



सत्यमेव जयते

UTTARAKHAND COURT NEWS

(A Quarterly News letter)

Vol-II Issue No-3 (July-September, 2011)



High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prafulla C. Pant
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sudhanshu Dhulia

COMPILED BY

K. D. Bhatt, Registrar General, High Court of Uttarakhand

A quarterly newsletter published by High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital
Also available on our website : www.highcourtofuttarakhand.gov.in



Hon'ble Mr. Justice Barin Ghosh, Chief Justice (Right) administered the Oath of office to
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Dhyani on 13.09.2011

CONTENTS

❖	Hon'ble Judges of Uttarakhand High Court	4
❖	From the Desk of Chief Justice.	5
❖	Transfers, Promotion & Appointments of Judicial Officers.	6
❖	Institution, Disposal & Pendency of cases in High Court.	7
❖	Institution, Disposal & Pendency of cases in District Courts.	8
❖	Circular Letters (issued in the quarter ending 30 th September, 2011)	9-12
❖	Some Recent Judgments of Uttarakhand High court.	13-18
❖	Major Events and Initiatives.	19
❖	Major Activities of UJALA.	19- 20

* * * * *

UTTARAKHAND HIGH COURT**LIST OF JUDGES (As on 30th September, 2011)**

SL. No.	Name of the Hon'ble Judge	Date of Appointment
		(Assumed charge in Uttarakhand)
1.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Barin Ghosh (Chief Justice)	12.08.2010
2.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tarun Agarwala	25.09.2009
3.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prafulla C. Pant	29.06.2004
4.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. S. Verma	15.07.2004
5.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.K. Bist	01.11.2008
6.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sudhanshu Dhulia	01.11.2008
7.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Servesh Kumar Gupta	21.04.2011
8.	Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Dhyani	13.09.2011

* * * * *



Barin Ghosh



**CHIEF JUSTICE
HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND**

Nainital – 263001
September 30, 2011

MESSAGE

In the last few months, there have been some very important activities on the part of the High Court. One of them was to fill up the vacancies in the higher judiciary. A post of Hon'ble Judge of this High Court has also been filled up on 13th September, 2011. Steps have also been taken to select people, who are to be appointed in the ministerial cadre of District Judgeships.

The Court, however, has not received any response from the members of the judiciary to the request, which I had made to you on last occasions. It would be appropriate on your part to share your experience with others.

Keeping in view the plight of the litigants, the Central Government has given an appropriate impetus for establishment of morning and/or evening courts. This Court has decided to take advantage of the said generosity on the part of the Central Government and has agreed to establish evening courts in those District Courts, where number of litigations are more. In order to serve the litigant people, I request all of you to make every endeavour to ensure success of the evening courts established in our State.

Thank you,

TRANSFERS, PROMOTION & APPOINTMENTS OF JUDICIAL OFFICERS**(in the quarter ending 30th September, 2011)**

SL.NO.	Name of the Judicial Officer	From	To	Date of Order
1.	Sri Krishan Datt Bhatt, District & Sessions Judge	Pauri Garhwal	Registrar General, High Court of Uttarakhand, Nainital	13-09-2011
2.	Ms. Kumkum Rani, Judge, Family Court	Pauri Garhwal	District & Sessions Judge, Pauri Garhwal	14-09-2011
3.	Sri Mahesh Chandra Kaushiwa, Chief Judicial Magistrate	Rudraprayag	Joint Registrar, Public Service Tribunal, Dehradun	02-09-2011
4.	Sri Anirudh Bhatt, Civil Judge (Sr. Div.)	Rudraprayag	Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rudraprayag	02-09-2011
5.	Sri Rakesh Mishra, Chief Judicial Magistrate	Pithoragarh	Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Div.), Udham Singh Nagar	21-09-2011
6.	Sri Jai Pal Singh, Retired H.J.S.	-----	Special Judicial Magistrate, Haldwani (Nainital)	29-07-2011
7.	Sri Roop Singh, Retired H.J.S.	-----	Special Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun	29-07-2011
8.	Sri Yash Paul Sharma, Retired H.J.S.	-----	Special Judicial Magistrate, Rishikesh (Dehradun)	29-07-2011
9.	Sri Ram Lal, Retired H.J.S.	-----	Special Judicial Magistrate, Kashipur (Udham Singh Nagar)	29-07-2011

INSTITUTION, DISPOSAL AND PENDENCY OF CASES

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND (from 01.07.2011 to 30.09.2011)

						Pendency		
						(At the end of 30.06.2011)		
						Civil Cases	Criminal Cases	Total Pendency
						12705	6470	19175
<i>Institution</i> (01.07.2011 to 30.09.2011)			<i>Disposal</i> (01.07.2011 to 30.09.2011)			<i>Pendency</i> (At the end of 30.09.2011)		
Civil Cases	Criminal Cases	Total Institution	Civil Cases	Criminal Cases	Total Disposal	Civil Cases	Criminal Cases	Total Pendency at the end of 30.09.11
2411	1363	3774	2081	1494	3575	13035	6339	19374

➤ **District Courts (From 01.07.2011 to 30.09.2011)**

SL. No	Name of the District	Civil Cases				Criminal Cases				Total Pendency at the end of 30.09.11
		Opening Balance as on 01.07.11	Institution from 01.07.11 to 30.09.11	Disposal from 01.07.11 to 30.09.11	Pendency at the end of 30.09.11	Opening Balance as on 01.07.11	Institution from 01.07.11 to 30.09.11	Disposal from 01.07.11 to 30.09.11	Pendency at the end of 30.09.11	
1.	Almora	701	146	132	715	1237	348	349	1236	1951
2.	Bageshwar	119	39	41	117	201	165	129	237	354
3.	Chamoli	400	99	103	396	914	327	400	841	1237
4.	Champawat	144	51	57	138	692	287	269	710	848
5.	Dehradun	13251	2082	2473	12860	51595	21664	26842	46417	59277
6.	Haridwar	8135	2072	2178	8029	22853	7856	7721	22988	31017
7.	Nainital	2696	571	438	2829	9647	5605	5943	9309	12138
8.	Pauri Garhwal	1325	248	204	1369	2540	710	1031	2219	3588
9.	Pithoragarh	293	97	107	283	690	392	351	731	1014
10.	Rudraprayag	171	47	50	168	336	394	324	406	574
11.	Tehri Garhwal	482	182	155	509	1322	420	578	1164	1673
12.	U.S.Nagar	4128	1275	1221	4182	24317	5461	6014	23764	27946
13.	Uttarkashi	359	95	89	365	739	551	661	629	994
	Total	32204	7004	7248	31960	117083	44180	50612	110651	142611

Circular Letters

(issued in the quarter ending 30th September, 2011)

- C.L. No. 05/UHC/Admin.A/2011

Dated: July 20, 2011

Subject: Regarding withdrawal of four days Extra Casual Leave.

In continuation of earlier Circular Letter No. 03/UHC-2002 dated 02.03.2002 and on the subject noted above, I am to inform that the Hon'ble Court is pleased to decide that Circular Letter dated 02 March, 2002 and all other previous letters pertaining to extra casual leave to an officer and staff belonging to hills and posted in plains and vice-versa are withdrawn.

Registrar General

- C.L. No. 06/UHC/Admin.A/2011

Dated: July 20, 2011

Subject: Regarding submission of statement relating to movable and immovable properties.

In continuation of earlier Circular Letter No. 37/Admin. (A), dated 08.09.1995 on the subject noted above, I am to inform that the Hon'ble Court is pleased to decide that annual statements by the Judicial Officers, regarding movable and immovable properties, be submitted to the Court for the financial year commencing 1st April and ending 31st March of each year, within 30th April following.

Registrar General

- C.L. No. 07/UHC/D.R. (I)/2011

Dated: July 20/21, 2011

Subject: Regarding disposal of old cases.

I am desired to say that Hon'ble Court has been pleased to issue certain guidelines and directions for the disposal of old cases in your judgeship, which are as follows:

1. All out sincere efforts shall be made to dispose of, by 31st March, 2012, all the cases instituted before 1st July, 2006.
2. Each Presiding Officer shall ascertain the reason why a case, pending before 1st July, 2006 in his court or in the court of which he is in-charge, is still pending in the court and shall

prepare a list thereof, incorporating the reason for the pendency. A copy of the list shall be furnished to the High Court.

3. In the event, it transpires that the reason for the case remaining still pending is an order passed by any higher court, to bring the same to the notice of the High Court within a period of one month from today. In addition to that, the Presiding Officers shall ask the litigants and their counsel to file fresh certified copies of the orders staying a case pending in his court or in a court of which he is in-charge, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the stay order is still continuing.
4. In all other cases, every effort shall be made to dispose of the same expeditiously.
5. In addition to that, every Presiding Officer shall make an endeavour to ascertain, which of the cases have no movement for a considerable period of time, ascertain the reason thereof and make sincere effort to remove the bottleneck.
6. Every court shall have a register for the purpose of recording therein communications received from the District Judge or from the High Court or from the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Presiding Officer of every court as well as the Presiding Officer of the court of which he is in-charge shall take notice of the entries made in course of the day in the register at the end of the day to update himself of the communications, thus, received.
7. Every Presiding Officer shall prepare a list of criminal cases, where summons have not been served and where witnesses have not been produced on the date fixed and furnish such list to the District Judges on monthly basis so that a copy thereof may be handed-over by the District Judge in course of monthly meetings held by him with the District Magistrate and the Superintendent / Senior Superintendent of Police of the district concerned.
8. The Presiding Officers, in all criminal cases, where the offence is compoundable, shall make an effort to compound the same and, at the same time, shall give opportunity of plea bargaining.
9. Every Judicial Officer shall ensure that cases, which can be sorted out through mediation, are sent to the mediator.

I am, therefore, to request you kindly to bring above directions to the notice of all the Judicial Officers working in your judgeship for their information and strict compliance.

Registrar General

• C.L. No. 08/UHC/D.R. (I)/2011

Dated: July 20/21, 2011

Subject: Submission of monthly report regarding the assessment of judgments of the Judicial Officers.

In continuation of earlier C.L. No. 14/UHC/XVII-31 D.R. (I) 2010 dated: November 24, 2010 on the subject noted above, I am directed to request you to also look at the following and send your comments while assessing the Judgements of Judicial Officers posted under you, in addition to what is being looked at:

1. Whether the judgment in criminal side is in accordance with Section 354 of Cr.P.C. and in civil side Order 20 of C.P.C.?
2. Actual matter of controversy has been dealt with or not?
3. Whether the judgment is sound on fact and law, well reasoned and expressed in good language?
4. Language of the judgment easily understandable by the litigants, for whom judgment has been pronounced?
5. Operative portion of the judgment is clear and decisive or not?
6. Adequacy of punishment awarded and rational given for awarding lesser punishment.
7. Whether judgment has been passed on date fixed?
8. Whether issues or charges as framed have been addressed while rendering the judgement ?
9. Whether the officer has tried to write down unnecessary a lengthy judgment?
10. Whether the judgment is precise and to the point?
11. Whether the officer has adopted the correct mode of citation as prescribed by C.L. No. 36/IV-h-35 dated 11th April, 1956 read with C.L. No. 105/IV-h-35 dated 3rd December, 1956 and whether the law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court and Hon'ble High Courts that has been mentioned by the officer in his / her judgment has been correctly applied?
12. Whether the officer has reproduced the injuries from the injury reports of the injured person as prescribed by C.L. No. 13/VI-b-47 dated 3rd March, 1982?
13. Whether the officer has taken upon himself the obligation to express criticism upon matters with which he has no concern, as disapproved by G.L. No. 91/2(A) dated 10th November, 1936?
14. Overall Quality of the judgment poor, good, very good, or excellent.

I am, therefore, to request you kindly to bring the contents of this letter to the notice of all the Judicial Officers working in your judgeship.

Registrar General

• C.L. No. 09/UHC/Admin.A/2011

Dated: September 20, 2011

Subject: Nomination of Administrative Judge(s).

In supersession of earlier Circular Letters on the subject noted above, I am to inform that Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to nominate the following Hon'ble Judges as the Administrative Judges Incharge of the District(s) shown against their names in the list given below with immediate effect.

1. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tarun Agarwala - Dehradun and Nainital.
2. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prafulla C. Pant - Almora and Hardwar.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S.Verma - Rudraprayag and Udham Singh Nagar.
4. Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.K. Bist - Bageshwar and Pithoragarh.
5. Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. Dhulia - Tehri Garhwal and Uttarkashi.
6. Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Gupta - Chamoli and Pauri Garhwal.
7. Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C. Dhyani - Champawat.

You are therefore, informed accordingly.

Registrar General

* * * * *

Some Recent Judgments of Uttarakhand High Court

FULL BENCH JUDGMENTS:

1. On 4th August, 2011, a Full Bench in *M/s Om Ispat Vs. Secretary, Industrial Department, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun & Others (Writ Petition M/S 163 of 2009)*, considered the question that Whether the petitioner is entitled for central excise exemption under the notification No. 50/2003 dated 10.06.2003? The backdrop of the case is that Central Government issued a notification No. 50/2003 dated 10.06.2003 under Section 5A of the Central Excise Act, 1944, which provided that new industrial units and existing industrial units on their substantial expansion which are set up in the growth centres, industrial estates etc., as specified and other areas as notified from time to time by the Central Government would be entitled to 100% excise duty exemption for 10 years. The aforesaid notification clearly indicates that new units which has commenced commercial production on or after 07.01.2003 would be entitled for exemption from excise duty on such goods as specified.

In the instant case, petitioner unit was denied this exemption from excise duty on the contention that the area where the petitioner's unit was located had been earmarked for existing units only and, since the petitioner's unit was a new unit, the petitioner was consequently not entitled for any exemption under the notification.

The Hon'ble Full Bench set aside the above contention and observed that the notification dated 10.06.2003 clearly indicates that a new unit would be entitled for exemption if it commences production after 07.01.2003 established in an area specified in Annexure-II. The Full Bench concluded that the categories mentioned do not in any manner indicate that the said categories relates to an existing unit or to a new unit and held that the petitioner was entitled for exemption under the notification No. 50/2003 dated 10.06.2003.

DIVISION BENCH JUDGEMENTS:

2. On 4th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Kallu and eight others (All residents of Village Khata Khedi P.S. Jhabrera, District Haridwar) Vs. State of Uttaranchal (Uttarakhand) (Criminal Appeal No. 1851 of 2001)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 47), while dismissing the appeal, did not find any force in the contention of appellants that statement of PW1 Virendra is not admissible in evidence as the examination-in-Chief of the witness was not signed by the Presiding Officer at the time of recording of the statement. The statement was got signed by the then Presiding Officer but successor of the Presiding Officer sent the statement for signatures to his predecessor, and the same got signed.

The Bench observed that part of examination-in-chief of Virendra was signed by the witness on the same day and rest of his examination was recorded before succeeding Presiding Officer of the trial court on which date the defence counsel cross-examined him at length, and there was no suggestion that the statement recorded on previous date is wrong. The Presiding Officer on the previous date had signed the order sheet that incomplete statement of P.W. 1 was recorded by him, but due to inadvertence signatures on each page of that part of examination-in-chief could not be made by the then Presiding Officer, and record was later sent to him.

The Bench observed that this kind of irregularity even if taken to be true, does not vitiate the trial, and in view of the provision contained in Section 465 of Cr.P.C., since no failure of justice has occurred, the finding recorded by the trial court does not need interference on this ground, particularly when no objection was raised at the time of cross examination.

In the same case, the Bench also set-aside the contention of appellants that there is defect in the charge, as Section 149 of I.P.C. is not mentioned with Section 302 of I.P.C. The charge on the record shows that as against all the nine accused charge relating to offences punishable under Section 147, 452, 323, 302 of I.P.C. was framed. The defect pointed out on behalf of the appellants, even if accepted, since it has not misled the defence, nor resulted in failure of justice, as such, the trial does not get vitiated on this ground. Section 464 of the Cr.P.C. provides that no finding sentence or order by a court of competent jurisdiction shall be deemed invalid merely on the ground that no charge was framed or on

the ground of any error, omission or irregularity in the charge, unless in the opinion of the court of appeal, a failure of justice has in fact occasioned thereby.

3. On 5th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Indra Pal Vs. State of Uttarakhand (Criminal Appeal No. 820 of 2001)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 28), while dismissing the appeal of accused against the conviction and sentence recorded by the trial court under Section 302 I.P.C., observed that the blackening, charring and tattooing around wound of entry caused by the firearm, not only depends on the fact that from how close distance the fire was shot but it also depends whether that part of the body which received the wound of entry was open (without clothes) or not. Apart from this it also depends whether the firearm used was of a shorter barrel like country made pistol or was one having long barrel (more particularly the weapon like Rifle). HWV COX in the Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology opines, regarding the rifle weapons, that at intermediate range from two feet up to the effective range of the weapon, the entrance would be small with regular margins, grease ring and abrasion collar. According to the author, there may not be microscopic or chemical detectable residues on the skin and no burning or singeing. Apart from this, the distance of 2 feet is not a measured distance, but a guesswork of the witnesses.
4. On 5th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Lt. Col. Rajendra Singh (SL-4092P) Vs. Union of India and others (Writ Petition (S/B) NO. 173 of 2011)*, (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 13) held that the Tribunal had power to direct re-trial under Section 16 (2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 and the re-trial could not be considered as second trial.
5. On 7th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Commissioner of Income Tax, Haldwani, Nainital Vs. M/s. Mallikarjun Georesources Associates (Income Tax Appeal No. 33 of 2009)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 11), while placing reliance on *Income Tax Officer, Udaipur Vs. Arihant Tiles and Marbles (P) Ltd.*, 321 ITR 79 and *Commissioner of Income tax Vs. N.C. Budharaja & Co.* 204 ITR 412 (S.C.), held that boulder, which is a stone, would remain a stone even after it is crushed and converted into grits/stone chips/powder. The activity of converting boulder into grits/stone chips/powder may not be a manufacturing activity, but since such activity would be producing grits/stone chips/powder, the same would be

production and consequently firm is entitled to deduction under Section 80-IB of the Income Tax Act.

6. On 12th July, 2011, a Division bench in *M/s India Glycols Limited Vs. State of Uttarakhand & another (Writ Petition No. 1202 of 2007)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 8), while interpreting the power to levy excise duty held that the right to impose duty of excise on alcoholic liquors for human consumption is a recognized right of the State, inasmuch as the State has exclusive privilege of manufacturing and producing alcoholic liquors for human consumption. The Bench observed that when a commodity is taken out from the State and used up in another State within Union of India, will have the same effect when the commodity is used up outside Union of India. The Bench observed that the levy is not governed by Article 286 of the Constitution in such situation.
7. On 13th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Director, Income Tax (International Taxation) Vs. Transocean Offshore International Ventures Ltd. & others (Income Tax Appeal No. 25 of 2010)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 2), held that when appeals are consolidated at the appellate stage and the appellate authority is invited to render one judgment to dispose of all the appeals by a common judgment, may be several decrees / orders are required to be passed to dispose of those appeals by a common judgment, one appeal, is maintainable against a common judgment, but, appellant would be required to pay court fees as is payable in accordance with the provisions of the applicable Court Fees Act in respect of each appeal, which stands consolidated by the common judgment against which an appeal has been preferred.
8. On 13th July, 2011, a Division Bench in *Preet Kumar & other Vs. State of Uttarakhand & others (Writ Petition (PIL) No. 590 of 2006)* (reported in 2011 (2) U.D., 5), while hearing a Public Interst Litigation against issuing a 'No Objection' for establishing a stone crushing unit within 500 Meters from a river, set-aside the contention of respondants that the distance of 500 Meters is not to be maintained, when the water body is not a river, held that the logical conclusion from the various policies of the State Government would be that the word 'river', used in the policy, denotes water bodies of importance to the people and that, water is life of living being, the policy prevented establishment of stone crushing units

within 500 metres from all and every living water body and, accordingly, the District Magistrate had no authority, in law, to grant the 'No Objection, in the instant case

SINGLE BENCH JUDGMENTS:

9. On 1st July, 2011 a Single Judge Bench in *Noor Mohammad Vs. State of Uttarakhand & another (Criminal Revision No. 157 of 2003)*, while dismissing the plea of respondent that for prosecution of public servants, previous sanction under Section 197 of Cr.P.C. is needed, observed that Law is well settled on this point. When the public servant does an act, which does not have any nexus with his official duty, then no sanction at all is needed for his prosecution. In the instant case, Bench observed that it appears prima facie that respondent has remained involved in preparing the forged transfer deed of possession in order to avert the Hon'ble High Court's orders, which by no stretch of imagination can be attributed to be a part of his official duty.
10. On 20th September, 2011, a Single Judge Bench in *Suresh Pal Singh Vs. State of Uttarakhand & another (Criminal Application No. 723 of 2005)*, while hearing for quashing the chargesheet filed against the applicant, on a plea of respondent that applicant/petitioner has a long criminal history, Hon'ble Court turned down the contention of petitioner that out of so many cases, in most of them, the petitioner has been acquitted, and further observed reiterating the case of "Chheda Vs. State, reported in 1986 A.Cr.R. Page 71" that "if a person being involved in a large number of cases escapes conviction on account of technicalities and niceties of law, it would not mean that the man has a clean slate. It is also to be noted that on account of delay in trial, so many things happen on account of which accused are at times acquitted. Therefore, mere acquittal can not be a sound yardstick to enunciate the principle that unless and until a person has not been convicted, it can not be said that the man does not have a criminal history". Moreover in the instant case, there was nothing on the record to reveal that the petitioner has been absolved from the offences stated.
11. On 20th September, 2011, a Single Judge Bench in *Narsingh Narayan Dubey & Another Vs. State of Uttarakhand & Another (Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 640 of*

2009), while quashing the impugned order for declaring the accused juvenile, Hon'ble Court observed that undoubtedly, the enquiry to determine the juvenility of an accused can be conducted at any stage of the trial as envisaged under Section 7 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000, but just believing a certificate as furnished by the accused person on the basis of verification of its genuineness of issuance only is not enough to declare the accused a juvenile. It does not amount to an enquiry as has been prescribed under the relevant rules and provisions of the Act.

In the instant case, accused applied for registration of his birth on 03.07.2008 in the concerned office, while the occurrence was of 13.11.2006. Hon'ble Court observed, so his oblique motive to get his birth registered was to make him enable to take the plea of juvenility. In addition to that there were so many other incongruities and discrepancies in the contents of this certificate, viz, the name of the accused, name of his father as well as the place of his birth, which are enough to show that it has been obtained by an act of knavery in collusion with the concerned staff.

12. On 21st September, 2011, a Single Judge Bench in *Balbir Singh Vs. Smt. Harjeet Kaur & Others (Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 76 of 2006)*, while hearing the contention that trial court lacks territorial jurisdiction, observed while reiterating the case of *Virendra Singh Vs. State of U.P. and others*, reported in 1994 (31) ACC 809, held that it is well established rule that procedural law should be interpreted in the manner so as to promote cause of justice and not in the manner it may defeat it.

* * * * *

MAJOR EVENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ❖ **Administrative Conference of District Judges:** To discuss the various problems arising in day-to-day administration of justice, to look-out ways for reduction in arrears of cases and to suggest required changes in General Rules (Civil) and General Rules (Criminal), an administrative conference of District Judges and Officers equivalent to the rank was organized in High Court library hall on 25-06-2011. All the District Judges of the Uttarakhand attended the said conference.

The conference was inaugurated by Hon'ble Sri Barin Ghosh, the Chief Justice. All the Hon'ble Judges of High Court of Uttarakhand graced the conference with their benign presence.

In the day long conference, concrete decisions were taken to reduce the arrears and resolutions were passed to amend some rules in General Rules (Civil) and General Rules (Criminal).

- ❖ **Recruitment in Higher Judicial Service:** In the H.J.S. direct recruitment quota from the bar, main examination was held in the last quarter. Finally 03 candidates were declared successful and their names have been recommended to the Government for appointment after required verification. Apart from this, suitability test has been held to fill-up the promotional quota of H.J.S. cadre and 11 candidates from Civil Judge (Sr. Div.) cadre have been recommended to be promoted.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF UJALA

- ❖ **Library inauguration, Foundation stone function on 26-06-2011:** In Uttarakhand Judicial & Legal Academy, Bhowali, District Nainital, a library has been established. Sri Barin Ghosh, Hon'ble the Chief Justice, High Court of Uttarakhand inaugurated the library on 26.06.2011 in the benign presence of Hon'ble Judges. After the inauguration, Hon'ble the Chief Justice alongwith Hon'ble Judges took a round of the library and praised the academy administration for establishing e-library. Apart from

inauguration of library, Hon'ble the Chief Justice also laid foundation stones for construction of Auditorium, Recreation Centre and Guest House.

- ❖ **Workshop on Service Jurisprudence:** On 24th and 25th of September, 2011, a workshop on Service Jurisprudence for the District Judges and Officers of equivalent rank was organized. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tarun Agarwala, the Senior Judge, High Court of Uttarakhand inaugurated the said workshop and enlightened the participants regarding different aspects of Service Jurisprudence. Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.K. Bist, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Servesh Kumar Gupta and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Dhyani, the Judges, High Court of Uttarakhand also addressed the participants in the workshop.

* * * * *



Hon'ble the Chief Justice, Sri Barin Ghosh, inaugurating the library of Uttarakhand Judicial & Legal Academy, Bhowali on 26.06.2011 in the benign presence of Hon'ble Judges.

Hon'ble Mr Justice Tarun Agarwala (Sr. Judge) (in the centre) & Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. S. Verma are looking on

Group Photograph of District Judges and officers of equivalent rank with Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges taken on 25.06.2011 at Administrative Conference



Sitting (from Left) : Hon'ble Mr Justice S. K. Gupta, Hon'ble Mr Justice B. S. Verma, Hon'ble Mr Justice Tarun Agarwala, Hon'ble Mr Justice Barin Ghosh (Chief Justice), Hon'ble Mr Justice Prafulla C. Pant, Hon'ble Mr Justice V.K. Bist.

Standing (from left) : Mr. Kanta Prasad, Mr. Kawer Sain, Ms. Kumkum Rani, Mr. Jai Deo Singh, Mr. R. C. Kukreti, Mr. V. B. Sharma, Smt. Meena Tewari, Mr. R. C. Khulbe, Mr. U. C. Dhyani, Mr. K. D. Bhatt, Mr. Ram Singh, Mr. Raj Krishan, Mr. B. S. Dugtal, Mr. R. D. Pandey, Mr. D. P. Gairola, Mr. Alok Kumar Verma.