## NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY

## P-920: National Conference of the Presiding Officers of Labour Courts/Tribunals: 10-04-15-12-04-15

Name of Programme Coordinator: Saumya Sharma

No of Participants: 20 No of Evaluation Forms: 20

1 1	o of Evaluation Forms: 20	_	OFFE 1	-	
		I.	OVERAL	L	
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a.	The objective of the Program was clear to me	89.47	10.529	0	8. The Programme is subject . Basic Practical and Procedural work of judge are not Discussed
b.	The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	88.88	11.11	0	
c.	Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	78.94	21.05	0	
d.	I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	82.35	17.64	0	9. Highly conflicting views of the speakers.
e.	Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	36.84	57.89	5.26	20. Two resource person per session would have been ideal.
		II. K	NOWLWD	GE	
PR	ROPOSITIONS				
a.	useful to my work	72.22	27.77	0	
b.	comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	72.22	27.77	0	
c.	up to date	70.58	29.41	0	
d.	related to Constitutional vision of justice	63.15	36.84	0	
e.	related to international legal norms	29.41	70.58	0	
	III	STRUCTU	RE OF TH	E PROGR	AM
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	
a.	The structure and sequence of the program was logical	84.21	15.78		
b.	The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz.  Group discussions	62.5	25	12.5	
	Case studies	63.15	36.84		

	Interactive sessions	44.44	50	5.55		
	Simulation Exercises	37.5	37.5	25		
	Audio Visual Aids	41.17	52.94	5.88		
		IV. INDI	VIDUAL SI	ESSIONS		
PROPOSITIONS To a great To some Not at all						
	11101 081110118	extent	extent			
a.	Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized	62.5	25	12.5		
b.	The session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons	58.82	29.41	11.76		
		V. PROG	RAM MAT	ERIALS		
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great	To some	Not at all		
		extent	extent	1 (ot at an		
a.	The Program material is useful and relevant	84.21	15.78			
b.	The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area	63.15	36.84			
c.	The content was organized and easy to follow	66.66	27.77	5.55		
	VI. RESOURCE PERSONS					
		VI RES	OURCE PE	PRONG		
	Name of the Resource Persons					
	Name of the Resource Persons	Highly Effective &	OURCE PE Moderate	Not Satisfactory		
	Name of the Resource Persons  1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda	Highly		Not	9. favoring philosophy when which judgment up to 1970 were based	
	1.Mr. Justice V.	Highly Effective & Useful	Moderate	Not	which judgment up to 1970 were	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda 2.Mr.Justice S.J.	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47	Moderate 10.52	Not Satisfactory	which judgment up to 1970 were	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda 2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47	Moderate  10.52  22.22  33.33  38.88	Not Satisfactory	which judgment up to 1970 were based	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P.	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47 66.66	10.52 22.22 33.33	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55	which judgment up to 1970 were	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47 66.66 61.11 55.55	Moderate  10.52  22.22  33.33  38.88	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55	which judgment up to 1970 were based	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari  5.Mr .Lalit Bhasin  6.Prof.(Dr.) B.T.Kaul  7.Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47  66.66  61.11  55.55  52.94  84.21  38.88	Moderate  10.52  22.22  33.33  38.88  47.05  15.78	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55  5.55	which judgment up to 1970 were based  9. Favoring employers  9. Out Standing the Best	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari  5.Mr .Lalit Bhasin  6.Prof.(Dr.) B.T.Kaul  7.Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda  8.Mr. Partha Sarathi Sengupta	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47  66.66  61.11  55.55  52.94  84.21  38.88  26.66	10.52 22.22 33.33 38.88 47.05 15.78 50 66.66	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55  5.55  11.11  6.66	which judgment up to 1970 were based  9. Favoring employers  9. Out Standing the Best	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari  5.Mr .Lalit Bhasin  6.Prof.(Dr.) B.T.Kaul  7.Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda  8.Mr. Partha Sarathi	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47  66.66  61.11  55.55  52.94  84.21  38.88	Moderate  10.52  22.22  33.33  38.88  47.05  15.78	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55  5.55	which judgment up to 1970 were based  9. Favoring employers  9. Out Standing the Best	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari  5.Mr .Lalit Bhasin  6.Prof.(Dr.) B.T.Kaul  7.Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda  8.Mr. Partha Sarathi Sengupta	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47  66.66  61.11  55.55  52.94  84.21  38.88  26.66	10.52 22.22 33.33 38.88 47.05 15.78 50 66.66	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55  5.55  11.11  6.66	which judgment up to 1970 were based  9. Favoring employers  9. Out Standing the Best	
	1.Mr. Justice V. Gopalagowda  2.Mr.Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya  3.Ms.Justice Ruma Pal  4.Mr.Justice B.P. Dharmadhikari  5.Mr .Lalit Bhasin  6.Prof.(Dr.) B.T.Kaul  7.Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda  8.Mr. Partha Sarathi Sengupta  9.Mr. Jamshed Cama  10. Ms. Narmadha	Highly Effective & Useful 89.47 66.66 61.11 55.55 52.94 84.21 38.88 26.66 61.11	10.52  22.22  33.33  38.88  47.05  15.78  50  66.66  33.33	Not Satisfactory  11.11  5.55  5.55  11.11  6.66  5.55	which judgment up to 1970 were based  9. Favoring employers  9. Out Standing the Best	

13. Mr. Sanjay Singhvi	40	60		
14. Ms. Seema Jhingan	27.77	55.55	16.66	
15. Prof. Debi S.Saini	68.75	31.25		
16. Dr. Rajendra Hittanagi	23.52	76.47		
17. Mr. M.S.Ananth	35.29	64.70		
overall, Resource Persons had expertise relevant to the sessions in which they participated	76.92	23.07		
m which they purchased	VII. F	HOSPITALI	TY	
PROPOSITIONS	,			
a. Arrangements for my reception and transport to and from railway station/ airport	94.44	5.555		9. Out Standing
b. Services at the reception counter	88.88	11.11		9. Out Standing
c. Hygiene and facilities in the room	82.35	17.64		9. Out Standing
d. Quality of food	77.77	16.66	5.55	9. Out Standing
e. Arrangements in dining halls	82.35	17.64		9. Out Standing
f. Assistance from travel desk for changes in travel reservations	82.35	17.64		9. Out Standing
	VII	I. GENERA	L	
a. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme	Consequence 5. I am Newl about newly 6. Passer & f 7. Acquainte Powers. 8. Philosoph 10. Recent Ju material on r 12. Legal Co reinstatemen powers of lal 15. Updation consideration 16. We are u compel to ch 17. Case law	e court Dismiss y appointed Popassed judgme urtive of Trib d with up-to-d y of Labour La udgment, Proceedl, New charsequences of t and back was pour court and understanding for following pdated in Labo ange our think	sed or dischar O of Labour O ent on Labour unal & Labour unal & Labour ate decisions, aw edural Phenorumps is indust Dismissal or ges, judicial retribunals. In the provisor is the provisor is views of law our laws, we laing.	Court and learnt about learnt Laws and SD.  Group Discussion on ID  mena with require to sentry of trial Disputes Act discharge of workman, eview (Limitation and extent of

1	White car b	1 Deinsteller og Deiler og Gestreck I elemen
b.	Which part of the Programme	1. Reinstatement & Back wages + Contract Labour.
	did you find most useful and	2. In Hindi- English was the medium of teaching for the whole
	why	programme. Hindi is our mother tongue. If Hindi had been the medium
		of instruction then the programme would have been more beneficial to all.
		3. in Hindi- Respected resource persons used only English to teach.
		Along with English the discourse should have been in Hindi also.
		4. S.2A ID Act, S.11.A ID Act, S. 33(CJR)ID Act
		5. Session V- Reinstatement and Back wages; Session VI - Recovery of
		Money under Industrial Disputes Act; & Session IX- Judicial Review
		(Limitation and Extent of Powers of Labour Courts and Industrial
		Tribunals)
		10. Knowledge Lecture delivered by esteemed Resource person on case
		less National law leading text Etc.
		12. Reinstatement and back wages this programme is very useful as we
		faced this problem in day to day affairs at the time of conducting court
		proceeding
		13. 3 <sup>rd</sup> day session
		15. All Programme
		16. Lecture of Justice Gowda as he has excellent knowledge in labour
		laws who has shacked with use within ½ hours
		17. Judicial review, reinstatement and back wages
		18. Adjudication process of industrial disputes, issue of retrenchment
		legal implication, recovery of money under ID Act. Because day to day
		dispute increase.
		20. Prof. Kaul's immense knowledge in law inspired me.
c.	Which part of the Programme	6. Session V- Reinstatement and Back wages; Session VI - Recovery of
	did you find least useful and	Money under Industrial Disputes Act
	why	8. The Programme is not fit for give any new task for Practical work of
		Judges in court dealing Labor Matters.
		10. Audio visual acids which I Dan feel too much useful in our daily
		court work.
		12. Discussion on employees state insurance act this programme is least
		useful in day to day affairs in the court Proceeding.
		13. 3 <sup>rd</sup> day session because of Resource Person
		15. None
		17. Recent legislative initiatives in the field of labour law because it
		cannot help us in our work.
		18. Recent legislative initiatives in the field of labour law because not
		useful routine work
d.	Kindly make any suggestions	4. Speeches of resource Person may be recorded & supplied to
	you may have on how NJA	participants in Electronic Form like on CD/Pen Drive.
	may serve you better and	8. Such programme should not be Limited to speaker and lecture, There
	make its programmes more	should be some practical guild line required to enlighten Judges.
	effective	10. NJA may serve better in my opinion, by way of giving more emphasis
		and more time on practical aspects via group discussion, case studies and
		interactive session.
		12. This programme should not vetted with labour Laws. My Suggestion
		to NJA the conference should be organized in future for industrial
		tribunal only.
		15. Being Professional pioneer you know better.
		16. NJA have to arrange such a conference in future in which Justice
		Gowda has to invite and keep arrange his lecture at learnt 3 hours,
		General remarks is A+ Excellent
		17. Regularly invite us particularly judicial officers working in Gujarat
		for this type programme.
		18. Time is shortage thus sufficient time require and regular programme

require for refreshment of thinking process.  20. District Judges could be called in as resource person.