

**e-NEWSLETTER**

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

VOLUME : 01
ISSUE : 02

In this Issue:

From the Desk of Chief Editor

Case Comment

Latest Cases : Court Fees Act

Latest Cases : Civil & Criminal

Notifications

Recent & Forthcoming Events

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

FROM THE DESK OF CHIEF EDITOR

This is the second e-Newsletter (June 2016). In fact, e-Newsletter of CJA was launched on June 01, 2016. The e-Newsletter is the medium through which we are able to reach the Judges and Judicial Officers of both the States as also in other parts of the country. It is with the idea of providing continuous Judicial Education and Training. To keep you updated. To remain connected with the programmes being run by CJA. It is yet not clear to me as to how many Judges and Judicial Officers would have accessed the first e-Newsletter. The reason for doubt in my mind is, we have not received any response with regard to the initiation of this step towards Judicial Education. This is just the beginning. CJA is desirous of serving the Judicial Fraternity in every possible way. Therefore, how can we improve upon this medium of Judicial Education. What more should be included. What needs to be excluded. What changes need to be made. The effort is to make this medium Judge-Need based. Unless you would respond, we would not be able to provide the required service. Thus, we keenly look forward to your response.

We have also initiated and taken the first step forward in starting with the Study Circles in different Districts across both the States. The object and purpose of the Study Circles is that every month in each district, Judges and Judicial Officers should meet to discuss different identified areas / topics. In each district, two presentations are to be prepared one by ADJ and another by Civil Judge. Based upon the discussion, papers would be prepared. Whatever possible help would be required towards achieving the object of this effort from CJA, the same would be provided. I am happy to share that we have received positive response from different districts. CJA looks forward to monitoring the working of the Study Circles. The different papers could be collected. Annually, a volume may be published of selected Papers. Each volume could be rich material for the benefit of Judges and Judicial Officers. I urge the Judicial brethren to take up this venture seriously and effectively. It would serve the cause of Judicial Education. It would also keep the Judicial Fraternity connected. Any suggestion, we keenly look forward. Please remain connected with the e-Newsletter and CJA.

Balram K. Gupta

CASE COMMENT

Raman versus State of Haryana and others : 2013 (3) PLR 502 is a case which needs to be noticed. A four years old child came in contact with naked high tension electric wire which passed over the roof of his house. Both arms and one leg of the child were amputated which rendered him totally invalid for whole of his life. There was criminal negligence. Haryana Bizli Vitran Nigam had failed to make periodical check of wire which was installed thirty years ago. A writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution was filed for the grant of exemplary monetary compensation. It was held that the writ petition was maintainable and **the victim could not be sent to civil court which process would take long time.**

The award of compensation in writ jurisdiction for violation of Human Rights is a developing jurisprudence. The Punjab and Haryana High Court in this case awarded exemplary relief of ₹60 lacs besides providing of expenses incurred in securing robotic limbs lifelong. It was argued that the Supreme Court in *Nelabati Behera vs. State of Orissa*; 1993 (2) SCC 746 and in *Dr. Mehmood Nayyar Azam vs. State of Chhatisgarh* ; JT 2012 (7) SC 178 had laid down that the Supreme Court and the High Courts being the protectors of civil liberties of citizens, not only have the power and jurisdiction but also an obligation to grant relief in exercise of their extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 32 and 226 of the Constitution. Dealing with this extraordinary and exceptional situation, it was recorded in the judgment of Punjab and Haryana High Court (Supra): “I am inclined to think that principles of strict liability go to Article 21 of Constitution of India and invade the battle ground in fighting for the protection of life and liberty of our people.”

The award of compensation in writ jurisdiction particularly under Article 21 for the violation of the right to life in a situation like this is a step forward. The writ jurisdiction can be innovated to repair damage and provide monetary compensation **notwithstanding the rights of the citizens to enforce conventional civil**

and criminal proceedings for relief. The judgment of the High court assumed finality with the Supreme Court decision dated December 17, 2014 in *Raman vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.* – 2015 (1) Recent Apex Judgements 43. The Apex Court directed that the directions of the High Court shall be complied with and its report shall be submitted before the Hon’ble Single Judge. On April 25, 2016, Punjab and Haryana High Court on application seeking compliance of court orders directed UHBVNL to issue a short term tender at the earliest keeping in view *Raman’s* present age and requirement of Myo Electric Prosthesis (Prosthetic Limbs). It was further recorded in the judgment: “The Court has also felt that the technology will keep on changing with the passage of time including the stem cells therapy and there may be a possibility that other companies, who are in the process of developing of such types of limbs, may come out with better technology in future.”

In another case of ***Om Pati and Ors. vs. The State of Haryana and Ors.***: 2016 (2) RCR (Civil) 692 where a writ petition came to be filed against UHBVNL, Ram Rattan who was 47 years of age was electrocuted and as a result, he expired. He was given ₹50,000/- by Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board. Accordingly, it was argued that they were not entitled to any further compensation. Rejecting this plea, it was held that the Board was also liable under strict liability rule. In any case, applying the multiplier of 13, a compensation of ₹6,25,000/-, was ordered. The amount already paid was held to be adjustable. The corporate bodies have social responsibility as also accountability. This approach should provide the requisite sensitization to our Judges at all levels. Judicial remedies and tools need to be innovated and punctuated with compassion and humanism. Compassion and humanism are Fundamental Duties of citizens under the Indian Constitution. They are integral to the discharge of their Judicial functions.

Balram K. Gupta

CASES RELATING TO COURT FEES ACT

“Judicial officer cannot have two standards, one in the court and another outside the court. They must have only one standard of rectitude, honesty and integrity.”

K. Jagannatha Shetty, J. in Daya Shankar v. High Court of Allahabad, (1987) 3 SCC 1

Tarsem Singh and Ors. vs. Vinod Kumar and Ors. : 2014 (1) ICC 1054 - Court Fees Act, 1870, Section 7(iv)(c) – Declaration as to the validity of sale deed – The Supreme Court judgment in *Suhrid Singh @ Sardool Singh vs. Randhir Singh*, AIR 2010 SC 2807 held : “In this case, there is no prayer for cancellation of the sale deeds. The prayer is for a declaration that the deeds do not bind the co-parceners and for joint possession. The plaintiff in the suit was not the executant of the sale deeds. Therefore, the court fee was computable under Section 7(iv)(c) of the Act. The Trial Court and the High Court were therefore, not justified in holding that the effect of the prayer was to seek cancellation of the sale deeds or that therefore, Court fee had to be paid on the sale consideration mentioned in the sale deeds.” The Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court decided the issue leading to payment of court fee in terms of the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court.

Pradeep Sonawat vs. Satish Prakash @ Satish Chander : AIR 2015 P&H 130 – Court Fees Act, 1870 – S.16 – Refund of court fees where suit compromised. Suit for specific performance of a sale agreement was mutually settled and compromised. In such a situation court fees paid by the plaintiff should be refunded. **Section 16** should be invoked in all cases of compromise with or without the persuasion of the court.

Paramjit Singh and Anr. vs. Inderjit Singh and Ors.: 2015 (2) PLR 647 – Where a party to a sale deed lays challenge to the sale deed and seeks its cancellation, he has to pay ad valorem court fees on the sale consideration and not on the market value of the property.

Harcharan Singh vs. Pushpa Devi and Ors.: 2015 (2) PLR 642 – Civil Procedure Code – S.148 – Plaintiff directed to make good the deficiency in court fees within 30 days. Court fees not paid within the said period and further extension of time sought. Application dismissed by the trial court. Held that even after the amendment in **S.148 CPC**, placing a limit of 30 days for extension of time, court has

the power to extend time beyond 30 days if sufficient cause made out.

Tarun Kumar and Ors. vs. Pankaj Kapoor and Ors.: 2016 (1) PLJ 322 – Payment of court fee in a suit where challenge is laid to the validity of sale deed on the ground of fraud.

Where a person is fraudulently made to execute a sale deed without paying the consideration amount therefor and possession remains with the vendor, in a suit for declaration that the sale deed is void, ad valorem court fee is not required to be paid.

Satnam Singh vs. Mandeep Kaur and Anr.: 2016 (1) PLR 733 – Court Fees Act, 1870 – S.7 (ii) – Court fee payable in a suit for maintenance. Valuation for court fees at ten times the annual maintenance is very stiff and unrealistic. Claims to maintenance in India are predominately made by wife or aged parents who have no resources to fend for themselves. The Governments of Punjab, Haryana and UT Chandigarh are exhorted to place proposals before the appropriate Legislatures for suitably amending the Court Fees Act, 1870 with a view to exempt claims for maintenance from payment of court fee or provide only for a modest court fees.

Sunita Rani and Anr. vs. State of Punjab and Ors.: 2015 (3) PLR 580 – Suit for compensation / damages for Rupees Eight Lakh. But only a tentative court fee of ₹500/- paid on the plea that the court is yet to determine the amount of compensation payable to the plaintiff. Held that where the amount of compensation has been specifically quantified, ad valorem court fees is payable on the amount claimed.

Rajiv Kumar & Ors. vs. Rakesh Kumar and Ors. : 2015 (4) PLR 191 – Suit for partition and separate possession of joint family property by a co-sharer who is not in physical possession of any part of it. In such a suit only fixed court fee is payable because possession of joint property by a co-owner is, in the eyes of law, possession of all the co-owners even if the plaintiff is not in actual physical possession of any part of joint family property.

LATEST CASES : CIVIL

VKNM Vocational Higher Secondary School vs. State of Kerala : (2016) 4 SCC 216 – General Clauses Act, 1897— S.6 — Vested right —Requirements of Accrual of vested right to survive change in law — For a vested right to survive change in the law, all preconditions for entitlement to the right claimed must stand satisfied before the law changes.

Satish Kumar vs. Karan Singh : (2016) 4 SCC 352 — Specific Relief Act, 1963 — Ss. 9, 20 & 15 (1) (b) and proviso thereto — When genuineness of contract is doubtful and it becomes unenforceable, it cannot be specifically enforced.

Mohammad Sadique vs. Darbara Singh Guru : 2016 (2) RCR (Civil) 919 — No need to change one's name after conversion to another religion. For conversion to Sikh religion, no particular ceremony required.

Nagabhushanammal vs. C. Chandikeswaralingam : (2016) 4 SCC 434 — Civil Procedure Code, 1908 — S.11 — Res judicata — Conditions for applicability — Res judicata not attracted when earlier suit for possession of entire property was based on a settlement deed while the latter suit is for partition claiming plaintiff's share in property based on her birth right. Both suits should be based on same cause of action.

Khursida Begum and Ors. Vs. Mohammad Farooq and Ors. : (2016) 4 SCC 549 – Whether gift of undivided property under Muslim Law was valid – Whether appellant was entitled to recover rent from the gifted property – the gift was by father to his minor son – property is under tenancy. – The gift is by a registered deed. – Right to collect rent stands transfers to done – Held – The courts below are not justified in not giving effect to the gift which has been held to be genuine.

Rishabh Chand Jain and Ors. vs. Ginesh Chandra Jain : 2016 (2) RCR (Civil) 944 – CPC – S.96 r/w Order XLI – Maintainability of appeal – Non-framing of

issue – The impugned order dismissing the suit on the ground of Res-Judicata does not cease to be a decree on account of a procedural irregularity of non- framing an issue. The court ought to treat the decree as if the same has been passed after framing the issue and on adjudication thereof, in such circumstances. Even if there is a procedural irregularity in the process of passing such order, if the order passed is a decree under law, no revision lies under Section 115 of the Code in view of the specific bar under sub-section (2) thereof. It is only appealable under Section 96 r/w Order XLI of the Code.

Narayan vs. Babasaheb and Ors. : AIR 2016 SC 1666 – Limitation Act, 1956 – Ss. 7 & 8 and Article 60 and 109 – Suit for partition – Delay therein – Maintainability – Plaintiff challenging the transfer of an immovable property made by his guardian in contravention of section 8(1)(2) of 1956 Act and seeks possession of property – Suit can be filed within the limitation prescribed under Article 60 – the limitation is three years from the date of attaining majority – Articles 109, 110 or 113 of the Act are not applicable.

Oriental Insurance Company Limited vs. R.K. Dogra : 2016 SCC OnLine P&H 3397, decided on 18.05.2016 — Life insurance claim cannot be denied to the family of the insured on the ground that the deceased insured patient refused treatment against medical advice.

U.P. State Road Transport Corporation vs. Mamta and Ors. : (2016) 4 SCC 172 – Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 – Ss. 96, 140, 166 and 173 – Deceased while going on motor cycle was hit by appellant's corporation bus, who later succumbed to his injuries – Compensation awarded by Tribunal – Appeal u/s 173 is essentially in the nature of first appeal alike section 96 CPC – High court is equally under legal obligation to decide all issue arising in a case both on facts and law, after appreciating entire evidence.

LATEST CASES : CRIMINAL

“The maxim ‘let hundred guilty persons be acquitted, but not a single innocent be convicted’ is, in practice, changing the world over and courts have been compelled to accept that ‘society suffers by wrong convictions and it equally suffers by wrong acquittals.’”

Bhagwan Sahai and Anr. vs. State of Rajasthan : Criminal Appeal No. 416 of 2016 – Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 2301 of 2016 – DoD 03.06.2016 – The Right to private defence – when can it be claimed : Held – The Right to use force can legitimately be claimed once they see their parents being assaulted and when actually it has been shown that due to such assault and injury their father subsequently died.

Prem Sagar Manocha vs. State (NCT of Delhi) : (2016) 4 SCC 571 – Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 – S.340 – Evidence Act, 1872 - S.45 – Change in opinion by expert – when it amounts to perjury - Held – Merely because expert has tendered an opinion – that too, without being conclusive and definite – mere rejection of the expert evidence by the court, itself may not warrant initiation of proceedings u/s 340 Cr.P.C. - It is unjust, if not unfair, to attribute any motive to the expert, in case of somersault from his original stand in the written opinion. - Proceedings u/s 340 Cr.P.C. – Not warranted.

Satish Shetty vs. State of Karnataka; Criminal Appeal No. 1358 of 2008, DoD 03.06.2016 : 2016 OnLine SC 589 – Whether in the absence of any charge framed u/s 306 IPC by Trial Court, High Court could have convicted the accused u/s 306 IPC – Held – Once the prosecution succeeds in establishing the component of cruelty leading to conviction u/s 498-A, in our view only in a rare case, the court can refuse to invoke the presumption of abetment, if other requirement of **Section 113-A of Evidence Act** stand satisfied.

Prakash Nagardas Dubal – Shaha vs. Sou. Meena Prakash Dubal Shah and Ors. : 2016 (2) RCR (Criminal) 852 – Protection of women from Domestic Violence

B.N. Agrawal, J. in Krishna Mochi vs. State of Bihar, (2002) 6 SCC 81

Act – Dismissal of divorce petition – Wife is entitled to seek protection against domestic violence – After rejection of divorce petition, she continues as lawfully wedded wife - Provision of DV Act are applicable.

Gajanan Dashrath Kharate vs. State of Maharashtra : (2016) 4 SCC 604 – Evidence Act – S.106 ; IPC – S.302 – Held – When murder is committed in secrecy of the house – Initial burden undoubtedly on prosecution – In view of **Section 106 Evidence Act**, corresponding burden rests on inmates of the house to give cogent explanation as to how the crime was committed – Where accused is unable to offer any explanation as to homicidal death of his father, it is a strong circumstance against the accused that he is responsible for the crime.

State of Rajasthan vs. Ram Kailash: (2016) 4 SCC 590 – Test of application of IPC Ss. 302 and 304 Part I – Test laid down by Apex Court in State of A.P. vs. Rajavarapu Punnayya AIR 1977 SCC 45 – To ascertain whether case would fall under S. 302 or 304 Part I – affirmed – Approach the problem in three stages – Three stages are : (i) Whether the accused has done an act by doing which he has caused the death of another; (ii) Whether that act of the accused amounts to ‘culpable homicide’ as defined in S. 299 and (iii) Whether the facts proved by the prosecution bring the case within the ambit of any of the four clauses of the definition of ‘murder’ contained in S. 300.

Tekan vs. State of M.P. : (2016) 4 SCC 461 – Victim Compensation Scheme for rape victims u/s 357-A of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 – The Scheme of National Commission for Women (NCW) for Rehabilitation of Victims with Special Needs, like handicapped woman who

require specialized treatment and case, is in addition to Victim Compensation Scheme under S. 357-A Cr.P.C. All the States and Union Territories directed to make endeavor to formulate a uniform scheme under S.357-A Cr.P.C. taking into consideration the scheme framed by State of Goa for rape victim compensation.

Gulzari Lal vs. State of Haryana: (2016) 4 SCC 583 – Dying Declaration – Valid dying declaration may be made without obtaining a certificate of fitness of the declarant by a medical officer – There is no requirement of law that a dying declaration must necessarily be made to a magistrate – When such statement is recorded by a magistrate, there is no specified statutory form for such recording – What evidential value or weight has to be attached to such statement necessarily depends on the facts and circumstances of each particular case.

State through CBI, Chennai vs. V. Arul Kumar : 2016 (2) RCR (Criminal) 1023 – **Prevention of Corruption Act – S.5 (1), Code of Criminal Procedure – S.193** – S.5 (1) empowers a Special Judge to take cognizance of offence without the accused being committed to him for trial – It has the effect of waiving the otherwise mandatory requirement of S.193 which stipulates that the court of session cannot take cognizance of any offence as a court of original jurisdiction unless the case is committed to it by a magistrate under the Code– This embargo of S.193 of the Code has been lifted by S.5(1) of PC Act.

N.D. Jayaprakash vs. Union of India: (2016) 4 SCC 741 – **Criminal Procedure Code – Ss. 327, 55-A and 56** – Presentation of accused after arrest before Magistrate – For safety of accused, a student leader, accused of sedition for allegedly having organized and participated in a meeting in his university premises where anti-national slogans, etc. were allegedly raised, and others on account unpleasant and unacceptable incidents in court premises as large assemblage of students, supporters, legal fraternity and media persons during judicial proceedings, directions issued to restrict entry of persons into court hall and to ensure orderly conduct of proceedings.

Susanta Das vs. State of Orissa : (2016) 4 SCC 371 – **Penal Code – Ss. 302, 307 and 326 /149** – **Common object to murder, attempted murder and infliction of grievous injuries – if established** – It is not necessary that there must be specific overt act played by each of the member of such an unlawful assembly in the commission of an offence. It is sufficient that participation of each member of an unlawful assembly of five or more persons is shown, who indulge in an offence as a member of such an unlawful assembly, for the purpose of invoking S. 149 – What is required to be shown is the participation as a member in pursuance of a common object of the assembly or being a member of that assembly, such person knew as to what is likely to be committed in prosecution of any such common object.

Chaman and Ors. vs. State of Uttrakhand : 2016 (2) RCR (Criminal) 1017 – Proof beyond reasonable doubt – is only a guideline and not a fetish and that someone, who is guilty, cannot not get away with impunity only because truth may suffer some infirmity when projected through human processes – it has been propounded that reasonable doubt is simply that degree of doubt which would permit a reasonable and a just man to come to a conclusion. It has been underlined therein that reasonableness of doubt must commensurate to the nature of offence to be investigated.

Choudhary Gulam Rasool and Anr. vs. State of Punjab; MANU/PH/0930/2016: Criminal Appeal No. D-1222-DB of 2014, DoD June 02, 2016 – **NDPS Act, 1985 – S.32-B** – Huge quantity of heroin i.e. five kgs. recovered from the conscious possession of the accused – The recovery of SIM cards of a neighboring country points to a possibly wider network at play across border operations – the very fabric of society is seriously indented – S.32-B – there is no bar to impose a punishment higher than the prescribed minimum – the court must be alive to the impact which the crime would have on society and should not swayed by any misplaced sympathies. – Upheld the sentence of twenty years imposed upon them.

NOTIFICATIONS

1. **The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 was amended by the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2015, No. 3 of 2015.** The Amendment Act has come into force w.e.f. 07.01.2015:

- The legislation has brought about an amendment in Sections 7 and 9 of the Principal Act.
- Section 2A has been introduced in the Principal Act so as to make applicable the provisions of Sections 7 and 9, to e-cart and e-rickshaw.
- Section 2A also carries the meaning of e-court and a rickshaw.
- The Motor Vehicle (Amendment) Ordinance 2015 has been repealed.

2. **Punjab Government Gazette (Extra) Notification, dated June 2, 2016 Part-IV,** has inserted Rule I-A after the existing Rule I, in Chapter 1, Part D of the Rules and Orders of Punjab and Haryana High Court, Volume-III, which reads as under:

“Rule 1-A : Accused to be permitted to sit during the trial – The accused in a criminal trial shall be permitted to sit down during the trial, unless it becomes necessary for him to stand up for any specific purpose, such as identification or otherwise. Such facility accorded to the accused shall, however, be subject to the established convention followed in the courts that everyone concern should stand when the Presiding Officer enters and leaves the court.”

3. **The Gazette of India (Extraordinary) Part II Section 1, March 13, 2015: The Public Premises (Eviction of unauthorized occupants) Amendment Act, 2015:** This amendment amends the provisions of the Public Premises (Eviction of unauthorized occupants) Act, 1971:

- The word ‘company’ has now been defined to mean, in which not less than 51% of the paid up capital is held partly by Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments. Also to include company which is subsidiary of the first mentioned company and which carries on the business of public transport including metro railway.
- The provisions of Section 4 of the Principal Act have been amended to introduce sub-section (1) (1A) (1B) to widen the powers and role of estate officer.
- Section 5 of the Principal Act has also been amended, to give more powers to the estate officer so as to expedite the eviction process.
- Section 7 of the Principal Act has also been amended to substitute the words ‘compound interest’ for ‘simple interest’.

4. **High Court of Punjab and Haryana vide Notification dated May 02, 2016:No.34 Gaz.II/XXI.C.22 in Haryana Govt. Gazette May 31, 2016** has appointed Sh. Nitin Raj, a member of HCS (Judicial Branch) as Judicial Magistrate 1st Class for the trial of cases involving the commission of offences punishable under the Indian Railways Act, 1890 and under the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Act, 1966, for Ambala District and further to appoint him as Judicial Magistrate First Class for all other Districts in the State of Haryana for the trial of cases involving the commission of offences punishable under the Indian Railways Act, 1890 with effect from the date he assumes the charge of his office.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH

1. Valedictory of the Induction Training Programme of newly promoted Additional District and Sessions Judges (Pb.& Hry.) was held on June 01, 2016. Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.J. Vazifdar, Acting Chief Justice-cum-Patron-in-Chief, CJA was the Chief Guest. The President, BOG, HMJ Rajesh Bindal along with all other members: HMJ M.M.S. Bedi, HMJ A.C. Chaudhari, HMJ R.K. Jain and HMJ A.G. Masih were also present on this occasion. HMJ Rajesh Bindal in his address announced the launching of monthly e-Newsletter which was actually done by HMJ S.J. Vazifdar, ACJ. The President, BOG also announced the setting up of Study Circles in all the Districts of the States of Punjab and Haryana including Chandigarh. The Study Circles would work under the overall charge of the respective District and Session Judges. It would meet every month. One Additional District and Sessions Judge and another Judicial Officer would prepare the presentation on an identified topic. The same would be discussed in the monthly meeting. The Paper shall be finalized based upon the discussion. In this manner, more than forty papers would become available every month for circulation which could be done either through the medium of monthly e-Newsletter or otherwise. Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice congratulated the promotee ADJs and wished them well to continue to contribute to the cause of Justice. Dr. Balram K. Gupta, Director (Academics) welcomed the guests and Ms. Harpreet

Kaur Jeewan, Director (Administration) proposed the vote of thanks.

2. 32 Trainee Judicial Officers from Jharkhand Judicial Academy came on a visit from June 01 to June 05, 2016 for Knowledge Sharing Programme. In the Ice-breaking session on June 02, 2016, HMJ Virender Singh, Chief Justice of High Court of Jharkhand was also present. Warm welcome was extended to Hon'ble the Chief Justice, Mr. Nalin Kumar, Additional Director, JJA and the Trainee Judicial Officers. Hon'ble the Chief Justice of Jharkhand High Court spoke at length about the Training Programme of the newly selected Judicial Officers. His Lordship also shared the facilities which are available at the Jharkhand Judicial Academy which was inaugurated only some months back. The TJOs of Jharkhand visited the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and its Museum. Besides this they also visited the Rock Garden and the Lake. They also went to the holy city of Amritsar to visit Golden Temple, Jaliawala Bagh and Wagha Border.

3. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Civil Judges of Punjab and Haryana was organized to sensitize the Judicial Officers about Criminal Cases and relevant Procedures on June 04, 2016. Besides the CJA faculty, Mr. Balbir Singh, District & Session Judge, Chandigarh and Ms. Archana Puri, District & Session Judge, Mohali were the Resource Person.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

1. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for the Additional District and Session Judges from the States of Punjab and Haryana on July 16, 2016 on Sentencing, Victimology and Compensation.

2. Refresher-cum-Orientation Course for Civil Judges from the States of Punjab and Haryana on July 30, 2016 to sensitize them about criminal cases and relevant Procedures.