



NOVEMBER 2016

# CJA

# e-NEWSLETTER

Monthly Newsletter of  
Chandigarh Judicial Academy of Punjab & Haryana High Court  
For circulation among the stakeholders in Judicial Education

VOLUME : 01  
ISSUE : 07

## In this Issue:

**From the Desk of Chief Editor**

**Latest Cases: CIVIL**

**Latest Cases: CRIMINAL**

**Notifications**

**Events of the Month &  
Forthcoming Events**

## FROM THE DESK OF CHIEF EDITOR

The Apex Court of the country has shown serious concern about certain matters in recent weeks. The same, I wish to share with the Judicial Fraternity. In the matter of Sabu Matthew George versus U.O.I., vide order dated November 16, 2016, it expressed serious concern about the falling Child Sex Ratio. Even in earlier cases, the Summit court had expressed its concern in this regard. The concern has been expressed in the context of advertisements under Section 22 of PC and PNDT Act. The intention of law is to prevent any message / communication which results in determination / selection of sex by any means whatsoever scientific or otherwise. In particular, three software companies, namely, Google India Private Limited, Yahoo India Limited and Microsoft Corporation (I) Private Limited were before the Supreme Court. These companies were required to develop a technique so that, the moment any advertisement or search is noticed into the system, that will not be projected or seen by adopting the method of 'auto block'. This concept was clarified by stating that if any person tries to avail the corridors of these companies, this devise shall be adopted so that no one can enter or see the said advertisement or message or anything that is prohibited under the PC and PNDT Act, 1994. In the present case, the court directed that Union of India shall constitute a 'Nodal Agency' and give due advertisement in television, newspapers and radio by stating that the Nodal Agency has been created in pursuance to the order of the Summit Court. It be further clarified that anyone who comes across anything that has the nature of an advertisement or any impact in identifying a boy or girl in any method, manner or mode by any search engine shall be brought to its notice. Once it is brought to the notice of Nodal Agency, the Agency shall intimate the concerned Search Engine or the corridor provider immediately on receipt of the same. Accordingly, the search engine would be obliged to delete it within 36 hours with intimation to the Nodal Agency. These were interim directions. The matter has been ordered to be kept pending. Further directions would follow.

The purpose of sharing this concern of the Supreme Court is that the Judicial Fraternity must also be equally concerned in ensuring the effective implementation of this legislation. The concern relates to everyone in the Judicial domain. If the seriousness is not demonstrated in reality and in actuality, the purpose of the legislation would be defeated. There is equally serious concern relating to the commercial elements involved in this entire exercise. Resultantly, the Judicial approach will have to be one step forward so that the melody is effectively controlled and stopped. Let us join our hands together to ensure the true implementation of this social legislation.

Balram K. Gupta

## Editorial Board

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal**  
Editor-in-Chief

**Dr. Balram K. Gupta**  
Chief Editor

**Prof. Shashi K. Sharma**  
**Ms. Navjot Kaur**  
Editors

## LATEST CASES: CIVIL

“The good faith of the judges is the firm bed-rock on which any system of administration securely rests and an attempt to shake the people’s confidence in the courts is to strike at the very root of our system of democracy.”

M. Hidayatullah, C.J. in E.M. Sankaran Namboodripad v. T. Narayanan Nambiar, (1970) 2 SCC 325

**Satya Pal Anand vs. State of M.P. & Ors.:2016 (10) SCALE 329 – Ss. 33, 68 & 69 of the Registration Act, 1908** - The High Court had held that since the Registering Officer registered the document presented to him for registration, his function is exhausted. He would then become functus officio and no power to impound the document u/s 33 of the Act. This decision of the High Court became the subject matter of challenge before the Apex Court. **Held** that once the document is registered, it is not open to any authority, under the Act of 1908, to cancel the registration. The remedy of appeal provided under the Act of 1908 is limited to the inaction or refusal by the Registering Officer to register a document. Further held, the power conferred on the Registrar by virtue of Section 68 cannot be invoked to cancel the registration of documents already registered.

**Anantheswami vs. Nayana S. Bhakta & Ors. : MANU/SC/1480/2016: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 – A Clause for Arbitration in Partnership Deed** – When the partners and those who claim through partners agreed to get the dispute settled by arbitration, it is not open for the Appellants to contend that partnership being unregistered partnership, the dispute cannot be referred. The petitioners failed to show any statutory provision either in 1996 Act or in any other statute from which it could be said that dispute concerning unregistered partnership deed cannot be referred to arbitration.

**Harish Chandra & Company vs. State of U.P. through Superintending Engineer : (2016) 9 SCC 478 – Arbitration Act, 1940 – Ss. 30 & 33 – the Apex Court held** that in appeal, the High Court cannot proceed to examine legality and correctness of findings of fact of arbitrator by re-appreciating evidence and on that basis conclude that arbitrator had gone beyond terms of agreement between parties. An objection, neither raised before arbitrator nor before trial court, but raised for first time before High Court should not be entertained. It can set aside a reasoned award only when reasons ascribed by arbitrator are perverse

to the extent that no man with ordinary prudence could take such view or there is error apparent on record or award is based on wrong proposition of law.

**Madhya Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation vs. Manoj Kumar & Ors.: (2016) 9 SCC 375 – Voluntary Retirement** - In those cases, where the Scheme is contractual in nature, **provisions of the Indian Contract Act would apply**. The VRS Scheme floated by the employer would be treated as **invitation to offer** and the application submitted by the employees pursuant thereto is an offer which does not amount to resignation in praesenti and the offer can be withdrawn during the validity period. This would be the position even when there is a Clause in the Scheme that offer once given cannot be withdrawn at all. However, exception to this principle is that in such cases offer is to be withdrawn during the validity period of the Scheme and not thereafter even when if it is not accepted during the period of the Scheme.

**Bhupinder Singh Bawa vs. Asha Devi: MANU/SC/1473/2016: Rent Act Matters - Eviction Matters of Personal Necessity – Held** – Landlord can evict tenants for bonafide need of premises for business purpose. It is open to the landlord to choose a most suitable premises for carrying on business of her son and that the respondent cannot be dictated by the appellant as to from which shop her son should start the business from.

**State of Punjab vs. Jagjit Singh & Ors.: 2016 (10) SCALE 447 – Equal Pay for Equal Work – Held** – There is no escape from the above obligation, in view of different provisions of the Constitution referred to above, and in view of the law declared by this Court under Article 141 of the Constitution of India, the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ constitutes a clear and unambiguous right and is vested in every employee – whether engaged on regular or temporary basis. Referring to various case laws on the subject, the Court summarized the principles as follows: The ‘onus of proof’, of parity in the duties and responsibilities of the subject post with the reference post, under the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’, lies on

the person who claims it. He who approaches the Court has to establish, that the subject post occupied by him, requires him to discharge equal work of equal value, as the reference post. The mere fact that the subject post occupied by the claimant, is in a "different department" vis-a-vis the reference post, does not have any bearing on the determination of a claim, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work'. Persons discharging identical duties, cannot be treated differently, in the matter of their pay, merely because they belong to different departments of Government.

**Saheb Reddy vs. Sharanappa & Ors.:** **MANU/SC/1493/2016 – Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956 – S.12** – In view of the provisions of S.12 of the Adoption Act, it is crystal clear that the property which had been vested in the widow and three daughters of late Shri Sharnappa Gaded in 1957 would not be disturbed because of adoption of Defendant No.1, which had taken place on 9th February, 1971. Thus, Smt. Sharnappa had become absolute owner of 1/4th share and Smt. Nagamma, the mother of the Plaintiff had also become an owner of 1/4th share of the property belonging to late Shri Sharnappa Gaded. In view of the aforesaid legal position, it was held that a **child adopted by a Hindu widow would not have any rights to the property of the women's deceased husband and may lay claim only over the property inherited by his mother.** The adoption of a child would not disturb or take away from the rights and interest of other members of the family to which they were entitled before the adoption.

**Madhuri Ghosh vs. Debobroto Dutta and Ors.:** **MANU/SC/1478/2016 – Testamentary Succession – Held** – where an absolute bequest has been made in respect of certain property to certain persons in a Will, then a subsequent bequest made qua the same property later in the same Will to other persons will be of no effect. An attempt should always be made to read the two parts of the document harmoniously, if possible; it is only when this is not possible, e.g., where an absolute title is given in clear and unambiguous terms and the later provisions trench on the same, that the later provisions have to be held to be void. Perusing the contents of the Will under question, the court observed that there are no words of limitation used in it and it could not be said that the bequeath is only a limited interest in favour of the widow and the elder daughter.

A reading of this paragraph therefore, leaves no manner of doubt that what is granted jointly in favour of the widow and the elder daughter is an absolute right to the property.

**Robin Ramjibhai Patel vs. Anandibai Rama @ Rajaram Pawar & Ors. : Civil Appeal of 2016 arising out of SLP(C) No. 31087 of 2014 : DoD 10.11.2016 – Impleadment of Proposed Purchasers of Property** – Plaintiff filed a suit for the specific performance of an agreement for sale of property. His application to implead the proposed purchasers having registered agreement of sale in their favour as defendants was rejected by the trial court and the order was confirmed by the high court. On his appeal, the apex court observed that the necessary parties in a suit for specific performance of a contract for sale are not only parties to the contract or their legal representatives, but also a person who had purchased the contracted property from the vendor.

**Reliance General Insurance Co. Ltd. vs. Shashi Sharma & Ors.:** **2016 (9) SCALE 317 – Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 - Compensation** – It is the balancing of loss and gain of the claimant occasioned by the death. But this has to change its colour to the extent a statute intends to do. Thus, this has to be interpreted in the light of the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act. It is very clear, to which there could be no doubt that this Act delivers compensation to the claimant only on account of accidental injury or death, not on account of any other death. Thus, the pecuniary advantage accruing under this Act has to be deciphered, correlating with the accidental death. The compensation payable under the Motor Vehicles Act is on account of the pecuniary loss to the claimant by accidental injury or death and not other forms of death. If there is natural death or death by suicide, serious illness, including even death by accident, through train, air flight not involving a motor vehicle, it would not be covered under the Motor Vehicles Act. Thus, the application of the general principle under the common law of loss and gain for the computation of compensation under this Act must correlate to this type of injury or death, viz., accidental. If the words "pecuniary advantage" from whatever source are to be interpreted to mean any form of death under this Act, it would dilute all possible benefits conferred on the claimant and would be contrary to the spirit of the law.

## LATEST CASES: CRIMINAL

“Any kind of criminalisation of politics is an extremely lamentable situation. It is an anathema to the sanctity of democracy. The criminalisation creates a concavity in the heart of democracy and has the potentiality to paralyse, comatose and strangulate the purity of the system.”

Dipak Misra, J. in *Krishnamoorthy v. Sivakumar*, (2015) 3 SCC 467

### **Het Ram Beniwal vs. Raghuvveer Singh & Ors.: 2016 (10) SCALE 313 – Contempt of Courts Act–S.5**

The apex Court upheld an order of Rajasthan High Court convicting two advocates who had made serious allegations of corruption and bias against the High Court. They had indulged in an assault on the integrity of the judges of the High Court by making baseless and unsubstantiated allegations. Therefore, they cannot seek shelter u/s 5 of the Act. **Held** that every citizen has a fundamental right to speech, guaranteed under Article 19 of the Constitution of India. Contempt of Court is one of the restrictions on such right. We are conscious that the power under the Act has to be exercised sparingly and not in a routine manner. If there is a calculated effort to undermine the judiciary, the courts will exercise their jurisdiction to punish the offender for committing contempt.

### **Yogesh Singh vs. Mahabeer Singh: 2016 (10) SCALE 219 – Held**

that it is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that the guilt of the accused must be proved beyond all reasonable doubts. However, the **burden on the prosecution is only to establish its case beyond all reasonable doubt and not all doubts**. The bench observed that the accused was not per se entitled for acquittal on the ground of non-compliance of **mandatory provisions of Section 313 Cr.P.C.** With regard to the contention with respect to delay in sending FIR to magistrate, the bench said it could not be laid down as a rule of universal application that whenever there is some delay in sending the FIR to the magistrate, the prosecution version becomes unreliable and the trial stands vitiated. When there is positive evidence to the fact that the FIR was recorded without unreasonable delay and investigation started on the basis of that FIR and there is no other infirmity brought to the notice of the court, then in the absence of any prejudice to the accused, it cannot be concluded that the investigation was tainted and the prosecution story rendered unsupportable.

**Harbeer Singh vs. Sheeshpal: 2016 (10) SCALE 211 – Delay in Recording Witnesses’ Statements Can be Fatal for Prosecution Case – Held** that delay in recording of statements of the prosecution

witnesses **u/s 161 Cr.P.C.**, although those witnesses were or could be available for examination when the Investigating Officer visited the scene of occurrence or soon thereafter, would cast a doubt upon the prosecution case. The court observed that though it is a well-settled law that delay in recording the statement of the witnesses does not necessarily discredit their testimony, but if those witnesses were or could be available for examination when the Investigating Officer visited the scene of occurrence or soon thereafter, and even then the delay has occurred, it would cast a doubt upon the prosecution case.

### **Shyam Pal vs. Dayawati Besoya & Ors.:2016 (10) SCALE 441 – Negotiable Instruments Act, 1988–S.138– Cr.P.C. – S.4 to 7**

The materials on record leave no manner of doubt that the complaints filed by the Respondents stem from two identical transactions between the same parties where in the Respondent had advanced loan of Rs. 5 lacs each to the Appellant on two different dates against which the latter had issued cheques to discharge his debt and that the cheques had been dishonored. The facts pleaded and proved do unassailably demonstrate that the loans advanced had been in the course of a series of transactions between the same parties on same terms and conditions. Significantly in both the cases, following the conviction of the Appellant under Section 138 of the Act, the same sentences as well have been awarded. There is thus an overwhelming identicalness in the features of both the cases permitting, the two transactions, though undertaken at different points of time, to be deemed as a singular transaction or two segments of one transaction. This deduction understandably is in the singular facts of the case. **Held** that the appellant was entitled to the benefit of the discretion contained in S.427 of the Code. Ordered that the substantive sentences of ten months simple imprisonment awarded to the appellant in the two complaint cases would run concurrently.

**Mahavir Singh vs. State of Madhya Pradesh: 2016 (10) SCALE 591 – The Role of Investigating Officer dealing with murder**

**case** – In the instant case, an innocent man has lost his life at the hands of another man. Looking at the way in which the investigation was handled, the Apex Court observed that it was carried out in a lackluster manner. The approach of the Investigating Officer in recording the statements of witnesses, collecting the evidence and preparation of site map had remained unmindful. The Investigating Officer, dealing with a murder case, is expected to be diligent, truthful and fair in his approach and his performance should always be in conformity with the police manual and a default or breach of duty may prove fatal to the prosecution's case. We may hasten to add that in the present case the investigation was carried out with unconcerned and uninspiring performance. There was no firm and sincere effort with the needed zeal and spirit to bring home the guilt of the accused. We feel that there are no compelling and substantial reasons for the High Court to interfere with the order of acquittal when the prosecution has miserably failed to establish the guilt of the accused.

**Nathiya vs. State rep. by Inspector of Police, Bagayam Police Station:2016 (10) SCALE 567–Grave Suspicion cannot substitute proof in Criminal Trials** – Though the materials on record do raise a needle of suspicion towards them, the prosecution has failed to elevate its case from the realm of “may be true” to the plane of “must be true” as is indispensably required in law for conviction on a criminal charge. It is trite to state that in a criminal trial, suspicion, howsoever grave, cannot substitute proof. The chain is complete or not would depend on the facts of each case emanating from the evidence and no universal yardstick should ever be attempted. In judging the culpability of the accused, the circumstances adduced when collectively considered, must lead only to the irresistible conclusion that the accused alone is the perpetrator of the crime alleged. The circumstances established must be of a conclusive nature consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused.

**K.V. Prakash Babu vs. State of Karnataka : MANU/SC/1524/2016 – IPC – Ss.498A/306** – The prosecution case was that the wife felt extremely hurt and, eventually being unable to withstand the conduct of the husband who was allegedly involved in an extra-marital affair, put an end to her life. The High court upheld the trial court judgment convicting him u/s 498A and also held him guilty for driving his wife to

suicide. **Held** – The explanation (a) to Section 498-A of the IPC which includes cruelty to drive the woman to commit suicide, would not be attracted. The court also observed that there is no whisper with regard to any kind of ill-treatment or cruel behaviour by the husband other than the allegations of extra-marital relationship and said: Extra-marital relationship, per se, or as such would not come within the ambit of Section 498-A IPC. It would be an illegal or immoral act, but other ingredients are to be brought home so that it would constitute a criminal offence. The court clarified that if the husband gets involved in an extra-marital affair that may not in all circumstances invite conviction u/s 306 of the IPC, but definitely that can be a ground for divorce or other reliefs in a matrimonial dispute under other enactments.

**Bajnath vs. State of Madhya Pradesh: MANU/SC/1501/2016 – IPC – Ss. 304B&498A** – One of the essential ingredients of dowry death u/s 304B of the Penal Code is that the accused must have subjected the woman to cruelty in connection with demand for dowry soon before her death and that this ingredient has to be proved by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt and only then the court will presume that the accused has committed the offence of dowry death u/s 113B of the Indian Evidence Act. The Apex court acquitted accused in-laws in a dowry death case, holding that the prosecution failed to prove this indispensable component of Sections 304B and 498A of the Penal Code beyond reasonable doubt. The court also held that the factum of unnatural death in the matrimonial home and that too within seven years of marriage, therefore, is thus ipso facto not sufficient to bring home the charge under Ss. 304B and 498A of the Code against them.

**Kuldeep Kapoor vs. Court on its Motion: Criminal Appeal No.1011/2006 (SC) – 10.11.2016 – Refusal to Answer Court Queries – is it Criminal Contempt**–The Plaintiff was accused of tempering with documents he produced along with the plaint. The court initiated court contempt proceedings for refusing to answer the queries put to him. The High court sentenced them to undergo simple imprisonment for two months and to pay fine of ₹2000/-. **Held** that a litigant refusing to answer a question put to him by the court does not constitute Criminal Contempt of Court. We find that the behavior of the appellants was not contemptuous.

## NOTIFICATIONS

### 1. THE REAL ESTATE (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 2016

- **This Act has come into force on May 1<sup>st</sup> 2016** as per notification dated 27.04.2016 notified of Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty and Alleviation.
- The Ministry of HUPA has notified the Rules for Union Territories w.e.f. 01.01.2016 while the State Govt. barring Gujarat have yet to frame the Rules for carrying out the provisions.

#### **Salient features of the Act**

- The law mandates all residential projects, with some exceptions, to be Registered with Regulatory Authority.
- The promoter has to register their project (residential as well as commercial) with the Regulatory Authority before booking, selling or offering apartments for sale in such projects. In case a project is to be promoted in phases, then each phase shall be considered as a standalone project, and the promoter shall obtain Registration for each phase.
- The Act provides for mandatory deposit of 70% of amount realized from allottees by the promoters in a separate account to be maintained in a scheduled bank subject to Regulations allowing the promoter to withdraw the amounts for utilization for construction.
- There are provisions regulating acceptance or refusal of registration, revocation or lapse of registration.
- There is a provision laying a limit on the promoter from accepting a sum more than 10% of the cost as advance payment.
- There are provisions regarding refund of amount in case of delay in handing over possession.

#### **Offences and penalties**

- Stringent provisions have been provided under the Act against the promoter in case of contravention or non compliance of the provisions of the Act or Orders, decisions or directions of Regulatory Authority or Appellate Tribunal.

#### **Bar of jurisdiction**

- According to Section 79 of the Act, no civil court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or proceeding arising out of the Act over which the Authority, or the Adjudicating Officer or the Appellate Tribunal is empowered to determine. No injunction shall be granted by any court

or other authority in respect of any action taken or to be taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under the Act.

#### **Bar of cognizance**

- No court shall take cognizance of any offence punishable under the Act or the Rules or Regulations, unless on a complaint made in writing by the Authority or by any Officer of the Authority duly authorized by it for this purpose.
- No court inferior to that of Metropolitan Magistrate or judicial magistrate first class shall try any offence punishable under the Act.

### 2. CVC LAYS DOWN GUIDELINES: CASES OF MISCONDUCT AGAINST JUDICIAL OFFICERS

The CVC has put forth the procedures and principles to be followed as those prescribed by the Supreme Court in RP Parekh case (AIR 2016 SC 3356). The circular stated that the new set of guidelines should be kept in mind along with those enunciated in Commission's circular dated 1<sup>st</sup> November 2007, while examining cases of alleged misconduct by judicial officers. It also directed the CVOs to apprise all the disciplinary/administrative authorities in organizations of the stated principles. The circular has cited the Para from the Supreme Court judgment that places the onus on the investigating authority to determine whether the act by the judicial officer has been actuated by an oblique motive or corrupt practice by careful appraisal of the material on record.

### 3. RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERIM MEASURES: THE INADEQUACY OF THE INDIAN ARBITRATION AMENDMENT ACT, 2015

It is an established position that section 17 from the old regime was limited and that it did not confer any power on the arbitral tribunal to enforce its orders. Nonetheless, with the 2015 Arbitration Amendment coming into force, a broader mandate was granted to an arbitral tribunal, solidifying it with a statutory mechanism of enforcement. What it fails to reflect is the establishment of a regime for the recognition and enforcement of interim measures issued by arbitral tribunal seated outside India.

## EVENTS OF THE MONTH

1. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course (**through Video Conferencing**) was organized on November 05, 2016 on Important Issues relating to **Cyber Crime**. Mr. Praveen K. Sinha, IG, Cyber Police, Punjab was in discussion and inter-action with the Civil Judges across the State of Punjab. Mr. Sandeep Garg, ADCP, Ludhiana assisted Mr. Sinha in this Video Conferencing.

2. State Legal Service Authority, UT Chandigarh organized a Seminar-cum-Workshop on Mediation: Challenges and Way Ahead and Art of Making Referrals to Mediation on November 05, 2016 at the Chandigarh Judicial Academy. HMJ A.K. Sikri, Judge, Supreme Court of India monitored the open house discussion and question-answer session. On this occasion, besides others, HMJ Shiavax Jal Vazifdar, Chief Justice, High Court of Punjab and Haryana and HMJ S.S. Saron, HMJ Surya Kant, Judges of High Court of Punjab and Haryana spoke on different issues relating to Mediation. The two Directors, CJA, the Faculty and the Trainee Judicial Officers were also part of the workshop.

3. Chandigarh District Courts celebrated its Golden Jubilee from November 01-05, 2016. Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Goyal, Judge, Supreme Court of India chaired the inaugural session and Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.K. Sikri was the Chairman at the Valedictory. HMJ S.J. Vazifdar, Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana High Court, HMJ S.S. Saron, HMJ Surya Kant, HMJ Mahesh Grover participated in the deliberations. Different Hon'ble Judges of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, District and Sessions Judges past and present attended the celebrations. Chandigarh Judicial Academy was also duly represented through the two Directors, the Faculty and the Trainee Judicial Officers from Haryana. Even some members of the office staff of CJA were part of the team during the celebrations.

4. The Trainee Judicial Officers, Haryana were taken for one day Revenue Training in the District of Panchkula. The Revenue Training was organized by Ms. Ritu Tagore, District & Sessions Judge, Panchkula and was duly co-ordinated by B.M. Lal, Faculty Member on

November 07, 2016. This provided practical opportunity to the Judicial Officers to know the different details relating to Revenue matters. The group also included the Additional District & Sessions Judge Mr. Gurmohan Singh, under training.

5. Mr. Gurmohan Singh, ADJ (Direct from Bar) completed his three months training at Chandigarh Judicial Academy. Accordingly, he was relieved to join at Jalandhar on the evening of November 08, 2016 at a brief ceremony by HMJ Rajesh Bindal, President, BOG in the presence of both the Directors of the Academy.

6. State Institute of Rural Development (Punjab) organized one day Workshop on the Powers of Collectors (Village Common Land Act, 1961) on November 10, 2016 in co-ordination with Chandigarh Judicial Academy. Justice Rajive Bhalla (Retd.) and Mr. B.M. Lal, Faculty, CJA took different sessions.

7. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Civil Judges from the States of Punjab and Haryana was organized on November 19, 2016 to sensitize the Judicial Officers with regard to the Important Provisions of NDPS Act. Judicial Officers, 64 in number attended / participated in this Refresher Course. Ms. Harpreet Kaur Jeewan, Director (Administration), Ms. Mandeep Pannu and Mr. Pradeep Mehta, Faculty Members, CJA took different sessions.

8. One day Workshop on Forensic Examination – Scientific and Technical Issues was organized on November 27, 2016. Senior Doctors, Senior Police Officers and Officers from CFSL Chandigarh and State Forensic Laboratories of Punjab and Haryana participated in this Workshop. HMJ Rajesh Bindal addressed the participants on different objectives of the Workshop in the inaugural session. Mr. Pradeep Mehta, Faculty-cum-Coordinator explained: Forensic Science and Technical Issues. Dr. Balram K. Gupta, Director (Academics) and Mr. Mehta monitored the discussions and presentations of different groups. Ms. Harpreet Kaur Jeewan, Director (Administration) also spoke at the inaugural session. 95 different Stakeholders participated in the Workshop.

## FORTHCOMING EVENTS

1. Chandigarh Judicial Academy has organized five day Academic Programme for a group of 30-35 Sri Lankan Judges from December 12 to 16, 2016. Hon'ble Mr. Justice K. Sripavan, Chief Justice, Sri Lanka would also be in the Academy during this Programme. HMJ Madan B. Lokur, Judge,

Supreme Court, other Judges, Lawyers and accomplished Professors would be taking the different sessions as Resource Persons.

2. There would be Video Conferencing on December 03, 2016 on Important Issues relating to Cyber Crime for Civil Judges, Haryana.