

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
<u>SESSION 1</u> Independent and Impartial Judiciary: A Prerequisite to Constitutional Democracy and Rule of Law		
1.	M.P.Singh, <i>Securing the Independence of the Judiciary-The Indian Experience</i> IND. INT'L & COMP. L. REV	2
2.	H.R. Khanna, <i>Independence of the Judiciary</i> (1981) 3 SCC 15	50
3.	Justice J.S. Verma, <i>Independence of Judiciary – Some Latent Dangers</i> , Excerpts of Chapter from the book titled “New Dimensions of Justice”	57
4.	Yash Vyas, <i>The Independence of the Judiciary: A Third World Perspective</i> Third World Legal Studies: Vol. 11, Article 6.	69
5.	United Nations General Assembly, Basic Principles on The Independence Of The Judiciary (General Assembly Resolutions 40/32 and 40/146), 1985 Retrieved From: http://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/UN-Basic-principles-independence-judiciary-1985-eng.pdf	122
6.	J. Clifford Wallace, <i>An Essay on Independence of the Judiciary: Independence from What and Why</i> New York University Annual Survey of American Law	125
7.	Pim Albers, <i>The Assessment of Court Quality: A Breach of the Independence of the Judiciary or a Promising Development?</i> Retrieved From: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/quality/Qualityofjudiciary_en.asp	138
<i>Case Law Jurisprudence</i>		
1.	Somesh Chaurasia v. State of M.P. and Another 2021 SCC OnLine SC 480	149
2.	The Chief Election Commissioner of India v. M.R. Vijayabhaskar and Ors (2021) 9 SCC 770	150
3.	Central Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of India v. Subhash Chandra Agarwal (2020) 5 SCC 481	154
4.	Indore Development Authority v. Manohar Lal and Ors (2020) 6 SCC 304	159
5.	Krishna Prasad Verma (D) thr. L.Rs. v. State of Bihar and Ors (2019) 10 SCC 640	161
6.	State of Rajasthan and Ors. v. Ramesh Chandra Mundra and Ors 2020 (1) SLR 13 (SC)	162

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
7.	Madan Mohan v. State of Rajasthan and Ors (2018) 12 SCC 30	165
<u>SESSION 2</u> Judiciary and Media: Need for Balance		
1.	Mr. Sudhanshu Ranjan, <i>Media and Judiciary: Revitalization of Democracy</i> 57 JILI (2015) 415	167
2.	Mr. Ahkam Khan and Parimal Kashyap, <i>Sting Operations: The Role of Media as a Vigilante</i> (2018) 4.2 IJLPP 61	184
3.	Justice G. Raghuram, <i>Media as an Instrument of Public Accountability</i> NALSAR Media Law Review, Vol 3, NMLR 2013	194
4.	Justice G. S. Singhvi, <i>Trial by Media: A Need to Regulate Freedom of Press</i> Bharati Law Review, Oct.- Dec., 2012	209
5.	K.G. Balakrishnan, <i>Reporting of Court Proceedings by Media and the Administration of Justice?</i> (2010) 6 SCC J-1	219
6.	<i>Use of Social Media by Judges</i> , Declaration on Judicial Integrity adopted at the launch of the Global Judicial Integrity Network in April 2018 Retrieved From: https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/restricted/network-launch.html	225
7.	Justice G. Raghuram, <i>Judiciary and the Media - Need for Balance</i>	246
8.	Lord Woolf. <i>Should the Media and the Judiciary be on Speaking Terms?</i> Irish Jurist , 2003, New Series, Vol. 38 (2003), pp. 25-3	272
<i>Case Law Jurisprudence</i>		
1.	The Chief Election Commissioner of India v. M.R Vijayabhaskar & Ors. 2021 SCC Online SC 364	282
2.	Rajendra SAIL v. M.P. High Court Bar Association & Ors (2005) 6 SCC 109	297
3.	Venkatesh @ Chandra & Anr. v. State of Karnataka Criminal Appeal Nos. 1476-1477 OF 2018 Dated: 19 th April 2022 [TV debates on criminal cases pending in courts amount to interference with the administration of justice: Allowing said DVD to go into the hands of a private TV channel so that it could be played and published in a program is nothing but a dereliction of duty and direct interference in the administration of Justice.]	317
4.	R.K. Anand v. Registrar, Delhi High Court (2008) 8 SCC 106	350

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
5.	T.N. Suraj v. State of Kerala and Others WP (CRL.) NO. 346 OF 2022(S) Dated: 19th April 2022 [Media can't usurp courts' jurisdiction; media trial not protected speech: Kerala High Court: Trial by media results in denigration of the justice delivery system which without doubt, is the very foundation of the rule of law in any democratic setup.]	441
<u>SESSION 3</u> Inherent Power, Suo Moto Powers and Powers of Judicial Review		
Articles		
1.	Mr. V. Lakshminarayanan, <i>Power of the High Courts to do Complete Justice</i> (2021) 6 SCC J - 9	465
2.	Mr. V. Lakshminarayanan, <i>High Courts – Co- sentinels on the Qui Vive</i> (2020) 8 SCC J - 8	479
3.	Markandey Katju, <i>Administrative Law and Judicial Review of Administrative Action</i> (2005) 8 SCC J-25	493
4.	Mr. G.B. Reddy and Mr. Pavan Kasturi, <i>A comprehensive Analysis on Judicial Legislation in India</i> 2022 SCC OnLine Blog OpEd 24	502
5.	Justice V.S. Deshpande, <i>Judicial Review-Expansion and Self-Restraint</i> 15 JILI (1973) 531	520
6.	Madhavi Goradia Divan, <i>Judicial Review: Supremacy of the Courts or of the Constitution</i> (2009) 10 SCC J 23	538
7.	Dr. Justice B S Chauhan, <i>Judicial Review</i>	564
8.	Dr. Justice B S Chauhan, <i>Exercise of Suo Moto Powers in Civil and Criminal Cases</i>	580
9.	Dr. Justice B S Chauhan, <i>Inherent Power, Suo Moto Powers and Powers of Judicial Review</i>	597
<i>Case Law Jurisprudence on Inherent Powers of the High Court</i>		
1.	R.P. Kapur v. State of Punjab AIR 1960 SC 866 [The Supreme Court considered the circumstances in which the High Court can, by invoking its inherent powers, quash the criminal proceedings in a subordinate criminal court.]	614
2.	Homi Rajvansh v. State of Maharashtra and Ors 2014(4) SCALE190	619

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
	[Section 482 not to scrutinize the allegations for the purpose of deciding whether the allegations are likely to be upheld in trial]	
3.	Lalitkumar V. Sanghavi (D) Th. L.Rs. Neeta Lalit Kumar Sanghavi and Anr.Vs. Dharamdas v. Sanghavi and Ors. 2014(3) SCALE362 [Any order passed by the arbitral tribunal is capable of being corrected by the High Court Under Article 226 or 227 of the Constitution of India- is not permissible.]	624
4.	Central Bureau of Investigation v. Jagjit Singh 2013(12) SCALE 299 [The power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code]	629
5.	Engineering Export Promotion Council v. Usha Anand and Anr. AIR 2013 SC 2548 [Circumstances under which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised]	634
6.	Arun Bhandari v. State of U.P. and Ors (2013)2SCC801 [The judicial obligation of the High Court to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice or to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process.]	640
7.	Monnet Ispat and Energy Limited v. Jan Chetna and Ors (2013)10SCC574 [Bench of High Court shall scrupulously follow the relevant provision of law and shall not violate statutory provisions specifying its jurisdiction.]	651
8.	T.T. Antony v. State of Kerala and Ors. (2001)6SCC181 [Exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code]	656
9.	Smt. Nilabati Behera alias Lalita Beherav. State of Orissa and others (1993)2SCC746 [Power to give compensation for the violation of FR under Art.226]	671
10.	Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab (2014) 6 SCC 466 [Section 482 Crpc envisages 3 circumstances in which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised, namely, “to give effect to an order under CrPC, to prevent abuse of the process of the court, and to secure the ends of justice]	686
11.	Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat (2017) 9 SCC 641 [In this case, the Supreme Court referred to various precedents and summarised the following principles to govern the power of High Court under Section 482 of CrPC]	706
12.	Madhu Limaye v. State of Maharashtra (1977) 4 SCC 551 [Where the impugned interlocutory order clearly brings about a situation which is an abuse of the process of the court then for the purpose of securing the ends of justice, interference by the High Court is absolutely necessary and nothing contained in Section 397 (2) can limit or affect the exercise of the inherent power	720

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
	of the High Court: Held the principles that governs the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court]	
13.	State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 [The provisions of section 482 and the power of the High Court to quash criminal proceedings or FIR.]	732
14.	Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 315 [On the powers of the High Court while adjudicating a petition for quashing of the FIR – filed under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 and Article 226 of the Constitution of India.]	789
15.	<i>Write up for Inherent Powers of High Court: Section: 482 Cr.PC</i> Source: Supreme Court Cases Synopsis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inherent powers of High Court ➤ Power of review ➤ Anticipatory quashment ➤ Compounding of offence and quashment on basis of settlement. ➤ Quashment on ground of delay in initiation of criminal proceedings ➤ Quashing of one of two remarkably identical FIRs ➤ Quashment of criminal proceedings ➤ Quashment of non-compoundable offences ➤ Quashment of proceedings ➤ Power of Quashment ➤ Suo motu proceedings ➤ Power to alter sentence ➤ Criminal liability arising out of contract with a company ➤ Material that may be considered by High Court ➤ Power of court to direct accused already on bail ➤ Extraordinary relief of stay of further proceedings, including stay on arrest. ➤ Scope of power 	817
16.	<i>Write up for Inherent Powers of High Court: Section: 482 Cr.PC,</i> Source: Manupatra Synopsis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Legislative history ➤ Scope and application ➤ Section inapplicable to order passed in executive or administrative statutory capacity ➤ Inherent powers cannot be invoked in matters directly covered by specific provisions of Code ➤ Inherent powers cannot be invoked for doing act contrary to statutes ➤ Section does not confer additional powers but only preserves pre-existing inherent powers ➤ "Power" to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code ➤ Power" or to prevent abuse of the process of any court ➤ Power "or otherwise to secure the ends of justice ➤ Power of High Court to order sentences passed by subordinate court to run concurrently ➤ Power of High Court to review judgment ➤ Power of High Court to interfere at interlocutory stage of proceedings ➤ Power of High Court to not to quash police investigation ➤ Power of High Court to stay proceedings in case of civil suit 	822

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Power of High Court to expunge objectionable remarks from judgment ➤ Power of High Court to order restitution of property to proper person ➤ Power of High Court to excuse personal attendance of accused at trial ➤ Power of High Court to award costs ➤ Finding of High Court under this section on a question of jurisdiction cannot be' challenged in civil court ➤ Order under inherent process of High Court --Effect on civil court ➤ Inherent power of lower courts 	
<i>Case Law Jurisprudence on Sua Moto Powers</i>		
17.	In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation 2022 SCC OnLine SC 27	922
18.	In Re Remediation of Polluted Rivers 2021 SCC OnLine SC 756	924
19.	Delay in Release of Convicts after Grant of Bail 2021 SCC OnLine SC 947	926
20.	In Re: Alarming Newspaper Report Regarding Kanwar Yatra in State of U.P. Sou Motu 2021 SCC OnLine SC 549	928
21.	In Re: Expeditious Trial of Cases Under Section 138 of N.I. Act 1881 2021 SCC OnLine SC 325	929
22.	In Re: To Issue Certain Guidelines Regarding Inadequacies and Deficiencies in Criminal Trials v. The State of Andhra Pradesh and Ors. (2021) 10 SCC 598	930
23.	Union of India v. Rakesh Malhotra and Ors. (2021) 9 SCC 222	931
24.	In Re: Distribution of Essential Supplies and Services during Pandemic (2021) 7 SCC 772	939
25.	In Re: Problems and Miseries of Migrant Labourers Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No(s). 6/2020	940
26.	In Re: The Proper Treatment of Covid 19 Patients and Dignified Handling of Dead Bodies in the Hospitals etc (2021) 2 SCC 519	941
27.	Suo Motu v. The State of Tamil Nadu 2020 SCC OnLine Mad 938	942
28.	In Re: Regarding Closure of Mid-Day Meal Scheme 2020 SCC OnLine SC 342	945
29.	In Re: Alarming rise in the number of reported child rape incidents (2020) 7 SCC 87	946
30.	In re: Justice C. S. Karnan (2017) 7 SCC 1	948
31.	In Re: Indian Woman Says Gang Raped on Orders of Village Court Published in Business and Financial NewsSuo Motu (2014) 4 SCC 786	950
32.	Kan Singh Mehta (Dr) v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. 1999 SCC OnLine Raj 491	951
33.	Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai v. Ankita Sinha, 2021	957

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
	SCC OnLine SC 897	
<u>SESSION 4</u> Challenges and Nuances of Second Appeal and Substantial Question of Law		
Articles		
1.	Justice Deepak Maheshwari & Naman Maheshwari, <i>Revisiting the Substantial Question of Law In a Civil Second</i> (2017) 1 SCC (J)	982
2.	R. Prakash, <i>Scope of High Court's Jurisdiction Under Section 100 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908,</i> (2003) 5 SCC J-27	989
Case Law Jurisprudence		
1.	Anant Mills Co. Ltd. v. State of Gujarat (1975) 2 SCC 175	995
2.	Chunilal v. Mehta and Sons Ltd. v. Century Spg. and Mfg. Co. Ltd. 1962 Supp (3) SCR 549 [The proper test for determining whether a question of law raised in the case is substantial would, in our opinion, be whether it is of general public importance or whether it directly and substantially affects the rights of the parties and if so whether it is either an open question in the sense that it is not finally settled by this Court or by the Privy Council or by the Federal Court or is not free from difficulty or call for discussion of alternative views.]	1028
3.	Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd. v. Union of India (1979) 2 SCC 529 [Under the proviso, the Court should be 'satisfied' that the case involves a substantial question of law and not a mere question of law. The reason for permitting the substantial question of law to be raised should be recorded by the Court.]	1035
4.	Jadu Gopal Chakravarty v. Pannalal Bhowmick (1978) 3 SCC 215 [The question came up before the court that whether the compromise decree was obtained by fraud. The court held that though it is purely a question of fact none of the lower courts has dealt with the question whether the decree was obtained by committing a fraud on the Court and hence, this court can look into the question of fact by exercising its power under Section 103.]	1073
5.	Ramji Bhagala v. Krishnarao Karirao Bagra (1982) 1 SCC 433 [An appellate court cannot partly admit and partly reject a second appeal under Section 100 and Section 101. It should either admit it wholly or reject it wholly.]	1094
6.	Sree Meenakshi Mills Ltd. v. CIT (1967) 1 SCR 392	1096

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page No.
	[It was pointed out that there lies a difference between the pure question of fact and a mixed question of fact and law, and observations aforesaid have a reference to the latter and not the former.]	
7.	Gopal Singh v. Ujagar Singh (1955) 1 SCR 86 [The question was whether a property is ancestral or not, or whether, when a raiyat purchased the interest of the proprietor, there is a merger of two interests, is a mixed one of fact and law. Though ordinarily, a second appeal does not lie on the finding of fact, when there is a legal conclusion that is necessary to be drawn from the finding of fact, a second appeal will lie on the ground that the legal conclusion was erroneous.]	1101
8.	Dudh Nath Pandey v. Suresh Chandra Bhattasali (1986) 3 SCC 360 [The High Court cannot set aside the finding of facts by the First Appellate Court]	1105
9.	Annappoorani Ammal v. G. Thangapalam (1989) 3 SCC 287 [The High Court can only interfere when there involves a substantial question of law.]	1109
10.	Dnyanoba Bhaurao Shemade v. Maroti Bhaurao Marnor (1999) 2 SCC 471 [Finding of fact is against the weight of evidence and there is no question of law in this.]	1116
11.	M.S.V. Raja v. Seeni Thevar (2001) 6 SCC 652 [The court should record the reason for the substantial question of law.]	1124
12.	Gurnam Singh v. Lehna Singh (2019) 7 SCC 641	1133
13.	James Joseph v. State of Kerala (2010) 9 SCC 642	1145
14.	Surat Singh v. Siri Bhagwan (2018) 4 SCC 562	1146
15.	Seethakathi Trust Madras v. Krishnaveni (2022) 3 SCC 150	1147
16.	Hasmat Ali v. Amina Bibi and Ors (29.11.2021 - SC) : 2022(229)AIC110	1149
17.	Haryana State Electronics Development Corpn. Ltd. v. Seema Sharma (2009) 7 SCC 311	1157
18.	Jogendra Ram Vs. Phullan Mian (D) by L.Rs. and Ors. (2011) 15 SCC 247 [Scope of Jurisdiction of High Court in the Second Appeal under Section 100 Code of Civil Procedure]	1161
19.	Write up for Second Appeal: Source: Supreme court cases Synopsis: ➤ Applicability of Section 100(5) proviso ➤ Section 100 [as it stood prior to its amendment in 1976] as applicable to P&H High Court ➤ Finding of Fact, High Court's Interference ➤ Findings of fact	1168

Sl.No	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page . No.
.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Concurrent findings of fact : High Court's interference ➤ New case ➤ Substantial question of law ➤ Power of court to hear appeal on other question ➤ High Court to Formulate Substantial Question of Law ➤ Manner of Disposal ➤ Interim Order/Interim Relief ➤ Second appeal/Letters patent appeal — Essential ingredients ➤ Re-appreciation of entire evidence on record ➤ Reappreciation of evidence by High Court 	
20.	<p><i>Write up on Second Appeal: Section: 100, Source: Manupatra</i></p> <p>Synopsis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Amendments ➤ Mixed questions of law and fact Scope ➤ Finding of fact ➤ Effect of non-formulation or non-consideration of substantial question of law ➤ New Plea ➤ Error of law relating to evidence and procedure ➤ Additional evidence in Second Appeal ➤ Second appeal against ex parte decree passed by lower Appellate Court ➤ Cross-objections in Second Appeal ➤ Reversal of findings of fact ➤ What is a Substantial question of law ➤ Concurrent findings of fact 	1175