

# National Judicial Academy

**P-1173: Workshop for High Court Justices**

05<sup>th</sup> – 06<sup>th</sup> October, 2019

**Programme Coordinator** : Ms. Sonam Jain, Research Fellow

**No. of Participants** : 14

**No. of forms received** : 13

| I. OVERALL  |                   |                |            |         |
|---|-------------------|----------------|------------|---------|
| PROPOSITION   | To a great extent | To some extent | Not at all | Remarks |
| a. The objective of the Program was clear to me   | <b>69.23</b>      | <b>30.77</b>   | -          | -       |
| b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work                              | <b>53.85</b>      | <b>46.15</b>   | -          | -       |
| c. Overall, I got benefited from attending this program   | <b>69.23</b>      | <b>30.77</b>   | -          | -       |
| d. I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work                              | <b>69.23</b>      | <b>30.77</b>   | -          | -       |
| e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences                  | <b>61.54</b>      | <b>38.46</b>   | -          | -       |
| II. KNOWLEDGE   |                   |                |            |         |
| PROPOSITION   | 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>53.85</b>      | <b>46.15</b>   | -          | -       |
| b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists) | <b>61.54</b>      | <b>38.46</b>   | -          | -       |
| c. Up to date   | <b>46.15</b>      | <b>53.85</b>   | -          | -       |
| d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice  | <b>76.92</b>      | <b>23.08</b>   | -          | -       |

|   |  |                       |   |                |
|---|--|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| e. Related to international legal norms   | <b>18.18</b>   | <b>54.55</b>          | <b>27.27</b>  | -              |
| <b>III. STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM</b>  |  |                       |   |                |
| <b>PROPOSITION</b>  | <b>Good</b>  | <b>Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Remarks</b> |
| a. The structure and sequence of the program was logical  | <b>69.23</b>   | <b>30.77</b>          | -   | -              |
| b. The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz.                                      |  |                       |   |                |
| (i) Case studies were relevant  | <b>38.46</b>   | <b>61.54</b>          | -   | -              |
| (ii) Interactive sessions were fruitful   | <b>61.54</b>   | <b>38.46</b>          | -   | -              |
| <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>69.23</b>   | <b>30.77</b>          | <b>72.73</b>  | <b>27.27</b>   |
| 2   | <b>63.64</b>   | <b>36.36</b>          | <b>55.56</b>  | <b>44.44</b>   |
| 3   | <b>54.55</b>   | <b>45.45</b>          | <b>55.56</b>  | <b>44.44</b>   |
| 4   | <b>54.55</b>   | <b>45.45</b>          | <b>44.44</b>  | <b>55.56</b>   |
| 5   | <b>54.55</b>   | <b>45.45</b>          | <b>55.56</b>  | <b>44.44</b>   |
| <b>V. PROGRAM MATERIALS</b>   |  |                       |   |                |
| <b>PROPOSITION</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>53.85</b>   | <b>45.15</b>          | -   | -              |
| b. The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/ current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area | <b>38.46</b>   | <b>61.54</b>          | -   | -              |
| c. The content was organized and easy to follow   | <b>38.46</b>   | <b>61.54</b>          | -   | -              |

## VIII. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>a. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1. Interaction was good; 2. Com to know about the election law; 3. About companies fraud I come to know about the election time.</li> <li>2. Refreshing of topics academic intent; 2. Interactive sessions were useful; 3Some were ideas amassed.</li> <li>3. Objective study. Materials given.</li> <li>4. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>5. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>6. 1. Opportunity to hear the experiences of some of the speakers; 2. Introduction to the topic “Silences in the constitution”.</li> <li>7. 1. Insights into core concepts; 2. Interactions and perspectives; 3. Deeper understanding of present role.</li> <li>8. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>9. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>10. Meaningful discussions were there.</li> <li>11. Gained knowledge, provided the material along with citation the said material can be used in day to day work.</li> <li>12. Intellectual enrichment is very useful for administering picture; Interactions reveals new ideas; Some consistency is introduced in dealing with issues is day to day work.</li> <li>13. 1. Sounds of constitutional silence; 2. Separation of powers; 3. Supervisory power of high court.</li> </ol>                |
| <p>b. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When the election laws were big discussed.</li> <li>2. Last. Had some current relevance.</li> <li>3. Interactive session.</li> <li>4. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>5. Participant did not comment.</li> <li>6. Except the study material &amp; the two sessions on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day- rest wasn't useful at all.</li> <li>7. The first two sessions on conceptual aspects of constitutional law- Thought provoking and illuminative</li> <li>8. <b>Session 1: A Written Constitution: Construing the Sounds of Constitution's Silences: Meanings Beyond Text; Session 2: Judicial Review: Separation of Powers and Session 3: High Court: Supervisory Powers-</b> performance by Mr. R. Venkataramani &amp; Mr. Somasekhar Sundaresan.</li> <li>9. <b>Session 1: A Written Constitution: Construing the Sounds of Constitution's Silences: Meanings Beyond Text and Session 3: High Court: Supervisory Powers-</b> related to day to day discharge your duty.</li> <li>10. Corporate fraud &amp; manipulation.</li> <li>11. <b>Session 2: Judicial Review: Separation of Powers and Session 3: High Court: Supervisory Powers-</b> understood the scope of separation of powers &amp; also scope of supervisory powers.</li> </ol> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>12. <b>Session 1: A Written Constitution: Construing the Sounds of Constitution’s Silences: Meanings Beyond Text; Session 2: Judicial Review: Separation of Powers and Session 3: High Court: Supervisory Powers.</b></p> <p>13. All.</p>   |
| <p>c. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>   | <p>1. Company fraud. I did not know need about the terms which were big and.</p> <p>2. <b>Session 2: Judicial Review: Separation of Powers-</b> It was a properly addressed by any speaker.</p> <p>3. Overall.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. <b>Session 1: A Written Constitution: Construing the Sounds of Constitution’s Silences: Meanings Beyond Text; Session 2: Judicial Review: Separation of Powers and Session 3: High Court: Supervisory Powers-</b> the speakers were off tangent and relevancy to the topic was lost.</p> <p>7. The third session did not have anything new to offer.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. <b>Session 4: Free and Fair Elections: Judicial Contribution to Electoral Reforms.</b></p> <p>10. Free and Fair Elections. It should have been in consonance with real court cases.</p> <p>11. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>12. <b>Session 4: Free and Fair Elections: Judicial Contribution to Electoral Reforms; Session 5: Corporate Fraud and Manipulation-</b> because there is limited application in my state.</p> <p>13. None.</p> |
| <p>d. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p> | <p>1. The study material can be sent to the participants had in advance.</p> <p>2. Allow interactive session more time. Ask speakers to be the listeners speak. Some of them are too verbose.</p> <p>3. Keep it up.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. Programmes by the NJA need to have specific objectives- viz; only topic can be shared in advance so that participants come prepared to share &amp; have a dialogue (much less a monologue) “the speakers; Secondly all participants should be encouraged to share their experience” the sub-ordinate judges in their respective state academies. Thirdly relevancy of the programme so on to allow it to percolate downwards- needs to be looked at.</p> <p>7. The study material provided could be form more conventional sources (SCC online, AIR etc.).</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>10. Focusing on real problems that wants fall on day to day working.</p> <p>11. Extended the time limit of session.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>12. Reading/reference material may be sent to the high court while requisitioning nomination of judges so it can also be circulated while seeking consent of the judge.</p> <p>13. Participant did not comment.</p> |
|--|--|