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## SESSION - 1

### THE CONSTITUTIONAL VISION OF JUSTICE: ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fali S. Nariman</td>
<td>“Our Quest for Justice – and Why it Eludes Us”</td>
<td>Quest for Justice : Collection of Essays (Published By NIA Bhopal-2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Important Precedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Justice K. S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) &amp; Another vs. Union of India &amp; ors.</td>
<td>(Right to Privacy)</td>
<td>2017 SCC OnLine SC 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shayara Bano vs. Union of India &amp; ors.</td>
<td>(Triple Talaq Judgement)</td>
<td>2017 SCC OnLine SC 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Subramanian Swamy vs. Union of India (UOI), Ministry of Law and Ors.</td>
<td>(2016) 7 SCC 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nabam Rebia and Ors. vs. Deputy Speaker and Ors.</td>
<td>(2016) 8 SCC 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supreme Court Advocates on Record Association vs. Union of India</td>
<td>(NJAC Judgement)</td>
<td>2015 AIR SCW 5457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SESSION - 2

#### COURT MANAGEMENT

1. **Justice P. Sathasivam, “Effective District Administration and Court Management”**  
   Lecture delivered at Tamil Nadu State Judicial Academy on 15th June 2013

2. **W.S. Martin, “Court Administrators and the Judiciary — Partners in the Delivery of Justice”**  
   (Excerpts) International Journal for Court Administration, 2014, 6(2), 3–18

3. **Bert Mann, “Past & Future for Management of Courts”**  
   International Journal for Court Administration, 2010, 1 – 8

   Nyay Deep, XVI (III), July 2015, 13-35

5. **Justice Sunil Ambwani, “Justice Administration: Case and Court Management”**  
   Lecture Delivered at IJTR, Lucknow on 31st January, 2009

6. **Justice M. B. Lokur “Case Management Through Court Annexed Mediation and Other Developments”**  

7. **Ijoma Collins E. & Fazari Giuseppe N., “Applying the Case Management CourTools: Findings from an Urban Trial Court”**  
   International Journal for Court Administration, 2012, 1 – 10

#### Important Precedents

1. **Imtiyaz Ahmed vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & ors.**  
   *(2012) 2 SCC 688*

2. **Hussain and another vs. Union of India & another**  
   *(2017) 5 SCC 702*

### SESSION - 3

#### INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY IN COURTS

1. **Justice Swatanter Kumar, “Increased Use of Technology in Courts: Benefits and Pitfalls”**  
   Journal of Delhi Judicial Academy, January 2011, 7(1), 7 - 17

2. **Atul Kaushik, “Bringing the ‘E’ to Judicial Efficiency: Implementing the e-Courts System in India”**  


   *Common Clause*, 35(1), January-March, 2016, 5-12


**SESSION - 4**

**THEORIES OF JUDICIAL REVIEW**


2. **Wojciech Sadurski**, “Judicial Review and the Protection of Constitutional Rights”

3. **Manoj Mate**, “Globalization, Rights and Judicial Review in the Supreme Court of India”

4. **Larry D. Kramer**, “Judicial Supremacy and the End of Judicial Restraint”
   *California Law Review*, 100(3), 2012, 621-634

5. **Luc B. Tremblay**, “The legitimacy of judicial review: The limits of dialogue between courts and legislatures”


**Important Precedents**

1. **Prafulla Kumar vs. Bank of Commerce, Khulna**
   *AIR 1947 PC 60*

2. **Indira Nehru Gandhi vs. Raj Narain & Another**
   *AIR 1975 SC 1590*

3. **L. Chandra Kumar vs. Union of India**
   *AIR 1997 SC 1125*

4. **I. R. Coelho (Dead) by LRs vs. State of Tamil Nadu & ors.**
   *(2007) 2 SCC 1*
## SESSION - 5
### SEPARATION OF POWERS

1. **Philip B. Kurland**, “The Rise and Fall of the "Doctrine" of Separation of Powers”  

2. **Jessica Bulman-Pozen**, “Federalism as a Safeguard of the Separation of Powers”  
   *Columbia Law Review, 112(3), 2012, 459-506*

   *Peace Research, 37(1), 2005, 113-122*

   *World Politics, 64(4), 2012, 587-621*

## SESSION - 6
### ALLOCATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS: THE FEDERAL ARCHITECTURE

   *The Indian Journal of Political Science, 67(2), 2006, 303-310*

2. **Satya Prakash Dash**, “Indian Federalism & Distribution Of Responsibilities”  
   *The Indian Journal of Political Science, 68(4), 2007, 697-710*

3. **B.N. Srikrishna**, “Beyond Federalism”  
   *India International Centre Quarterly, 38(3/4), 2011-2012, 386-407*

   *Book Titled, ‘Courts in Federal Countries’, University of Toronto Press, 2017*

5. **Benjamin N. Schoenfeld**, “Federalism In India”  
   *The Indian Journal of Political Science, 20(1), 1959, 52-62*

   *The Indian Journal of Political Science, 11(4), 1950, 43-47*

### Important Precedents

1. **Gujarat University v. Krishna Ranganath Mudholkar**  
   *AIR 1963 SC 703*
### SESSION - 7

**FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND RESTRICTIONS ON ENTRANCED RIGHTS**

1. *Robert A. Samek*, “Untrenching fundamental rights”  

2. *Alan Gewirth*, “Are There Any Absolute Rights?”  
   The Philosophical Quarterly, 31(122), 1982, 1-16

   The International Journal of Political Science, 70(3), 2009, 779-786

### Important Precedents

1. Ram Jawaya Kapur vs. State of Punjab  
   AIR 1955 SC 549

2. State of Bombay vs. R. M. D. Chamarbaugwala  
   AIR 1957 SC 699

3. State of Bombay vs. Kathi Kalu Oghad & Ors  
   AIR 1961 SC 1808

4. Guru Datta Sharma vs. State of Bihar  
   AIR 1961 SC 1684

5. Babulal Parate vs State of Maharashtra & Ors.  
   AIR 1961 SC 884

6. Raghubar Dayal Jai Prakash vs. The Union Of India And Others  
   AIR 1962 SC 263

7. Kedar Nath Singh vs. State Of Bihar  
   AIR 1962 SC 955

8. Ranjit D. Udeshi vs. State of Maharashtra  
   AIR 1965 SC 881

9. E. M. Sankaran Namboodiripad vs. T. Narayanan Nambiar  
   AIR 1970 SC 2015
## Important Precedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precedent</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala</td>
<td>AIR 1973 SC 1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indira Nehru Gandhi vs. Raj Narain &amp; Another</td>
<td>AIR 1975 SC 1590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Session - 8

**Theory of Basic Structure: Contours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minerva Mills Ltd. &amp; Ors. vs. Union Of India &amp; Ors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M. Nagaraj and Others vs. Union Of India &amp; Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I.R. Coelho (Dead) By LRs vs. State Of Tamil Nadu &amp; Ors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION - 9**

**ART OF HEARING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Paula Lustbader, “Listening from the Bench Fosters Civility and Promotes Justice”  
| 2 | Jonathan R. Cohen, “Open minded Listening”  
   Charlotte Law Review, 5, 2014, 139-164 |