: observations in- <i>Shamsher Singh case</i> | 55 |
| IV. SESSION-3 | |
| Assessment and note on Annual Confidential Report: Issues and concerns | 56 |
| A. Setting the Context | 57 |
| <i>High Court of Delhi v. Sh. Purshottam Das Gupta</i> , | 58 |
| 2001-(034)-LIC-1170-DEL | |
| <i>Rajendra Singh Verma (Dead) Through Lrs. v. Lt. Governor of NCT of Delhi</i> | 59 |
| 2011-(010)-SCC-0001-SC | |
| <i>SC in M. S. Bindra v. UOI</i> (1990) 7 SCC 310 (Para 13) | 59 |
| <i>High Court of Punjab & Haryana v. Ishwar Chand Jain</i> , (1999) 4 SCC 579 | 60 |
| Important Case Laws on ACRs | 60 |
| <i>Rajendra Singh Verma (Dead) Through Lrs. v. Lt. Governor of NCT of Delhi & Anr</i> | 60 |
| 2011-(010)-SCC-0001-SC | |
| Compulsory Retirement: Relevance of ACR | 61 |
| <i>State of U.P. and Another v. Bihari Lal</i> (1994) Supp (3) SCC 593 | 61 |
| <i>Telegraphs Board v. C. S. N. Murthy</i> (1992) 2 SCC 317 | 61 |
| <i>Union of India v. Col. J. N. Sinha and another</i> | |
| 1970 (2) SCC 458 | 61 |
| ✓ Relevance of un-communicated remarks in ACR | 61 |
| <i>Baikuntha Nath Das and Another v. Chief District Medical Officer, Baripada and another</i> | 61 |
| (1989) 4 SCC 664 | |
| <i>Brij Mohan Singh Chopra v. State of Punjab</i> (1987) 2 SCC 188 | 62 |
| <i>Union of India v. M. E. Reddy</i> (1980) 2 SCC 15 | 62 |
| ✓ Assessment of ACRs: Extent of Judicial Review | 63 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Syed T.A. Naqshbandi v. State of J&K</i> ((2003) 9 SCC 592) | 63 |
| ✓ Evaluation of ACR | 63 |
| <i>High Court of Judicature, Patna, Through R.G. v. Shyam Deo Singh</i> | 63 |
| judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=41350 | |
| ✓ Washed Off Theory | 64 |
| <i>Rajasthan State Road Transport Corp. v. Babu Lal Jangir</i> | 64 |
| 2014-(101)-AIR-0142-SC | |

V. SESSION 4 AND 5

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Conducting discrete inquiry against Judicial Officers: Issues and concerns | 65 |
| Conducting inquiry against Staff of Judiciary: Issues and concerns | |
| ✓ SC observations on Inquiry against Judicial Officers | 66 |
| <i>R.C. Chandel v. High Court of M.P</i> (2012) 8 SCC 58 | |
| ✓ Landmark Judicial Decisions on ‘Inquiry’ | 67 |
| <i>R.C. Sood v. High Court of Judicature at Rajasthan and Ors</i> | 67 |
| <u>MANU/SC/1237/1994</u> | |
| <i>Anowar Hussain v. Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee and Ors.</i> AIR 1965 SC 1651 | 67 |
| 1. Relevant Case Law on Inquiry against Judicial Officers | 68 |
| <i>Registrar General & Anr v. Jayshree Chamanlal Buddhbhatti</i> 2014(1) AJR 118 | |
| 2. In cases where termination is resulting by way of Punishment: Proper Inquiry is the mandate | 69 |
| <i>Shamser Singh v. State of Punjab</i> AIR 1974 SC 2192 | 69 |
| <i>Anoop Jaiswal v. Government of India</i> , (1984) 2 SCC 369 | 70 |
| <i>Chandra Prakash Shahi v. State of U.P.</i> , (2000) 5 SCC 152 | 70 |
| Can an Inquiry be initiated against the authority exercising Quasi-Judicial functions? | 71 |
| <i>Union of India v. K.K. Dhawan</i> (1993)2 SCC 56 | 71 |
| 4. Whether the prolonged delay vitiates the Inquiry | 71 |
| <i>Government of Andhra Pradesh and others v. V.Appala Swamy</i> 2007(6) ALT24 (SC) | |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 5. Removal of Probationer: Is regular inquiry mandatory? | 72 |
| <i>Pavanendra Narayan Verma v. Sanjay Gandhi PGI of Medical Sciences and Another</i> , AIR 2002 SC 23 | 72 |
| <i>Parshotam Lal Dhingra v. Union of India: Magna Carta of Indian Civil Servants</i> | 73 |
| 6. Disciplinary/Departmental/Fact finding Inquiry: Scope of Judicial Review | 73 |
| 7. Fact Finding Inquiry: Observance of Principles of Natural Justice | 74 |
| <i>Justice P.D. Dinakaran v. Hon'ble Judges Inquiry Committee</i> | 74 |
| (2011)15 SCC 402 106 | |
| <i>Union of India v. P.K. Roy</i> AIR 1968 SC 850 | 74 |
| <i>Suresh Koshy George v. University of Kerala</i> AIR 1969 SC 198 | 74 |
| <i>A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India</i> (1969) 2 SCC 262 | 74 |
| <i>State of Orissa v. Dr. (Miss) Binapani Dei</i> (1967) 2 SCR 625 | 76 |
| <i>Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India</i> 1978 AIR 597 | 76 |
| | |
| VI. SESSION-6 | 77 |
| | |
| Role of Registrar (Vigilance/Intelligence) as Appellate Authority under RTI Act, 2005 | 80 |
| Judiciary on importance of RTI | 80 |
| <i>Sahara India Real Estate Corpn. Ltd. v. SEBI</i> ((2012) 10 SCC 603) | 80 |
| <i>State of Karnataka v. Associated Management of English Medium Primary & Secondary Schools</i> ((2014) 9 SCC 485 | 80 |
| <i>Namit Sharma v. Union of India</i> | 81 |
| http://supremecourtfindia.nic.in/outtoday/wc21012.pdf | |
| | |
| Recent Judgements on RTI wherein the Information is sought from the High Court | 83 |
| <i>Public Information Officer, Registrar(Administration), High Court, Madras v. Central Information Commission, Represented by its Registrar, New Delhi</i> | 83 |
| http://judis.nic.in/judis_chennai/Judge_Result_Dispatch.asp?MyChk=204644 | |
| <i>The Registrar General v. K. Elango</i> 2013 (5) MLJ 134 | 83 |
| <i>B. S. Mathur v. Public Information Officer of Delhi High Court</i> | 89 |

| | |
|--|----|
| [180(2011) DLT303] | |
| Some of the important cases on RTI relating to Vigilance and Inquiry | 93 |
| Vigilance report findings can be disclosed [Sec. 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act] | |
| <i>P.P.K. Rana v. CPIO, Delhi Police and AA, Delhi Police</i> CIC/AT/A/2006/00322, | 93 |
| Dated: 11/12/2006 | |
| <i>Sarvesh Kaushal v. F.C.I, and others</i> | 93 |
| No. 243/ICPB/2006 and 244/ICPB/2006 | |
| Public authority to disclose information if public interest outweighs the | 93 |
| harm to the protected interests [Sec. 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act] | |
| <i>S.R. Goyal v. PIO, Services Department, Delhi,</i> No. CIC/WB/A/20060523 | 93 |
| <i>N.B.S. Martian v. Dept. of Post</i> No. 267/ICPB/2006 | 93 |
| | |
| No disclosure of third-party confidential information | 94 |
| [Sec. 8(1) (j) of the RTI Act] | |
| <i>A.P. Singh v. Punjab National Bank</i> No.12/IC(A)/ 2006 | 94 |
| <i>Nahar Singh v. Deputy Commissioner of Police & PIO,</i> | 95 |
| <i>Delhi Police</i> CIC/AT/C/2006/00452 | |
| Reasons for rejection of requests for information must be clearly provided | 95 |
| [Sec. 8(1) of the RTI Act] | |
| <i>Dhananjay Tripathi v. Banaras Hindu University,</i> CIC/OK/A/00163 | 95 |
| <i>Dr. Anand Akhila v. Council of Scientific and Industrial Research</i> | 95 |
| CIC/EB/C/2006/00040 | |
| Judgment of Delhi High Court on Judges Assets Matter | 95 |
| <i>The CPIO, Supreme Court of India v. Subash Chandra Agrawal and Another</i> | 96 |
| W.P(C) 288/2009 | |
| <i>Mangto Ram v. Addl. Commissioner & PIO,</i> | 96 |
| <i>Delhi Police</i> CIC/AT/A/2006/00355 | |
| | |
| No disclosure in case of pending trial [Sec. 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act] | 96 |
| <i>Ashok Agarwal, Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax v. Department of Revenue,</i> | 96 |
| Appeal No. 01/IC(A)/2006, dated 16/02/2006 | |
| | |
| Self- disclosure by public authorities (Sec. 4 of RTI Act, 2005) | 96 |
| Person seeking information not to give reasons | 97 |

Surupsingh Hrya Naik v. State of Maharashtra, A.I.R 2007 Born 121 97

VII. SESSION 7 AND 8

Session-7: “Inspection of Courts” 98

And

Session-8: Follow-up action on ‘Inspection/Inquiry Reports’

Some of the thought evoking observations on power of supervision and Inspection 99

All India Judges' Association v. Union of India, 1992 AIR 165 99

H. C. Puttaswamy case (1991 Lab IC 235 (SC)) (Para 11) 99

Supreme Court Advocates on Record Association v. U.O.I., reported as (1993) 4 SCC 441 99

High Court of Punjab and Haryana v. Ishwar Chand Jain (1069) 3 JT (SC) 266 99

‘Identifying the different objectives of ‘Inspection’ and ‘Vigilance’ 100

<http://mphc.gov.in/pdf/circulars-orders/Inspection-and-Vigilance.pdf>

State of Punjab v. Ram Singh Ex. Constable, AIT 1992 SC 2188 102

Important Cases on ‘Inspection of Courts’ 103

Bishwanath Prasad Singh, v. State of Bihar and Others (1993) 4 SCC 288 103

V.P.Indira Devi v. The High Court of Kerala WP (C).No. 8359 of 2014 105

High Court of Delhi v. Shr. Purshottam Das Gupta and Others 2001 (90) DLT 203 146 106

VIII. Session-9 108

Sexual harassment at work place- Role of Registrar (Vigilance/Intelligence)

Some insights on menace of Sexual harassment at Workplace 109

Sri Subrata Kumar Choudhury v. State Bank of India (2008) 4CALLT183 (HC) 109

G. Pushkala v. High Court of Judicature 2007 (4) M.L.J. 692 109

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, (JT 1997 (7) SC 384) 109

International Law on Sexual Harassment at Work Place 110

A. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979 110

| | |
|---|------------|
| B. Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, 1995 | 110 |
| C. Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, 1993 | 111 |
| D. Sexual Harassment Cases against Judicial Officers | 112 |
| <i>Additional District and Sessions Judge 'X' v. Registrar General, High Court of Madhya Pradesh and others</i> | 112 |
| http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/imgs1.aspx?filename=42205 | |
| <i>Smt. Sushila Nagar v. The High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan & Ors.</i> | 117 |
| 2004 [2006] RD-RJ 1698 | |
| Sexual Harassment in the Workplace Guidelines and norms laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in <i>Vishaka and Others v. State of Rajasthan and Others</i> (JT 1997 (7) SC 384) | 120 |
| <i>Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra</i> AIR 1999 SC 625 | 123 |
| IX. Session-10 | |
| Contribution of Registrar (Vigilance/ Intelligence) in maintaining Higher Judicial Standards | 124 |
| Judicial Ethics: Exploring Misconduct and Accountability for Judges | 125 |
| By: Wayne MacKay | |
| http://cjei.org/publications/mackay.html | |
| The Corruption in the Judiciary and its Defining, Delimitation and Elimination | 149 |
| By: Aleksandar Shopov | |
| www.10iacc.org/download/w1-06.pdf | |