

# NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY

**P-1089: National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices**

9<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2018

**Programme Coordinator** : Ms. Paiker Nasir, Faculty, NJA, Bhopal

**No. of Participants** : 21

**No. of forms received** : 15

I. OVERALL				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The objective of the Program was clear to me	<b>93.33</b>	<b>6.67</b>	-	-
b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	<b>66.67</b>	<b>33.33</b>	-	15. It will enhance the ethics.
c. Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	<b>73.33</b>	<b>26.67</b>	-	-
d. I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	<b>73.33</b>	<b>26.67</b>	-	-
e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	<b>46.67</b>	<b>53.33</b>	-	15. From participants no active participation.
II. KNOWLEDGE				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
The program provided knowledge (or provided links / references to knowledge) which is:				
a. Useful to my work	<b>73.33</b>	<b>26.67</b>	-	-
b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	<b>80.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	-	-
c. Up to date	<b>86.67</b>	<b>13.33</b>	-	-

d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice	<b>80.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	-	-
e. Related to International Legal Norms	<b>14.29</b>	<b>78.57</b>	<b>7.14</b>	
<b>III. STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM</b>				
<b>PROPOSITIONS</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
a. The structure and sequence of the program was logical	<b>80.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	-	-
b. The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz.				
(i) Case studies were relevant	<b>71.43</b>	<b>28.57</b>	-	-
(ii) Interactive sessions were fruitful	<b>71.43</b>	<b>28.57</b>	-	-
(iii) Audio Visual Aids were beneficial	<b>35.71</b>	<b>57.14</b>	<b>7.14</b>	5. Needs to be used more.
<i>(To be modified as per the sessions planned)</i>				
<b>IV SESSIONS WISE VETTING</b>				
<b>Parameters</b>				
<b>Session</b>	<b>Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized</b>		<b>The Session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons</b>	
	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory
1	<b>64.29</b>	<b>35.71</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>
2	<b>71.43</b>	<b>28.57</b>	<b>80.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>
3	<b>57.14</b>	<b>42.86</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>
4	<b>71.43</b>	<b>28.57</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>30.00</b>
5	<b>64.29</b>	<b>35.71</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>
6	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>66.67</b>	<b>33.33</b>
7	<b>78.57</b>	<b>21.43</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>
8	<b>92.86</b>	<b>7.14</b>	<b>100.00</b>	-
<b>V. PROGRAM MATERIALS</b>				
<b>PROPOSITIONS</b>	<b>To a great extent</b>	<b>To some extent</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
a. The Program material is useful and relevant	<b>100.00</b>	-	-	15. Requires neat printing.

b. The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/ current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area	<b>86.67</b>	<b>13.33</b>	-	-
c. The content was organized and easy to follow	<b>86.67</b>	<b>13.33</b>	-	-

#### VIII. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

<p>1. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme</p>	<p>1. <b>Session 1:</b> High Courts: Guardians of District Judiciary; <b>Session 2:</b> Tribunalization of Justice: Boon or Bane; <b>Session 3:</b> Superior Courts: Managing Judicial Review within the Democratic Framework and <b>Session 4:</b> Contemporary Challenges for Judicial Review, Policing Governance within Separation of Powers Framework.</p> <p>2. Judges of High Court are guardians of judiciary, judicial review, Free and fair elections. Corporate Fraud and PC &amp; PNDT Act.</p> <p>3. It is enlightening with regards the manner in which orders can be structured to meet the challenges within the limits of the jurisdiction.</p> <p>4. The way of presentation is easily understandable. The interaction session is very useful. Sufficient time is given to interact.</p> <p>5. Interactions on judicial review, Role of High Court on sub-ordinate courts, discussion on corporate fraud.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. 1. Good exposure of the various aspects of law; 2. Knowledge enhancement; 3. Good interaction with brother judges.</p> <p>8. 1. Regarding election; 2. PC &amp; PNDT Act; 3. Tribunalization.</p> <p>9. Response to this section would be reflected as per feedback furnished in the previous section.</p> <p>10. Information delivered on Corporate Frauds and cultural, social and economic factors that promote gender bias and understanding how to attempt to conduct free &amp; fair elections.</p> <p>11. No comments.</p> <p>12. 1. The need for judicial review and the scope and applicability of the same; 2. The sociological aspect related to gender bias.</p> <p>13. Complete programme was good and gave me so many learning achievements.</p>
--	---

	<p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. 1. Introduced to new subjects; 2. Laws relating to the judges; 3. Role of Judges.</p>
<p>2. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why</p>	<p>1. Sessions indicated.</p> <p>2. <b>Session 1:</b> High Courts: Guardians of District Judiciary; <b>Session 3:</b> Superior Courts: Managing Judicial Review within the Democratic Framework and <b>Session 8:</b> Jurisprudence of the PC &amp; PNDT Act &amp; Cultural, Social and Economic Factors that Promote Gender Bias: Context of the PC &amp; PNDT Act in India.</p> <p>3. <b>Session 3:</b> Superior Courts: Managing Judicial Review within the Democratic Framework.</p> <p>4. Interaction and debate.</p> <p>5. Judicial review of legislation.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. One with Justice Uday U. Lalit.</p> <p>8. Election related issues.</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>10. <b>Session 7:</b> Corporate Fraud &amp; Manipulation: Repercussions, Deterrent Mechanisms &amp; Judicial Approach; <b>Session 8:</b> Jurisprudence of the PC &amp; PNDT Act &amp; Cultural, Social and Economic Factors that Promote Gender Bias: Context of the PC &amp; PNDT Act in India- Speakers were good and well researched.</p> <p>11. No comments.</p> <p>12. Interactive sessions was most useful as it allowed us to raise doubts.</p> <p>13. Discussion part.</p> <p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. Speech of the resource persons.</p>
<p>3. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>	<p>1. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>2. <b>Session 4:</b> Contemporary Challenges for Judicial Review, Policing Governance within Separation of Powers Framework and <b>Session 5:</b> Construing the Sounds of Constitution’s Speech: Meanings Beyond Text.</p> <p>3. <b>Session 2:</b> Tribunalization of Justice: Boon or Bane- Not very relevant in our day to day work.</p> <p>4. Interaction.</p> <p>5. Free and fair election.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p>

	<p>7. First.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>10. <b>Session 1:</b> High Courts: Guardians of District Judiciary- Practical tips were few.</p> <p>11. No comments.</p> <p>12. Nil</p> <p>13. All is good.</p> <p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. Participation of the participants judges not active because of paucity of time for interaction.</p>
<p>4. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p>	<p>1. Can still make the module more practically useful in day to day work.</p> <p>2. Printing of compilation needs improvement.</p> <p>3. We may be asked detailed written comments/ideas on the various sessions at the end.</p> <p>4. Does not arise.</p> <p>5. Audio-video clipping may be used.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. There should be more interactive session by extending the time limit.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>10. Please send study material in advance by e-mail or otherwise.</p> <p>11. Permit the spouse of participant to come here.</p> <p>12. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>13. May have some Resource Persons from other fields of society. Their views may help in development of law.</p> <p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. 1. Time for interactive session is not sufficient; 2. Study material should be made available well in advance.</p>