

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION 1 ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	
1.	Justice R.V. Reaveendran, <i>Justice Delivery – Some Challenges and Solutions</i> , 2022 8 SCC (J-1)
2.	Justice R. Banumathi, <i>JUDICIARY, JUDGES AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUDGES</i> 181-192 (Thompson Reuters 2020)
3.	Abhishek Singhvi, <i>Beating the Backlog - Reforms in Administration of Justice in India</i> in <i>JUDICIAL REVIEW PROCESS, POWERS AND PROBLEMS</i> 46-59 (Salman Khurshid, Sidharth Luthra, Lokendra Malik & Shruti Bedi, Cambridge University Press ed., 2020)
4.	Mitu Gulati & Richard A. Posner, <i>The Management of Staff by Federal Court of Appeals Judges</i> , 69(2) <i>Vanderbilt Law Review</i> 479-498 (2016)
Judgments	
<i>(Judgments mentioned below include citations and short notes for reference. Please refer full judgment (available in pen drive) for conclusive opinion)</i>	
<p>1. <i>Criminal Trials Guidelines regarding Inadequacies and Deficiencies, In Re v. The State Of Andhra Pradesh & Ors.</i>, (2021) 10 SCC 598 [All High Courts shall take expeditious steps to incorporate Draft Rules, 2021 as part of the rules governing criminal trials, and ensure that the existing rules, notifications, orders and practice directions are suitably modified, and promulgated (wherever necessary through the Official Gazette) within 6 months. If the state government's co-operation is necessary in this regard, the approval of the concerned department or departments, and the formal notification of the said Draft Rules, shall be made within the said period of six months.]</p>	
<p>2. <i>All India Judges' Association v. Union of India</i>, (2018) 17 SCC 555 [The Supreme Court held that without robust judiciary will not be able to function at its optimum level. Strengthening judicial infrastructure requires immediate attention in terms of planning, budgeting and execution.]</p>	
<p>3. <i>Krishnakant Tamrakar v. State of Madhya Pradesh</i>, (2018) 17 SCC 27 [The Court observed that there is a need to revisit decongestion of constitutional courts possibility of five year old cases pending in the High Courts particularly the criminal appeals within the existing system.]</p>	
<p>4. <i>Hussain and Another v. Union of India</i>, (2017) 5 SCC 702 [The Court held that speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure guaranteed under Article 21. This constitutional right cannot be denied even on the plea of non-availability of financial resources. The court is entitled to issue directions to augment and strengthen investigating machinery, setting-up of new courts, building new court houses, providing more staff and equipment to the courts, appointment of additional judges and other measures as are necessary for speedy trial.]</p>	
<p>5. <i>Imtiyaz Ahmed v. State of Uttar Pradesh</i>, (2017) 3 SCC 658 [The Supreme Court endorsed view of the Law Commission in its 120th Report and directed that ratio of 50 Judges per million be achieved within a period of five years and not later than 10 years. The Court further issued directions for revision of unit method.]</p>	

6. **Ramrameshwari Devi v. Nirmala Devi**, (2011) 8 SCC 249 [The Court provided steps to trial courts in order to curb delay in civil litigation through which the existing system can be drastically changed or improved.]

SESSION 2

ELEMENTS OF JUDICIAL BEHAVIOUR

1.	Justice R.V. Raveendran, How to be a Good Judge: Advice to New Judges in ANOMALIES IN LAW & JUSTICE: WRITINGS RELATED TO LAW & JUSTICE, EBC Publishing (P) Ltd., (2021) pp. 277-317	
2.	Lord Denning, “Into the Conduct of Judges” in THE DUE PROCESS OF LAW, Oxford University Press (2012), pp. 58-66	
3.	Justice Sunil Ambwani, Ethical Reasoning in Judicial Process , (2012) 4 SCC J-35	
4.	Aharon Barak, The Role of the Judge: Theory, Practice and the Future in THE JUDGE IN A DEMOCRACY, Princeton University Press (2008) pp. 306-315	
5.	The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, 2002 [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]	

Judgments

(Judgments mentioned below include citations and short notes for reference. Please refer full judgment (available in pen drive) for conclusive opinion)

1. **Harendra Rai v. State of Bihar and Others**, 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1023 [The Trial Court and the High Court miserably failed to notice the sensitivity and intricacies of the case. Both the Courts completely shut their eyes to the manner of the investigation, the Prosecutor's role, and the high-handedness of the accused as also the conduct of the Presiding Officer of the Trial Court, despite observations and findings having been recorded not only by the Administrative Judge but also by the Division Bench deciding Habeas Corpus petition. They continued with their classical rut of dealing with the evidence in a manner as if it was a normal trial. They failed to notice the conduct of the Public Prosecutor in not even examining the formal witnesses and also that the Public Prosecutor was acting to the advantage of the accused rather than prosecuting the accused with due diligence and honesty. The Presiding Officer of the Trial Court acquitting the accused as also the learned Judge of the High Court dismissing the revision, were both well-aware of the facts, legal procedures, as well as the law regarding appreciation of evidence in a criminal case. Both the courts below ignored the administrative reports as also the judgment of the High Court in the Habeas Corpus petition. In fact they should have taken judicial notice of the same. They completely failed to take into consideration the conduct of the accused subsequent to the incident, which was extremely relevant and material in view of Section 8 of the Evidence Act. They failed to draw any adverse inference against the accused with respect to their guilt.]
2. **Muzaffar Husain v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.**, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 567 [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.]
3. **Mathew Z Pulikunnel v. Chief Justice of India**, WP(C) NO. 17654 OF 2021 [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.]

4. **Sadhna Chaudhary v. State of Uttar Pradesh** (2020) SCC Online 307 [*Judicial officers must aspire and adhere to a higher standard of honesty, integrity and Probity.*]
5. **Shrirang Yadavrao Waghmare v. State of Maharashtra**, (2019) 9 SCC 144 [*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*]
6. **Registrar General, Patna High Court v. Pandey Gajendra Prasad**, 2012 STPL(Web) 305 SC [*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.*]
7. **Rajendra Singh Verma (Dead) Through LRs. v. Lieutenant Governor (NCT of Delhi)**, (2011) 10 SCC 1 [*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.*]
8. **Tarak Singh v. Jyoti Basu**, (2005)1 SCC 201 [*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.*

[*“Integrity is the hallmark of judicial discipline, apart from others. It is high time the judiciary took utmost care to see that the temple of justice does not crack from inside, which will lead to a catastrophe in the judicial-delivery system resulting in the failure of public confidence in the system. It must be remembered that woodpeckers inside pose a larger threat than the storm outside.”*]
9. **High Court of Judicature at Bombay v. Shashikant S. Patil**, (2000) 1 SCC 416 [*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.*]
10. **Union of India v. K.K. Dhawan** (1993) AIR 1478 [*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.*]
11. **High Court of Judicature at Rajasthan v. Ramesh Chand Paliwal**, (1998) 3 SCC 72 [*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.*]
12. **High Court of Judicature at Bombay v. Uday Singh**, (1997) 5 SCC 129 [*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.*]
13. **Daya Shankar v. High Court of Allahabad**, (1987) 3 SCC 1 [*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.*]
14. **C. Ravichandran Iyer v. Justice A.M. Bhattacharjee & Ors.** (1995) 5 SCC 457 [*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.]

15. **K.P. Singh v. High Court of H.P. & ors.** 2011(3)KLJ11 [A judge is judged not only by the quality of his judgments, but also by the quality and purity of his character and the measurable standard of that character is impeccable integrity reflected transparently in his personal life as well. One who corrects corruption should be incorruptible. That is the high standard, the public has set in such high offices of institutional integrity. Therefore, any departure from the pristine codes and values of discipline and disciplined conduct on the part of the judicial officers will have to be viewed very seriously lest the very foundation of the system would be shaken and, if so, that will be the death knell of democracy.]
16. **R.C. Chandel v. High Court of M.P.,** (2012) 8 SCC 58 [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 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.]
17. **All India Judges' Association v. Union of India,** 1992 AIR 165 [It is time we mention about society's expectation from the Judicial Officers. A judge ought to be wise enough to know that he is fallible and, therefore, even ready to learn and be courageous enough to acknowledge his errors. The conduct of every judicial officer should be above reproach. He should be conscientious, studious, thorough, courteous, 'patient, punctual, just, impartial, fearless of public clamor, regardless of public praise, and indifferent to private, political or partisan influences; he should administer justice according to law, and deal with his appointment as a public trust; he should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of his judicial duties, nor should he administer the office for the purpose of advancing his personal ambitions or increasing his popularity.]
18. **Rajesh Kohli v. High Court of J. and K. and Anr.** (2010)12SCC783 [Upright and honest judicial officers are needed not only to bolster the image of the judiciary in the eyes of litigants, but also to sustain the culture of integrity, virtue and ethics among judges. The public's perception of the judiciary matters just as much as its role in dispute resolution. The credibility of the entire judiciary is often undermined by isolated acts of transgression by a few members of the Bench, and therefore it is imperative to maintain a high benchmark of honesty, accountability and good conduct.]
19. **In Re: “K” a judicial officer,** AIR 2001 SC 972 [Adverse remarks - appeal filed for seeking deletion of adverse remarks passed by High Court in judgment delivered - judgment delivered in appeal filed against decision passed by appellant - appellant (Metropolitan Magistrate) contended that remarks made in judgment was not essential and adversely affect her career growth - no opportunity of explaining herself given to appellant - remarks passed were not necessary for matter decided - they were not formed the part of reasoning given in judgment although found prejudicial to appellant's career - remarks directed to be deleted.]

SESSION 3 JUDGING SKILLS

1.	Justice R. V. Raveendran, Rendering Decisions- Basics for New Judges (Decision-Making & Judgment-Writing) in ANOMALIES IN LAW & JUSTICE: WRITINGS RELATED TO LAW & JUSTICE, EBC Publishing (P) Ltd. (2021) pp. 319-361	
2.	Justice G. Raghuram, Art of Judgment	
3.	Justice Sunil Ambwani, The Art of Writing Judgment in JUDGMENTS AND HOW TO WRITE THEM, Eastern Book Company (2018)	

4.	S. I. Strong, <i>Writing Reasoned Decisions and Opinions: A Guide for Novice, Experienced, and Foreign Judges</i> , 2015(1) Journal of Dispute Resolution 93–128 (2015)	
5.	<i>Handbook on Combating Gender Stereotypes by Supreme Court of India</i> Retrieved From: https://main.sci.gov.in/pdf/LU/04092023_070741.pdf	
6.	<i>Bangkok General Guidance for Judges on Applying a Gender Perspective in Southeast Asia</i> Retrieved From: https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Southeast-Asia-Bangkok-Guidance-Advocacy-2016-ENG.pdf	

Judgments

(Judgments mentioned below include citations and short notes for reference. Please refer full judgment (available in pen drive) for conclusive opinion)

1. **State of Rajasthan v. Gautam s/o Mohanlal**, 2023 INSC 903 [*The Supreme Court advised Trial Courts to refrain from continuing the practise of adding one's caste next to the name in the cause titles.*]
2. **SBI & Another v. Ajay Kumar Sood**, 2022 SCC OnLine 1067 [*The judgment replicates the individuality of the judge and therefore it is indispensable that it should be written with care and caution. The reasoning in the judgment should be intelligible and logical. Clarity and precision should be the goal. All conclusions should be supported by reasons duly recorded. The findings and directions should be precise and specific. Writing judgments is an art, though it involves skillful application of law and logic.*]
3. **Aparna Bhat v. State of M.P.**, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 230 [*Court to make sure survivor can rely on their impartiality and neutrality. Sensitivity in judicial approach/language/reasoning. Sensitivity to the concerns of survivors of sexual offences. Embargo on orders that reflect adversely on the judicial system/undermining the guarantee to fair justice. Removing gender bias.*]
4. **Shakuntala Shukla v. State of Uttar Pradesh**, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 672 [*“Judgment” means a judicial opinion which tells the story of the case; what the case is about; how the court is resolving the case and why. ... It is also defined as the decision or the sentence of a court in a legal proceeding along with the reasoning of a judge which leads him to his decision. ... It is not adequate that a decision is accurate, it must also be reasonable, logical and easily comprehensible. The judicial opinion is to be written in such a way that it elucidates in a convincing manner and proves the fact that the verdict is righteous and judicious. What the court says, and how it says it, is equally important as what the court decides. ... The judgment replicates the individuality of the judge and therefore it is indispensable that it should be written with care and caution. The reasoning in the judgment should be intelligible and logical. Clarity and precision should be the goal. All conclusions should be supported by reasons duly recorded.*] (Refer Para 9)
5. **Ajit Mohan v. Legislative Assembly Delhi**, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 495 [*it is the need of the hour to write clear and short judgments which the litigant can understand. The Wren & Martin principles of precis writing must be adopted.*]
6. **Surjeet Singh v. Sadhu Singh**, (2019) 2 SCC 396 [*There was no need to cite several decisions and that too in detail. Brevity being a virtue, it must be observed as far as possible while expressing an opinion.]*
7. **Nipun Saxena v. Union of India**, (2019) 2 SCC 703, [*Keeping in view the social object of preventing the victims or ostracising of victims, it would be appropriate that in judgments of all the courts i.e. trial courts, High Courts and the Supreme Court the name of the victim should not be indicated. This has been repeated in a large number of cases and we need not refer to all.*]
8. **Kanailal v. Ram Chandra Singh**, (2018) 13 SCC 715 [*Reasons are live links between the mind of the decision-taker to the controversy in question and the decision or conclusion arrived; Objectivity in reasons; Adjudging validity of decision; Right to reason is indispensable part of sound judicial system; Salutory requirement of natural justice]*

9. **Joint Commissioner of Income Tax v. Saheli Leasing & Industries Ltd.**, (2010) 6 SCC 384 [*State only what are germane to the facts of the case; Must have correlation with applicable law and facts; Ratio decidendi should be clearly spelt out; Go through the draft thoroughly; Sustained chronology in judgment – perfect sequence of events; Citations should afford clarity rather than confusion; Pronounce judgment at the earliest*]
10. **Board of Trustees of Martyrs Memorial Trust v. Union of India**, (2012) 10 SCC 734 [*Brevity in judgment writing; Due application of mind; Clarity of reasoning; Focussed consideration; Examination of every matter with seriousness; Sustainable decision*]
11. **Reliance Airport Developers v. Airport Authority of India and Ors**, (2006) 10 SCC 1 [*Judicial Discretion – Parameters to be followed while exercising Discretion - Relevant Paras 26-35*]
12. **B (A Child)(Adequacy of Reasons)**, [2022] EWCA Civ 407 (Lord Justice Peter Jackson & Lady Justice Nicola Davies) (Relevant Paras 59 and 60)

Judgments reflect the thinking of the individual judge and there is no room for dogma, but in my view a good judgment will in its own way, at some point and as concisely as possible: state the background facts; identify the issue(s) that must be decided; articulate the legal test(s) that must be applied; note the key features of the written and oral evidence, bearing in mind that a judgment is not a summing-up in which every possibly relevant piece of evidence must be mentioned; record each party's core case on the issues; make findings of fact about any disputed matters that are significant for the decision; evaluate the evidence as a whole, making clear why more or less weight is to be given to key features relied on by the parties; give the court's decision, explaining why one outcome has been selected in preference to other possible outcomes.

The last two processes – evaluation and explanation – are the critical elements of any judgment. As the culmination of a process of reasoning, they tend to come at the end, but they are the engine that drives the decision, and as such they need the most attention. A judgment that is weighed down with superfluous citation of authority or lengthy recitation of inessential evidence at the expense of this essential reasoning may well be flawed. At the same time, a judgment that does not fairly set out a party's case and give adequate reasons for rejecting it is bound to be vulnerable.

13. **Siddharth Vashisht Alias Manu Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi)**, 2010 6 SCC 1 [*Adverse remarks - Trial Judge made adverse remarks against prosecution-And Division Bench against trial Judge-Such adverse remarks expunged. The higher Courts in exercise of their appellate or original jurisdiction may find patent errors of law or fact or appreciation of evidence in the judgment which has been challenged before them. Despite this, what is of significance is that, the Courts should correct the error in judgment and not normally comment upon the Judge. The possibility of taking a contrary view is part of the system. The judicial propriety and discipline demand that strictures or lacerating language should not be used by the higher Courts in exercise of their appellate or supervisory jurisdiction. Judicial discipline requires that errors of judgments should be corrected by reasons of law and practice of passing comments against the lower courts needs to be deprecated in no uncertain terms. The individuals come and go but what actually stands forever is the institution.]*

SESSION- 4

USE OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) IN COURTS

1.	e-Courts Brief , National Informatics Centre	
2.	The Milestones of e-Committee , Supreme Court of India (2021)	
3.	Status of Implementation of e-Court Mission Mode Project , 05 Aug 2022, Ministry of Law and Justice	
4.	R. Arulmozhiselvi, Court and Case Management through National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) (2021)	

5.	Dory Reiling and Francesco Contini, <i>E-Justice Platforms: Challenges for Judicial Governance</i> , 13 IJCA 1 (2022)	
6.	Francesco Contini, <i>Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Humans, Law and Technology Interactions in Judicial Proceedings</i> . Volume 2 (1) 2020 Law, Technology and Humans.	
7.	Sengupta <i>et.al.</i> , <i>Responsible AI for the Indian Justice System – A Strategy Paper</i> (2021) Retrieved From - https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/research/responsible-ai-for-the-indian-justice-system-a-strategy-paper/	

Judgments

(Judgments mentioned below include citations and short notes for reference. Please refer full judgment for conclusive opinion) (Full Text Judgment available in Pen Drive)

1. **Sarvesh Mathur v. The Registrar General of Punjab and Haryana High Court**, W.P.(Crl.) No. 351/2023 [The Supreme Court directed the High Courts to ensure that adequate internet facilities including Wi-fi are made available free of charge to all advocates and litigants appearing before the High Courts. The Apex Court also observed that links available through video conferencing must be made available in the cause list of the concerned court and that there should be no requirement to make a separate application to appear through virtual mode.]
2. **In Re: Children in Street Situations**, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 189 [Standard Operating Procedure for recording evidence of children through video conferencing to be followed in all criminal trials where child witnesses, not residing near Court Points, are examined and not physically in the courts where the trial is conducted. Remote Point Coordinators to ensure that child-friendly practices are adopted during the examination of the witnesses.]
3. **In Re. Guidelines for Court Functioning Through Video Conferencing During Covid-19 Pandemic**, (2021) 5 SCC 454 [The Video Conferencing in every High Court and within the jurisdiction of every High Court shall be conducted according to the Rules for that purpose framed by that High Court. High Courts that have not framed such Rules shall do so having regard to the circumstances prevailing in the State. Till such Rules are framed, the High Courts may adopt the model Video Conferencing Rules provided by the E-Committee, Supreme Court of India to all the Chief Justices of the High Court.]
4. **Arnab Manoranjan Goswami v. The State of Maharashtra**, (2021) 2 SCC 427 [The NJDG is a valuable resource for all High Courts to monitor the pendency and disposal of cases, including criminal cases. For Chief Justices of the High Courts, the information which is available is capable of being utilized as a valuable instrument to promote access to justice, particularly in matters concerning liberty. The Chief Justices of every High Court should in their administrative capacities utilize the ICT tools which are placed at their disposal in ensuring that access to justice is democratized and equitably allocated. Administrative judges in charge of districts must also use the facility to engage with the District judiciary and monitor pendency.]
5. **In Re. Guidelines for Court Functioning Through Video Conferencing During Covid-19 Pandemic**, (2020) 6 SCC 686 [The Supreme Court of India and all High Courts are authorized to adopt measures required to ensure the robust functioning of the judicial system through the use of video conferencing technologies. The District Courts in each State shall adopt the mode of Video Conferencing prescribed by the concerned High Court. Courts shall duly notify and make available the facilities for video conferencing for such litigants who do not have the means or access to video conferencing facilities. Video conferencing shall be mainly employed for hearing arguments whether at the trial stage or at the appellate stage. In no case shall evidence be recorded without the mutual consent of both the parties by video conferencing. Every High Court is authorised to determine the modalities which are suitable to the temporary transition to the use of video conferencing technologies. All measures taken for functioning of courts in consonance with social distancing guidelines and best public health practices shall be deemed to be lawful.]
6. **Pradyuman Bisht v. Union of India**, (2018) 15 SCC 639 [Directions for installation of CCTV Cameras in court complexes.]

7. *Swapnil Tripathi v. Supreme Court of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 639 [Directions regarding livestreaming of court proceedings - virtual access of live court proceedings will effectuate the right of access to justice or right to open justice and public trial, right to know the developments of law and including the right of justice at the doorstep of the litigants., live streaming of court proceedings in the prescribed digital format would be an affirmation of the constitutional rights bestowed upon the public and the litigants in particular. Sensitive cases, matrimonial matters, matters relating to children not to be livestreamed. Discretion of the judge to disallow live-streaming for specific cases where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice.]

**SESSION 5
MAINTAINING EQUANIMITY ON AND OFF THE DAIS**

1.	Jeremy D. Fogel, Mindfulness and Judging , 101(1) <i>Judicature</i> (2017)	
2.	Michael Kirby, Judicial Stress and Judicial Bullying , 14(1) <i>QUT Law Review</i> 1-14 (2014)	
3.	Terry A. Maroney, Judicial Temperament, Explained , 105(2) <i>Judicature</i> 48 (2021)	
4.	Allison P. Harris & Maya Sen, Bias and Judging , 22 <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 241-249 (2019)	
5.	Monica K. Miller & David M. Flores, Addressing the Problem of Courtroom Stress , 91 <i>Judicature</i> 60 (2007)	
6.	Cole-Mossman, Jennie et al., Reducing Judicial Stress through Reflective Practice , 54(2) <i>Court Review</i> 90-94 (2018)	