

TABLE OF CONTENTS		
SESSION 1		
JUDICIAL CONDUCT ON AND OFF THE BENCH		
1.	Barrie Lawrence Nathan, <i>Judges on and off the Bench</i> , Journal of Comparative Law 7, no. 2 (2012): 307-333	1
2.	Philip B. Benefiel, <i>Off-the-Bench Restrictions on Judges: Ambiguity in Search of an Answer</i> , Loyola University of Chicago Law Journal 20, no. 4 (Summer 1989): 903-918	29
3.	James D. Nosedo, <i>Limiting Off-Bench Expression: Striking a Balance between Accountability and Independence</i> , DePaul Law Review 36, no. 4 (Summer 1987): 519-550	47
4.	Patricia L. Cumming, <i>Governing Judicial Conduct</i> , University of New Brunswick Law Journal 45 (1996): 23-26	79
5.	Lord Denning, <i>Into the Conduct of Judges</i> in THE DUE PROCESS OF LAW, Oxford University Press (2012), pp. 58-66	84
6.	<i>Guide to Judicial Conduct</i> , Judiciary of England and Wales 2013 [<i>Guides to judicial conduct have become commonplace in recent years. As far as Commonwealth countries are concerned, a seminal study by Mr Justice Thomas, a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland, Judicial Ethics in Australia was published in 1988. They have followed many documents including the Canadian Judicial Council’s Ethical Principles for Judges (1998), Guide to Judicial Conduct published for the Council of Chief Justices of Australia (2002) and Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers of the Federal Republic of Nigeria</i>]	95
7.	Justice V. K. Bist, <i>Judicial Behavior and Conduct in the Present Scenario</i> , Uttarakhand Judicial & Legal Review, https://ujala.uk.gov.in/files/ch1.pdf	133
8.	Commentary on <i>Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct</i> , United Nations office on Drugs and Crime, September 2007 [<i>A detailed draft commentary was prepared on each of the Bangalore Principles and discussed in depth, together with the Principles, at the Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening Basic Principles of Judicial Conduct held in Vienna on 1-2 March 2007. The meeting was attended by participants from over 35 countries. The draft commentary and proposed amendments were also considered in detail at the fifth meeting of the Judicial Integrity Group. The Bangalore Principles and the amended commentary was adopted at those meetings and thereby given increased weightage and authority. The Commentary gives depth and strength to the Principles and contributes significantly to furthering their global adoption as a universal declaration of judicial ethics</i>] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence • Integrity • Propriety 	139 156 162

SESSION 2		
ETHICAL CONUNDRUMS IN JUDGING		
1.	Gray Thoron, <i>A Report on Judicial Ethics</i> , The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science , Jan., 1966, Vol. 363, Ethics in America: Norms and Deviations (Jan., 1966), pp. 36-43	193
2.	Leslie Steven Rothenberg, <i>The Role of Judges and the Courts as Definers of Ethical Norms</i> , Selected Papers from the Annual Meeting (American Society of Christian Ethics), 1977, Eighteenth Annual Meeting (1977), pp. 104-128	201
3.	Gray Cynthia, <i>So You're Going to Be a Judge: Ethical Issues for New Judges</i> , The Journal of the American Judges Association. 571, 2016	227
4.	Capurso Timothy J, <i>How Judges Judge: Theories on Judicial Decision Making</i> , University of Baltimore Law Forum: Vol. 29 : No. 1 , Article 2, 1998	238
5.	Philip J. Grib, S.J., <i>The Ethical Foundations of Judicial Decision-Making</i> , Volume 35, Number 1 Volume 35, Number 1	251
6.	Kozinski Alex, <i>The Real Issues of Judicial Ethics</i> , Hofstra Law Review: Vol. 32 : Iss. 4 , Article 1, 2004	308
7.	Cynthia Gray, <i>Ethical Standards for Judges</i> , American Judicature Society [<i>Ethical Standards for Judges was developed in 1999 under grant from the State Justice Institute, "An Educational Program for Members of State Judicial Conduct Organizations." It was substantially up-dated and revised in 2009</i>]	323
SESSION 3		
ROLE OF JUDICIAL ETHICS IN COURT ADMINISTRATION: ASPIRATION & IMPLEMENTATION		
1.	Mindaugas Šimonis, <i>The Role of Judicial Ethics in Court Administration: From Setting the Objectives to Practical Implementation</i> , Baltic Journal of Law & Politics, Volume 10, Number 1 2017	360
2.	Dana Ann Remus, <i>Just Conduct: Regulating Bench-Bar Relationships</i> , Yale Law & Policy Review 30, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 123-168	395
3.	Jörg Philipp Terhechte, <i>Judicial Ethics for a Global Judiciary – How Judicial Networks Create their own Codes of Conduct</i> , German Law Journal, Vol. 10 No. 04	441
4.	Dejo Olowu, <i>Quest for Universal Standards of Judicial Integrity: Some Reflections on the Bangalore Principles</i> , India Quarterly , June 2013, Vol. 69, No. 2 (June 2013), pp. 179-191	456
5.	Geoff Gallas; Michael Lampasi, <i>A Code of Ethics for Judicial Administrators</i> , <i>Judicature</i> 61, no. 7 (February 1978): 311-317	470
6.	Louraine C. Arkfeld, <i>Ethics for the Problem-Solving Court Judge: The New ABA Model, Code</i> , Justice System Journal 28, no. 3 (2007): 317-323	478

7.	Mindaugas Šimonis, <i>Effective Court Administration and Professionalism of Judges as Necessary Factors Safeguarding the Mother of Justice – The Right to a Fair Trial</i> , International Journal for Court Administration, Volume 10, Issue 1, Winter 2019	485
SESSION 4		
NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS OF JUDICIAL ETHICS		
1.	<i>The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, 2002</i> [The Bangalore Draft Code of Judicial Conduct 2001 adopted by the Judicial Group on Strengthening Judicial Integrity, as revised at the Round Table Meeting of Chief Justices held at the Peace Palace, The Hague, November 25-26, 2002]	498
2.	<i>Restatement of Values of Judicial Life</i> , 1999 [As adopted by Full Court Meeting of the Supreme Court of India on 7 th May, 1997]	509
3.	Justice R.C. Lahoti, <i>Canons of Judicial Ethics</i> , First MC Setalvad Memorial Lecture delivered by Chief Justice of India, 22 nd February, 2005	511
4.	Justice Y.K. Sabarwal, <i>Canons of Judicial Ethics</i> , MC Setalvad Memorial Lecture, 2005	559
5.	<i>Nolan Principles of Public Life</i> , [The Seven Principles of Public Life (the ‘Principles’) apply to people who serve the public in any way, including governors of higher education institutes. The Principles were first set out by Lord Nolan in May 1995 in the first report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life which he chaired. The principles apply to all aspects]	571
6.	<i>Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct</i> , UNODC September 2007	572
7.	<i>Resolution on Judicial Ethics</i> , The European Court of Human Rights, Adopted by the Plenary Court on 21 June 2021, Council of Europe.	748
ADDITIONAL READINGS		
1.	Code of Conduct for United States Judges [The Code of Conduct for United States Judges includes the ethical canons that apply to federal judges and provides guidance on their performance of official duties and engagement in a variety of outside activities] https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges	
2.	European Network of Councils for the Judiciary , Judicial Ethics Report 2009-2010 [Judicial ethics have been addressed in a positive manner, to emphasize the common, founding values of the judge’s work, preventive principles and personal qualities and to respond to the public’s expectations] https://www.enj.eu/images/stories/pdf/ethics/judicialethicsdeontologiefinal.pdf	
3.	Statement of Principles of Judicial Ethics for The Scottish Judiciary [The Statement of Principles of Judicial Ethics for the Scottish Judiciary was framed in 2010, after consultation, with the Judicial Council for Scotland. It was drafted by a working group of judges under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon Lord Osborne] https://www.judiciary.scot/docs/librariesprovider3/judiciarydocuments/statementofprinciplesofjudicialethicsreviseddecember2016.pdf?sfvrsn=db91ec0c_10	

4.	Code of Judicial Ethics , The International Criminal Court [<i>This Code of Judicial Ethics was initially adopted by the judges on 9 March 2005. It was amended by the judges on 19 January 2021, with the amendments entering into force upon its publication on the ICC website on 27 January 2021</i>] https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/Publications/Code-of-Judicial-Ethics.pdf
5.	California Code of Judicial Ethics , [<i>The original Canons of Judicial Ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association were modified and adopted in 1949 for application in California by the Conference of California Judges (now the California Judges Association)</i>] https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/ca_code_judicial_ethics.pdf
6.	Guide to Judicial Conduct , The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration (AIJA) [<i>The Guide provides principled and practical guidance to judges as to what may be an appropriate course of conduct, or matters to be considered in determining a course of conduct, in a range of circumstances. It is by maintaining the high standards of conduct to which the Guide aspires that the reputation of the Australian judiciary is secured and public confidence in it maintained</i>] https://aija.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/GJC-3ed-Nov2020.pdf
SESSION 5	
JUDICIAL ETHICS IN DIGITAL AGE: SOCIAL MEDIA & DIGITAL SECURITY	
1.	<i>Use of Social Media by Judges</i> , Discussion Guide for the Expert Group Meeting, November 2018, Vienna, UNODC 753
2.	Katrina Lee, <i>Your Honor, On Social Media: The Judicial Ethics of Bots And Bubbles</i> , Nevada Law Journal Vol. 19.3 Spring 2019 774
3.	Elizabeth G. Thornburg, <i>Twitter and the #So-Called Judge</i> , 71 SMU L. REV. 249 (2018) 808
4.	John G. Browning, <i>Why Can't We Be Friends? Judges' Use of Social Media</i> , 68 U. Miami L. Rev. 487 (2014) 874
5.	Aurora J. Wilson, <i>Let's Be Cautious Friends: The Ethical Implications of Social Networking for Members of the Judiciary</i> , 7 WASH. J. L. TECH. & ARTS 225 (2012). 922
6.	Craig Estlinbaum, <i>Social Networking and Judicial Ethics</i> , St. Mary's Journal On Legal Malpractice & Ethics Vol. 2:2 (2012). 935
7.	Dimitra Blitsa, Ioannis Papathanasiou & Maria Salmanli, <i>Judges & Social Media : Managing the Risks</i> , SSRN Electronic Journal January 2015 964
8.	Anja Schoeller-Schletter, <i>Impartiality of Judges and Social Media: Approaches, Regulations and Results</i> , Rule of Law Programme, June, 2020 985
ADDITIONAL READINGS	
1.	Lorne Sossin; Meredith Bacal, <i>Judicial Ethics in a Digital Age</i> , U.B.C. Law Review 46, no. 3 (September 2013): 629-664 https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1742&context=scholarly_works

2.	M. S. Kurita, <i>Electronic Social Media: Friend or Foe for Judges</i> , 7 St. Mary's Journal on Legal Malpractice & Ethics 184 (2017). https://commons.stmarytx.edu/lmej/vol7/iss2/3	
3.	Non-Binding Guidelines on the Use of Social Media by Judges, UNODC [<i>The Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration was launched by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to assist Member States in implementing the Doha Declaration, adopted by the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in 2015. The Declaration reaffirms Member States' commitment to "make every effort to prevent and counter corruption, and to implement measures aimed at enhancing transparency in public administration and promoting the integrity and accountability of our criminal justice systems, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption</i>] https://www.unodc.org/res/ji/import/international_standards/social_media_guidelines/social_media_guidelines_final.pdf	
CASE LAW		
1.	Muzaffar Husain v. State of Uttar Pradesh And Anr. Civil Appeal No. 3613 of 2022 [<i>Showing undue favour to a party under the guise of passing judicial orders is the worst kind of judicial dishonesty and misconduct. The extraneous consideration for showing favour need not always be a monetary consideration. It is often said that "the public servants are like fish in the water, none can say when and how a fish drank the water". A judge must decide the case on the basis of the facts on record and the law applicable to the case. If he decides a case for extraneous reasons, then he is not performing his duties in accordance with law. As often quoted, a judge, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion</i>]	1036
2.	Mathew Z Pulikunnel v. Chief Justice of India , WP(C) NO. 17654 OF 2021 [<i>If it is held that a party who is directly or indirectly connected with a dispute decided by a Judge can approach the Court in a proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution seeking direction on a complaint lodged against the Judge concerning the decision taken by him alleging that the same is not one conforming to the Restatement of Values of Judicial Life, there cannot be any doubt that the same will have a deleterious effect on the institution.</i>]	1044
3.	Sadhna Chaudhary v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2020) 11 SCC 760 [<i>Judicial officers must aspire and adhere to a higher standard of honesty, integrity and Probity</i>]	1057
4.	Shrirang Yadavrao Waghmare v. State of Maharashtra , (2019) 9 SCC 144 [<i>The first and foremost quality required in a Judge is integrity. The need of integrity in the judiciary is much higher than in other institutions. The judiciary is an institution whose foundations are based on honesty and integrity. It is, therefore, necessary that judicial officers should possess the sterling quality of integrity</i>]	1066
5.	Registrar General, Patna High Court v. Pandey Gajendra Prasad , 2012 STPL(Web) 305 SC [<i>There is no gainsaying that while it is imperative for the High Court to protect honest and upright judicial officers against motivated and concocted allegations, it is equally necessary for the High Court not to ignore or condone any dishonest deed on the part of any judicial officer</i>]	1070
6.	R.C. Chandel v. High Court of M.P. , (2012) 8 SCC 58 [<i>There can be no manner of doubt that a Judge must decide the case only on the basis of the facts on record and the law applicable to the case. If a Judge decides a case for any extraneous reasons then he is not performing his duty in accordance with law. 10. In our view the word "gratification" does</i>	1081

	<i>not only mean monetary gratification. Gratification can be of various types. It can be gratification of money, gratification of power, gratification of lust etc., etc.]</i>	
7.	Rajendra Singh Verma (Dead) Through LR.s. v. Lieutenant Governor (NCT of Delhi) , (2011) 10 SCC 1 [<i>In case where the Full Court of the High Court recommends compulsory retirement of an officer, the High Court on the judicial side has to exercise great caution and circumspection in setting aside that order because it is a complement of all the Judges of the High Court who go into the question and it is possible that in all cases evidence would not be forthcoming about integrity doubtful of a judicial officer</i>]	1095
8.	Tarak Singh v. Jyoti Basu , (2005)1 SCC 201 [<i>There is nothing wrong in a Judge having an ambition to achieve something, but if the ambition to achieve is likely to cause a compromise with his divine judicial duty, better not to pursue it. Because, if a Judge is too ambitious to achieve something materially, he becomes timid. When he becomes timid there will be a tendency to make a compromise between his divine duty and his personal interest. There will be a conflict between interest and duty</i>]	1166
9.	High Court of Judicature at Bombay v. Shashikant S. Patil , (2000) 1 SCC 416 [<i>Honesty and integrity are the hallmarks of judicial probity. Dishonesty and lack of integrity are hence the basic elements of misconduct as far as a Judicial Officer is concerned</i>]	1177
10.	C. Ravichandran Iyer v. Justice A.M. Bhattacharjee & Ors. (1995) 5 SCC 457 [<i>Judicial office is essentially a public trust. Society is, therefore, entitled to expect that a Judge must be a man of high integrity, honesty and required to have moral vigour, ethical firmness and impervious to corrupt or venial influences. He is required to keep most exacting standards of propriety in judicial conduct. Any conduct which tends to undermine public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the court would be deleterious to the efficacy of judicial process</i>]	1186
11.	Union of India v. K.K. Dhawan (1993) 2 SCC 56 [<i>The judicial officer, if acts negligently or recklessly or attempts to confer undue favour on a person or takes a decision which is actuated by corrupt motive, then he is not acting as a judge</i>]	1209
12.	High Court of Judicature at Rajasthan v. Ramesh Chand Paliwal , (1998) 3 SCC 72 [<i>Judges have been described as ‘hermits’, further reminding that, “they have to live and behave like hermits, who have no desire or aspiration, having shed it through penance. Their mission is to supply light and not heat</i>]	1219
13.	High Court of Judicature at Bombay v. Uday Singh , (1997) 5 SCC 129 [<i>Maintenance of discipline in the judicial service is a paramount matter. Acceptability of the judgment depends upon the credibility of the conduct, honesty, integrity and character of the officer. The confidence of the litigating public gets affected or shaken by lack of integrity and character of Judicial Officer</i>]	1234
14.	Daya Shankar v. High Court of Allahabad , (1987) 3 SCC 1 [<i>Judicial officers cannot have two standards, one in the court and another outside the court. They must have only one standard of rectitude, honesty and integrity. They cannot act even remotely unworthy of the office they occupy</i>]	1243