



JULY 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 : 03

In this Issue:

From the Desk of Chief Editor

Case Comment

Latest Cases: CIVIL

Cases Relating to Sentencing

Notifications

Events of the Month &
Forthcoming Events

FROM THE DESK OF CHIEF EDITOR

This is the third e-Newsletter (July 2016). During the month of July 2016, CJA conducted a Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Additional District & Sessions Judges from the states of Punjab & Haryana on "Sentencing". In the domain of Criminal Jurisprudence, 'Sentencing' plays a significant role. Accordingly, the Judicial fraternity needs to be sensitized regarding different parameters necessary to be kept in mind while awarding 'Sentence'. In order to ensure that basic elements are followed while awarding the 'sentence', this e-Newsletter has catalogued different cases particularly of the summit court. In listing these cases, the effort is to provide the basic guidelines to sensitize the judicial minds to the mitigating and aggravating circumstances which would provide the road-map in awarding 'sentence'. The case comment also covers the Constitutional Bench judgment of July 19, 2016 which is highly relevant while awarding 'sentence'. This is to urge the Judges at different levels to refer to the detailed judgments in order to cull out the basic guidelines to be kept in mind while awarding the sentence. This would help the Society to ensure that the criminal jurisprudence in 'sentencing' is neither lenient nor rigid. The 'sentence' needs to be such which would have the desired impact in balancing different elements of our Society.

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

I am happy to record that the Study Circles have become operational in different Districts of Punjab and Haryana during the month of July 2016. The CJA has received the feedback from some Districts of both Punjab and Haryana. I am happy to share that in different Districts, the presentations made by ADJs and other Judicial Officers are on different topics of practical importance. I am confident that the remaining Districts must have also held their respective meetings and presentations made. It is hoped that their reports would soon be reaching the Academy. This process is to be continued every month. The next step would be that the presentations made would be completed by the concerned judges incorporating the issues which came up for discussion during the meeting. In short, wholesome reports are to be prepared. The same are to be made available to the Judicial fraternity so that they are able to use them in their daily judicial work. This exercise would certainly strengthen our Justice Delivery System.

Balram K. Gupta

CASE COMMENT

Muthuramalingam & Ors. Versus State Rep. by Insp. of Police: 2016 SCC OnLine SC 713: This decision by Constitutional Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court is on the law point that "Whether consecutive life sentences can be awarded to a convict on being found guilty of a series of murders for which he has been tried in a single trial?" which was referred by a three Judge bench. In this case, the appellants were tried for several offences including an offence punishable u/s 302 of IPC for several murders allegedly committed by them in one incident. They were convicted and sentenced to suffer various sentences including imprisonment for life, for each murder committed by them and sentences were to run consecutively, resulting that every accused was to undergo two to eight such sentences as per the number of murders committed by them.

Only issue in appeal was the validity of the direction that the imprisonment for life awarded to the each one of the appellant would run consecutively. Since, the catena of judgment rendered earlier by Hon'ble Supreme Court were in conflict with regard to the views taken by the court on the question whether consecutive life imprisonment were legally permissible, the matter was referred to a larger bench. (The judgments in cases *O.M. Cherian @ Thankachan vs. State of Kerala & Ors., (2015) 2 SCC 501* and *Duryodhan Rout vs. State of Orissa (2015) 2 SCC 783* laid down that imprisonment for life in such cases can run concurrently and not consecutively. Whereas, the decisions in *Kamalanantha and Ors. vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2005) 5 SCC 194* and *Sanaullah Khan vs. State of Bihar, (2013) 3 SCC 52* were that it was legally permissible to direct that the sentences so awarded can run consecutively).

After giving a thoughtful consideration to Section 31 of the Cr.P.C. and the principles laid down in *O.M. Cherian's* and *Duryodhan Rout's* case (*Supra*) stated that proviso to Section 31 (2) Cr.P.C. forbids running of such sentences consecutively. To answer this, Hon'ble Supreme Court had further examined that, whether imprisonment for life does indeed imply imprisonment till

the end of the normal life of the convict. Answering it in the affirmative it has been held that it is no longer res-Integra, in view of the long line of decisions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. (Few of the cases mentioned are: *Ashok Kumar @ Golu vs. Union of India (1991) 3 SCC 498*, *Laxman Naskar vs. Union of India, (2000) 2 SCC 595*, *Swami Sharaddananda vs. State of Karnataka, (2008) 13 SCC 767* and a constitutional bench decision in *Union of India vs. Sriharan, 2015 (13) SCALE 165*). Fairly well settled legal position from these decisions, with regard to the life imprisonment is that as humans like all other living being have only one life to live and imprisonment for life awarded to the accused means imprisonment until the last breath. Whatever may be the length of remission earned by the prisoner, he can claim release only if the remaining sentence is remitted by the Government (competent authority) under the provisions of the law.

Finally, now the Apex Court has held in *Muthuramalingam's* case that the answer to the aforesaid question is in negative. The multiple sentences of imprisonment for life can be there in multiple murders or offences so punishable with life, but they cannot run consecutively, nor can be so ordered but are to run concurrently. However, such sentences can be superimposed over each other and any remission of commutation granted by competent authority in one of such sentences will not ipso facto apply to the other imprisonment for life. Contemplating the cases in which sentences awarded of imprisonment of different term apart from awarding imprisonment for life the direction of the court that these sentences shall run consecutively hold good and is unquestionable in view of the language of Section 31 Cr.P.C. In such cases court can legitimately direct that the prisoner shall first undergo the term sentence awarded before the commencement of life sentence. However, the converse is not true. This is because, once the prisoner spends his life in jail, there is no question of undergoing any further sentence.

LATEST CASES : CIVIL

“Care and brevity are not strange bed-fellows and both can combine in a judgment, with some beauty for a change.”

Y.V. Chandrachud, C.J. in *State of U.P. v. Jageshwar*, (1983) 2 SCC 305

Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record vs. U.O.I (Recusal Matter) Constitution Bench: (2016) 5 SCC 808 : Courts, Tribunals and Judiciary — Judicial Process — Recusal by Judge — When warranted: It is the duty of a Judge to hear every matter placed before him without fear or favour and a Judge must never recuse himself on the asking of a litigating party, unless justified. Recusal by Judge is warranted: (i) in case of financial interest of the Judge in the outcome of a case, he is automatically disqualified from hearing the case; (ii) in cases where the interest of the Judge in the case is other than financial, then the disqualification is not automatic but an inquiry is required whether the existence of such an interest disqualifies the judge tested in the light of either on the principle of “real danger” or “reasonable apprehension” of bias; and (iii) in cases where Judge is interested in a cause being promoted by one of the parties, then also he is automatically disqualified from hearing the case.

Aurobindo Ashram Trust vs. R. Ramanathan: (2016) 6 SCC 126 – Civil Procedure Code, 1908 — S. 92 — Public trust — Suit under S. 92 CPC — **Ambit of:** Trustees of a trust are entitled to a wide discretion in administration of trust. A disagreement with exercise of discretion by trustees, however passionate the said disagreement might be, does not necessarily lead to a conclusion of mal-administration in relation to trust, unless the exercise of discretion is perverse.

Union of India vs. Ambica Construction: (2016) 6 SCC 36 — Act, 1940 — Ss. 13, 29, 30, 33 and 34 — **Powers of arbitrator to award interest pendente lite:** Award of pendente lite interest depends upon nature of ouster clause in each case. It also depends on several factors such as overall intention of agreement, phraseology used in the agreement, clauses conferring power

relating to arbitration, nature of claim and dispute under reference and on what items power to award interest is expressly excluded and for what period.

Standard Chartered Bank vs. State of Maharashtra : (2016) 6 SCC 62 — **Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881— Ss.141 and 138** — **Dishonour of cheque — Offence by company:** It is necessary to specifically aver in the complaint under S. 141, that at the time the offence was committed, person accused was in charge of, and responsible for conduct of business of the company. Such averment is essential requirement of S.141 and has to be made in the complaint. Without such averment, requirements of S.141 cannot be said to be satisfied. Liability depends on the role one plays in the affairs of the company and not on his designation or status. Further, there cannot be any vicarious liability unless there is prosecution against the company.

Punjab State Warehousing Corp. vs. Bhushan Chander : 2016 SCC OnLine SC 632 – Employee of a Public Sector Undertaking not a ‘public servant’ under S. 197 Cr.P.C.: Deciding the question as to whether an employee of a Public Sector Undertaking can be considered to be ‘Public servant’ under Section 197 Cr.P.C, it was held that the protection by way of sanction under Section 197 Cr.P.C is not applicable to the officers of Government Companies or the Public Undertakings even when such public undertakings are ‘State’ within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution on account of deep and pervasive control of the government.

Nashik Municipal Corporation vs. R.M. Bhandari : (2016) 6 SCC 245 – Civil Procedure Code, 1908 — Ss. 148 and 151—Discretion of court to extend time for doing any act prescribed/allowed by CPC: Words “not exceeding thirty days in total” have been inserted vide Civil Procedure Code (Amendment) Act,

1999, with a view to curtail procedural delay caused by any party to the suit or proceeding. Therefore, enlargement of time under S. 148 CPC, whether one-time or phased, cannot exceed thirty days but, if act could not be performed within thirty days for reasons beyond control of parties, time beyond maximum thirty days can be extended u/s 151 CPC.

Balram Yadav vs. Fulmaniya Yadav : 2016 SCC OnLine SC 370 – S. 7(1) Explanation (b) of the Family Courts Act, 1984 – Suit or a proceeding for a declaration as to the validity of both marriage and matrimonial status of a person is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Family Court, since u/s 8, all those jurisdiction covered u/s 7 are excluded from the purview of the jurisdiction of the civil courts. In case, there is a dispute on the matrimonial status of any person, a declaration in that regard has to be sought only before the Family Court.

Pawan Kumar Pathak vs. Mohan Prasad: 2016 SCC OnLine SC 402 – General Clauses Act, 1897 – S.3(53), S.3(57), Code of Civil Procedure – O.6 R.17 – Once the law recognizes adopted son to be known as son, we fail to understand why it was necessary for the appellant to plead that he was the adopted son. There was no justifiable reason for the trial court to reject the plea in view of the provisions of section 3 (53) of the General Clauses Act. In fact, it was not even necessary for the appellant to move an application under O.6 R.17 of CPC. His averment to the effect that he was the only son, would be sufficient to lay the claim of inheritance on that basis.

Ajay Gupta vs. Raju; 2016 SCC OnLine SC 683 – Limitation Act, 1963 – Ss.4 and 5 – CPC O.VII R.11 – The last date for filing the suit was 31.12.2010 which was the last day of winter vacation for the court. The next day – 01.01.2011 was a non-working Saturday for the judges. It was not a holiday for the Registry. The Registry was not closed even for the part of the day. The suit was filed on

03.01.2011. Held – Section 5 of the Act which deals with Extension applies only to appeals or applications and not to suits. Therefore, no court or tribunal can extend the period of limitation for filing a suit. The only extension is permitted u/s 4 of the Act when the period is under court holiday. No extension permissible since 01.01.2010 was not a holiday for the Registry.

Shyam Lal vs. Deepa Dass Chela Ram Chela Garib Dass : 2016 SCC OnLine SC 661 – Punjab Security of Land Tenure Act, 1953, S.9 – Eviction of Tenant – Expiry of lease period – The Punjab Act of 1953 r/w relevant provisions of the 1987 Act do not include a tenant whose lease has expired – nevertheless, retention / continuation of possession after expiry of the duration of the lease with the consent of the landlord will continue to vest in the erstwhile tenant the same status on the principle of holding over – such continuance even after expiry of the deemed period of the lease u/s 106 of the Transfer of Property Act, as in the present case, would clothe the occupant with the status of tenant under the Act in view of S.116 of Transfer of Property Act which deals with the consequences of holding over – the operation of S.116 of Transfer of Property Act would confer legitimacy to the possession of the tenant even after the termination or expiration of the deemed period of lease so as to confer on him a status akin to that of statutory tenant and has protection from eviction as envisaged by the provisions of the Act 1953.

Janak Raj vs. Des Raj Chander Shekhar and Ors.: 2016 (2) RCR (Civil) 189 – CPC – O.21 R.37 and O.21 R.66 – Execution of Decree – Warrant of arrest – Show cause notice ought to be issued to judgment debtor with regard to the payment of decree amount failing which judgment debtor is liable to be arrested – The giving of opportunity to file objections against decree is not sufficient – Resorting to the provisions of O.21 R.66 without first complying with the provisions of O.21 R.37 is not maintainable.

CASES RELATING TO SENTENCING

“We fail to understand why our justice system has become so dehumanized that lawyers and Judges do not feel a sense of revolt at caging people in jail for years without a trial.”

P.N. Bhagwati, J. in *Kadra Pahadiya v. State of Bihar*, (1981) 3 SCC 671

Raj Bala vs. State of Haryana : 2016 (1) SCC 463 - Discretion in Sentencing – How to be Exercised – A Court, while imposing sentence, has a duty to respond to the collective cry of the society. When legislature in its wisdom has conferred discretion on the Court for imposing sentence up to certain maximum limit, the discretion is to be exercised on reasonable and rational parameters. A Judge has to keep in mind the paramount concept of rule of law and the conscience of the collective and balance it with the principle of proportionality while exercising the discretion. If discretion is exercised in a capricious manner, it would tantamount to relinquishment of duty and reckless abandonment of responsibility.

State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Udaibhan : (2016) 4 SCC 116 – Criminal Trial – Sentence – While awarding sentence, it is obligatory on court to ensure justice to both the parties. Undue leniency in awarding sentence needs to be avoided because it does not have the necessary effect of being deterrent for the accused and fails to reassure the society that offender has been properly dealt with.

Shanti Lal Meena vs. State of NCT of Delhi, CBI : (2015) 6 SCC 185 - Sentencing in P.C. Act Cases – The object of punishment, nature of crime and status of criminal are relevant factors in determination of quantum of sentence under P.C. Act. Providing condign punishment is one of the measures to eliminate corruption from polity and imposition of appropriate punishment is the manner in which the society's cry for justice against criminals should be responded by courts. *“There is no significance to the theory of reformation of the conduct of public service. The only relevant object of punishment in such cases is denunciation and deterrence.”*

Purashottan Dashrath Borate and another vs. State of Maharashtra: (2015) 6

SCC 652 – Criminal Trial – Sentence – Object of law and duty of courts – Protection of society and stamping out criminal proclivity is the object of law which may be achieved by imposing appropriate sentence. The facts and given circumstances of each case, the nature of the crime, the manner in which it was planned and committed, the motive of commission of the crime, the conduct of the accused and all other attending circumstances are relevant factors and a balance has to be struck by drawing a balance sheet of aggravating and mitigating circumstances, while imposing punishment. Undue sympathy to impose inadequate sentence would do more harm to the justice system by undermining the public confidence in efficacy and lesser punishment would render the judicial system suspect.

State of Punjab vs. Saurabh Bakshi: (2015) 5 SCC 182 – Criminal – Section 304-A I.P.C. – Adequacy of sentence- Needless to say, the principle of sentencing recognizes the corrective measures but there are occasions when the deterrence is an imperative necessity depending upon the facts of the case. The payment of compensation to the victim should not be a factor to be swayed away by the passion of mercy in applying the principle for reduction of sentence by the court. It is absolutely in the realm of misplaced sympathy. It is, in a way mockery of justice.'

Mohd. Arif @ Ashfaq vs. Registrar, Supreme Court of India: Constitution Bench : 2014 (9) SCC 737 – Sentencing policy – Crime and punishment are two sides of the same coin. Punishment must fit the crime. The notion of 'just deserts' or a sentence proportionate to the offender's culpability was the principle which, by passage of time, became applicable to criminal jurisprudence. It is not out of place to mention that in all of recorded history,

there has never been a time when crime and punishment have not been the subject of debate and difference of opinion. There are no statutory guidelines to regulate punishment. However, what factors which should be considered while sentencing are not specified under law in any great detail. A large number of aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances have been pointed out in *Bachan Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 684, that a Judge should take into account when awarding the death sentence.

Yakub Abdul Razak Memon vs. State of Maharashtra: 2013 (13) SCC 1 – Sentencing policy under Ss. 235 (2) & 354 (2) Cr.P.C. – Pre-sentence hearing – It is in recognition of new trend in penology and awarding of sentence taking into consideration various factors, that section 235 (2) has been incorporated in Cr.P.C. Fairness, justice and reasonableness which constitute the essence of the guarantee of life and liberty epitomized in Article 21 of the Constitution also pervade the sentencing policy in Ss.235 (2) and 354 (3) Cr.P.C. These two provisions virtually assimilate the concept of “procedure established by law” within the meaning of Article 21 of the Constitution. Thus, a strict compliance with these provisions in the way they were interpreted in *Bachan Singh vs. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 684* having regard to the development of Constitutional Law by the Supreme Court, is a must before imposing the death sentence.

Soman vs. State of Kerala : 2013 (11) SCC 382 – Awarding of sentence – Quantum of punishment – Factors for consideration – Giving punishment to the wrongdoer is at the heart of the criminal justice delivery system. In our country, it is the weakest part of this system as there are no legislative or judicially laid down guidelines to meet out just punishment to the accused. Court ought to base sentencing decisions on various different rationales – most prominent amongst which would be proportionality and deterrence. Consequences of criminal action can be relevant from point of view of these factors. So far as

proportionality is concerned, the sentence must commensurate with the seriousness or gravity of the offence and one of the factors judging the seriousness of the offence are the consequences resulting from it. Unintended consequences/harm may still be properly attributed to the offender if they were reasonably forcible.

State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Babu Barkara @ Dalap Singh : 2005(3) R.C.R.(Cri.) 18 – Sentencing – Quantum of Sentence – Guidelines – to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of offence is the duty of Court. Undue sympathy for inadequate sentence would do more harm to Justice system and to undermine the public confidence in the efficacy of Law. Judges in essence affirm that it ought to fit the crime always yet sentences are determined by other considerations largely, like correctional needs, desirability of keeping him out of circulation and tragic result of his crime. Punishing all serious crimes with equal severity is unknown in civilized Society but such a radical departure from the principle of proportionality has disappeared from the law and now for the single grave act, drastic sentences are imposed. For deciding just and appropriate sentence, the aggravating and mitigating factors and circumstances in which a crime has been committed are to be delicately balanced on basis of relevant circumstances in the dispassionate manner by the Court.

Jang Singh vs. State of Punjab (Full Bench) (P&H) : 2008 (1) R.C.R. (Cri.) 323 – Law regarding concurrent running of sentences – Summed up – Discretion to make the sentences to run is to be governed by different considerations. Thumb rule that concurrent sentences are to be awarded in case of single transaction may not apply if the transaction relating to offences is not the same or the facts constituting two offences are different. It is the sentencing court, which is required to apply its mind and consider what would be an appropriate sentence in a given case or in other words, if the sentences should be concurrent or consecutive.

NOTIFICATIONS

(1) The Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, 2015 – Received the assent of the President on 31.12.2015. The Amendment has introduced following changes:

The amendment has increased the wage threshold for determining applicability of the Act from ₹ 10,000/- to ₹ 21,000/- per month, covering a larger pool of employees.

Additionally, the wage ceiling for calculation of bonus has been increased from ₹3500/- to ₹ 7000/- per month or the minimum wage for the scheduled employment, as fixed by the appropriate government, (whichever is higher).

The amendment has been brought into effect from 01.04.2014.

(2) The Repealing and Amending Act, 2016 – has received the assent of the President on the 6th May, 2016.

It has repealed as many as 200 legislations. The repeal by this Act of any enactment shall not affect any other enactment in which the repealed enactment has been applied, incorporated or referred to. Besides repealing more than 200 different statutes as enlisted in first schedule, this legislation brings about minor Amendments in two legislations enlisted in second schedule:

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Work Place (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 – Section 6, 7 and 24 – The amendment is: (i) for the words “local Complaints Committee”, wherever they occur, the words, “Local Committee” shall be substituted.

The Governors (Emoluments, Allowances and Privileges) Amendment Act, 2014–Section 2 – (i) the words and figure “Section 2 of” shall be omitted : (ii) after the brackets and words “(hereafter referred to as the principal Act)”,

insert the words and figure “in section 2).

(3) Vide following different Notifications, amendments have been brought out in the Punjab Civil Service Rules: Vol.I, Vol.II & Vol. III: *The detailed Notification is available at <http://esarkar.punjab.gov.in> (Notification sr. no. 495)*

Notification No. G.S.R. 1/Const./Art. 309/Amd.(3)/2015, dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-I, Part-I.

i. Notification No. G.S.R. 2/Const./Art.309/Amd.(4)/2015, dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-I, Part-I.

ii. Notification No. G.S.R. 3/Const./Art.309/Amd.(5)/2015 dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-I, Part-I.

iii. Notification No. G.S.R. 4/Const./Art.309/Amd./2015, – dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-I, Part-II.

iv. Notification No. G.S.R. 5/Const./Art.309/Amd.(2)/2015 – dated The 22nd December, 2015 containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-II.

v. Notification No. G.S.R. 6/Const./Art.309/Amd./2015.– dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-III.

vi. Notification No. G.S.R. 7/Const./Art.309/Amd.(2)/2015 dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume –III.

vii. Notification No. G.S.R. 8/Const./Art.309/Amd.(3)/2015 dated the 22nd December, 2015, containing amendment in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-III.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH

1. The Valedictory function of the Induction Training Programme of the newly selected Additional District and Sessions Judge (P&H) was held on July 10, 2016. There were six different ADJs from Punjab and Haryana who were given the Certificates for having duly participated and completed the Induction Training. HMJ Rajesh Bindal, President, BOG, CJA gave the valedictory address followed by a meaningful interactive session. Dr. Balram K. Gupta, Director (Academics), CJA also spoke on this occasion. Ms. Smriti Dhir gave the expression of gratitude for the effort put in by the entire Faculty and the staff of CJA.

2. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for the Additional District and Session Judges from the States of Punjab and Haryana was held on July 16, 2016 on Sentencing, Victimology and Compensation. This Refresher Course was sub-divided into four different sessions which were taken by HMJ M.M.S. Bedi, Judge, P&H High Court, Dr. K.P. Singh, DGP, Haryana and Mr. H.S. Bhangoo, Faculty, CJA. Sixty different ADJs from both the states participated in the programme. The programme was also attended by the Judicial Officers of Haryana undergoing Induction Training at CJA. The CJA provided the background material to the participating judges and judicial officers in the form of relevant judgments

particularly on “sentencing” of the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

3. The State Legal Services Authority, UT, Chandigarh organized one day workshop with Hamsafar Trust, Mumbai on “Rights of Transgenders and Gender Identity” on 23.07.2016 in the Convention Hall of CJA. The Judicial Officers undergoing Induction Training at CJA also attended and participated in the workshop. The workshop was inaugurated by HMJ Surya Kant, Judge, P&H High Court. The different Resource Persons were from Hamsafar Trust, Saksham Trust, CBO, Chandigarh, Chandigarh State AIDS Control Society and Judges and Judicial Officers of UT, Chandigarh State Legal Services Authority.

4. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Civil Judges from the States of Punjab and Haryana was held on July 30, 2016 to sensitize them about criminal cases and relevant Procedures. Mr. Balbir Singh, District & Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, Ms. Archana Puri, District & Sessions Judge, Mohali, Sh. B.M. Lal and Sh. H.S. Bhangoo, the Faculty members, CJA took different sessions.

5. HMJ Surinder Gupta, Judge, P&H High Court, delivered a Special Lecture on “The Purchase of Property and Filing of Returns under the Conduct Rules” to TJOs (Haryana) on July 30, 2016.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

1. There would be Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Additional District & Sessions Judges of Punjab and Haryana on ‘Sentencing, Victimology and Compensation: Emerging Trends’ on August 20, 2016.

2. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for the Presiding Judges (ADJ-I) of Commercial Courts of different Districts of states of Punjab and Haryana. This

course is being structured under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015. The basic object of the legislation is to deal with commercial disputes expeditiously and effectively by experts in the commercial field.

3. Workshop under Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 to deal with children in dispute with law and to sensitize the Members of Juvenile Justice Boards.