A GOAN REAL ESTATE & CONSTRUCTION LTD. & ANR.

v.

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ORS.

(Writ Petition (C) No. 329 of 2008)

B

MARCH 31, 2010

[K.G. BALAKRISHNAN, CJI. AND J.M. PANCHAL, JJ.]

Environmental law – Construction on coastal area – C *Coastal Regulation Zone Notification declaring area upto 100 meters from High Tide Line as 'No Development Zone' – Amendment to the Notification in 1994, relaxing 'No Development Zone' to 50 meters from 100 meters – In 1996, Supreme Court declaring part of the amending Notification* D *as illegal – Effect on constructions made and on-going constructions by real estate owners pursuant to the plans sanctioned on the basis of amended CRZ Notification – Held: Judgment of 1996 declaring part of the amended Notification to be illegal, will not affect the completed or the on-going* E *constructions being undertaken pursuant to the said Notification – Operation of 1994 amendment neither stayed by this Court nor by Government – Thus, citizen entitled to act as per the said notification – Amendment was quashed because it would permit new constructions to take place which* F *was contrary to the provisions of Environment Act, 1986, thus, judgment is to be given prospective effect – Constitution of India, 1950 – Article 32.*

Judgment/Order – Construction of – Held: Judgment is G *to be read in its entirety – It cannot be read as a statute – It is to be construed having regard to the text and context in which the same was passed.*

Judgment – Retrospective or prospective – Determination of – Held: Court is to decide on a balance of

H

all relevant considerations – It would look into the justifiable reliance on the previous position by administration; ability to effectuate the new rule adopted in the overruling case without doing injustice, whether its operation is likely to burden the administration of justice substantially or would retard the purpose.

The Central Government issued the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated February 19, 1991 and the area upto 100 meters from the High Tide Line was earmarked as 'No Development Zone' and no construction was permitted within this zone. The said Notification was amended by the Notification dated August 16, 1994 and the 'No Development Zone' was relaxed to 50 meters from 100 meters.

In the year 1993, the petitioner no.1-owner of land situated near river Zuari at Goa, obtained permission to construct a hotel and residential complex beyond 100 meters. In view of the Notification dated August 16, 1994, the petitioners sought permission and commenced construction in accordance with newly approved plans. In 1996, this Court in * *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action's* **case declared the two amendments out of the six amendments introduced by the amending Notification, as illegal. Thereafter, the respondent no. 4 filed a complaint before the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority regarding constructions made by the petitioners between 50 meters and 100 meters. The Additional Collector, Goa issued a stop work order. Subsequently, the Additional Director of the MOEF, issued a clarification that any developmental activity which had been initiated between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 after obtaining all the requisite clearances should be construed as an on-going project. Even thereafter, stop work order was not lifted. The National Coastal Zone Management Authority concluded that the stand taken by the MOEF was correct**

A and was in accordance with the CRZ notification of 1991, thus, all the properties and assets constructed or under construction in the period between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 during which the set back line was changed from 100 meters to 50 meters was valid. The B Public Interest Litigation was filed and the same was disposed of. The petitioners were directed to maintain status quo. Hence the present writ petition.

The question which arose for consideration in the instant writ petition is whether the constructions made C and on-going constructions pursuant to the plans sanctioned on basis of the amended Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated August 16, 1994 would be affected or not.

D Partly allowing the writ petition, the Court

HELD: 1.1. It is declared that the judgment in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action's* case declaring part of the amending Notification dated August 16, 1994 to be illegal, E will not affect the completed or the on-going constructions being undertaken pursuant to the plan sanctioned under the amending Notification of 1994. The rule is made absolute to the extent indicated. [Para 18] [1182-C-D]

F 1.2. A critical study of the judgment in *Indian Council For Enviro-Legal Action's* case makes it clear that this Court found the two out of the six amendments made by Notification dated August 16, 1994 in the Notification dated February 19, 1991, to be arbitrary and illegal and, G therefore, they were struck down. When one part of the Notification was found to be legal and another part of the said Notification to be bad in law, it would not be proper to construe the judgment affecting past transactions. [Para 13] [1177-D-E]

H

1.3. This Court in its judgment dated April 18, 1996 in the case of *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* had not specifically directed demolition of existing structures. It had not stated as to what will be the fate of ongoing constructions which were coming up or on-going as per sanctions during the period when the said amending Notification dated August 16, 1994 was valid and in force. In view of the circumstances, it has become essential to understand the real intention of this Court ingrained in the judgment dated April 18, 1996. An order of Court must be construed having regard to the text and context in which the same was passed. For the said purpose, the judgment of this Court is required to be read in its entirety. A judgment cannot be read as a statute. Construction of a judgment should be made in the light of the factual matrix involved therein. What is more important is to see the issues involved therein and the context wherein the observations were made. Observation made in a judgment should be read in isolation and out of context. On perusal of the judgment, it is abundantly clear that even under 1991 Notification which is the main Notification, it was stipulated that all development and activities within CRZ will be valid and will not violate the provisions of the 1991 Notification till the Management Plans are approved. Thus, the intention of legislature while issuing Notification of 1991 was to protect the past actions/transactions which came into existence before the approval of 1991 Notification. [Para 13] [1177-G-H; 1178-A-D]

1.4. With regard to the submission in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* case that construction has already taken place along such rivers, creeks etc. at a distance of 50 meters and more, it was observed, that even if this be so, such reduction would permit new constructions to take place and this reduction could not be regarded as a protection only to the existing structures. Thus, on

A perusal of the said statement, it is clear that this Court had quashed the amendment because the amendment would permit new constructions to take place which was contrary to the provisions of the Environment Act, 1986 and not because of the reason that there was evidence B before the Court that constructions already made or on-going pursuant to the plans sanctioned on the basis of Notification of 1994 had, in fact, frustrated the object of the Act. Thus, paragraph 39 clearly reflects intention of this Court that Court wanted to give the judgment C prospective effect. On perusal of the judgment in entirety, it is abundantly clear that the judgment is in form of directions to the Central Government and other authorities formed within the purview of Environment Act, 1986 and those directions are to be followed in future. [Para 13] [1177-F; 1178-E-H; 1179-A-B] D

1.5. By communication dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 issued by Additional Director of Ministry of Environment and Forests and decision of National Coastal Zone Management Authority E dated October 30, 2007, it is brought on record that all the authorities unanimously opined that judgment of this Court dated April 18, 1996 will operate prospectively and further clarified that any developmental activity which has been initiated between August 16, 1994 and April 18, F 1996 after obtaining all requisite clearances from the concerned agencies including the Town and Country Planning should be construed as on-going projects and are not hit by the judgment of this Court dated April 18, 1996. [Para 13] [1179-C-F]

G 1.6. While interpreting the judgment, public interest should be taken into consideration. When judicial discretion has been exercised to establish a new norm, the question emerges whether it would be applied retrospectively to the past transactions or prospectively H

to the transactions in future only. This process is limited not only to common law traditions, but exists in all jurisdictions. It is, therefore, for the Court to decide, on a balance of all relevant considerations, whether a decision which unsettles the previous position of law should be applied retrospectively or not. The Court would look into the justifiable reliance on the previous position by the Administration; ability to effectuate the new rule adopted in the overruling case without doing injustice, whether its operation is likely to burden the administration of justice substantially or would retard the purpose. All these factors are to be taken into account while determining whether a judgment is prospective or otherwise. The Court would adopt either the retroactive or non-retroactive effect of a decision after evaluating the merits and demerits of a particular case by looking to the prior history of the rule in question, its purpose and effect and whether retroactive operation will accelerate or retard the object of the judgment. The purpose of the old rule, the mischief sought to be prevented by the judgment and the public interest are equally germane and should be taken into account in deciding whether the judgment has prospective or retrospective operation. The courts do make the law to prevent administrative chaos and to meet ends of justice. Taking into consideration all these factors, this Court refuses to interpret the 1996 judgment in a manner which would give it a retrospective effect. It is clear from the tenor of judgment and from other background circumstances, more importantly in view of decisions of NCZMA which is a statutory body that Three Judge Bench decision in 1996 case intended to give it prospective effect. [Para 13] [1179-E-H; 1180-A-E]

Managing Director, ECIL, Hyderabad & Ors. v. B. Karunakar and Ors. **(1993) 4 SCC 727, referred to.**

1.7. The submission that decision should not have been taken by the NCZMA on October 30, 2007 stating that

A **all the properties and assets constructed or under construction during the period between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 when the set back line stood changed from 100 meters to 50 meters, is valid and the said authority should have directed the parties to approach**
B **the High Court for appropriate orders, cannot be accepted. The whole matter was reconsidered by the NCZMA pursuant to the order passed by the Division Bench of the High Court. The said order was never challenged by the respondents before higher forum and**
C **by their conduct, the respondents had permitted the said order to attain finality. [Para 14] [1180-F-H; 1181-A]**

1.8. The submission that the construction already completed would not be affected in any manner by decision of this Court in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal*
D *Action's* **case but incomplete construction cannot be permitted to be completed is devoid of merits. Two amendments made in the year 1994 were declared to be illegal by judgment dated April 18, 1996. Till then, its operation was neither stayed by this Court nor by the**
E **Government. Therefore, a citizen was entitled to act as per the said notification. The rights of the parties were crystallized by the amending notification till part of the same was declared to be illegal by this Court. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that part of the amending**
F **notification was declared illegal by this Court, all orders passed under the said notification and actions taken pursuant to the said notification would not be affected in any manner whatsoever. [Para 15] [1181-B-D]**

1.9. The plea that the petitioner would get benefit of
G **interpretation placed by statutory bodies and others would not get any benefit and, therefore, the petition should be dismissed cannot be accepted. A bare glance at the minutes of the 16th meeting of the NCZMA held on October 30, 2007 makes it more than clear that it was**
H **concluded by the authority that the stand taken by the**

Ministry vide letters dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 was correct and was in accordance with Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 1991. The said authority has in terms held that the clarification given by the MOEF is applicable to all such cases in the coastal areas of the country. [Para 16] [1181-E-G]

***Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action vs. Union of India (1996) 5 SCC 281, Clarified.**

Case Law Reference:

(1993) 4 SCC 727	**Referred to.**	**Para 13**
(1996) 5 SCC 281	**Clarified.**	**Para 13, 17 and 18**

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 329 of 2008.

Petition Under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

G.E. Vahanvati, A.G. of India, Mukul Rohtagi and K.K. Vengopal, Mahesh Agarwal, Rishi Agrawala, Mohammed Himayatullah, Saurabh Kirpal, Rohma Hameed (for E.C. Agrawala), Anitha Shenoy, Noma Alvares, Mamta Saxena, Gopal Shankar Narayanan, Sanjay Parikh, Anish R. Shah, Manjula Gupta, Mihir Chatterjee and Devdatt Kamat for the appearing parties.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

J.M. PANCHAL, J. 1. By filing this petition under Article 32 of the Constitution, the petitioners have prayed to declare that the building plans sanctioned and constructions made and on-going constructions pursuant to the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated February 19, 1991 as amended by the Notification dated August 16, 1994 issued by the Central Government are valid.

A 2. The relevant facts emerging from the records of the case are as under :

The Petitioner No.1 is owner of the land situated near river Zuari at Goa. It submitted plans in the year 1993 for construction
B of a hotel and residential complex. The Central Government, through Ministry of Environment and Forests ('MOEF', for short), issued Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated February 19, 1991 in exercise of powers under Rule 5(d) of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986. As per the said notification, the area
C upto 100 meters from the High Tide Line was earmarked as 'No Development Zone' and no construction was permitted within this zone except for repairs etc. However, the Central Government issued another notification on August 16, 1994 amending notification dated February 19, 1991 and relaxing the
D 'No Development Zone' to 50 meters from 100 meters. In view of the said relaxation, the petitioners who had earlier obtained construction permissions in respect of a project beyond 100 meters, submitted an additional proposal to the Panchayat of Village Curca, Bambolim & Taloulim, Taluka Tiswadi, Goa for construction of 18 blocks between 50 meters and 100 meters.
E The Village Panchayat referred the matter to the Town and Country Planning Authority, as required under the Rules for technical evaluation. The Town and Country Planning Authority approved the abovementioned additional construction to be made between 50 meters and 100 meters vide order dated
F July 31, 1995. Based on this approval, vide its order dated July 31, 1995, the Village Panchayat sanctioned the plans and granted permission to construct. It is the case of the petitioners that they had commenced construction in accordance with newly approved plans which were revalidated from time to time and
G are valid till this date.

3. An NGO by the name of Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action filed a public interest litigation in this Court under Article 32 of the Constitution against the Union of India making prayer
H to direct the Central Government to implement notification dated

February 19, 1991 by which CRZs were formed and restrictions on development were placed. The grievance made was that the non-implementation of the said notification had led to continued degradation of ecology. In the said petition, Goa Foundation, a society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1960 filed an application challenging the vires of notification dated August 16, 1994 by which main notification dated February 19, 1991 was amended. This Court took into consideration the salient features of the main notification dated February 19, 1991 and noticed that the said notification was issued to ensure that the development activities were consistent with the environmental guidelines for beaches and coastal areas and, therefore, by the said Notification, restrictions on the setting up of industries which had detrimental effect on the coastal environment were imposed. The Court thereafter proceeded to examine validity of notification dated August 16, 1994. After noticing that six amendments were made in the main notification, this Court found that reduction of the ban on construction from 100 meters to 50 meters was illegal and power given to the Central Government for relaxation of developmental activities in the entire 6,000 kilometers long coast line was unbridled and capable of being abused. Thus, by judgment dated April 18, 1996 which is reported as *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action vs. Union of India,* (1996) 5 SCC 281, the abovementioned two amendments were held to be bad in law by this Court. From the final directions given by this Court in paragraph 47 of the judgment, it is evident that this Court partly accepted the petition by striking down two amendments which were introduced by notification dated August 16, 1994. From paragraph 39 of the judgment, it transpires that during the course of arguments, the learned Additional Solicitor General of India brought to the notice of this Court, the fact that construction had already taken place along such rivers, creeks etc. at a distance of 50 meters and more. This Court observed that there could not have been uniform basis for demarcating 'No Development Zone' and it would depend upon the requirements by each State Authority

A concerned in their own management plan, but no reason had been given as to why in relation to tidal rivers, there was a reduction of the ban on construction from 100 meters to 50 meters. This Court also took into consideration the fact that no explanation had been given in the affidavit filed on behalf of the B Union of India as to why the construction was permitted at a distance of 50 meters and more along rivers, creeks etc. This Court found that reduction of the ban on construction from 100 meters to 50 meters would permit new constructions to take place and, therefore, the reduction could not be regarded as a C protection only to the existing structures. Further, this Court noticed that there was absence of a categorical statement in the affidavit to the effect that such reduction would not be harmful or result in serious ecological imbalance. The Court expressed its inability to conclude that the amendment was made in the larger public interest and was valid. The said D amendment was held to be contrary to the object of the Environment Act and found not to have been made for any valid reason. Thus, the two amendments out of six amendments introduced by the amending Notification were declared to be illegal.

E

4. From the record, it becomes clear that the petitioners had made an application to the Panchayat to inspect the construction made on Survey No.12/1 and 99/2 which were stretches of lands lying between 50 meters and 100 meters. In F view of the contents of the said letter, a Panchayat official had inspected the site on September 25, 1996 and prepared a site inspection report. The said report indicated that the petitioners had completed foundation work up to the plinth level and in some of the areas of the property, the construction work of the G building was complete and ready for occupation.

5. However, People's Movement for Civic Action, i.e., Respondent No.4 herein made a complaint to the local Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority, i.e., the respondent No.3 regarding constructions made by the petitioners between 50

H

meters and 100 meters. Pursuant to the said complaint, the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority on October 22, 2006 issued communication through its Secretary, to the Additional Collector stating that on a joint inspection of the site at Survey Nos.99/2, 12/1 and 96, it was found that the construction work was going on in violation of CRZ Guidelines inasmuch as construction was made between 50 meters to 100 meters of 'High Tide Line'. By the said letter, the respondent No.3 requested the Additional Collector to ascertain whether clearance under CRZ had been obtained. On October 22, 2006, an order was passed by the Collector, North Goa District directing the petitioner to stop the construction at the site. Based on a complaint by Goa Bachao Abhiyan to the Chief Secretary regarding alleged violation of CRZ norms, the Additional Collector, North Goa issued a stop work order dated December 22, 2006 and directed the Police and Town Planning Authority to maintain the status quo at the site. On December 28, 2006, petitioner No.1 made a representation to the MOEF to issue clarification that the project of the petitioner No.1 was an on-going project and as the same was sanctioned according to the rules and regulations then applicable, the stop work notice by the Additional Collector was illegal. The Central Government, through the Ministry of Environment and Forests ('MOEF' for short) vide letter dated January 24, 2007 addressed to the petitioner with copy to the Director and Joint Secretary, Department of Science, Technology and Environment, Government of Goa, clarified that new developmental activities to be carried out in the zone between 50 meters and 100 meters in the High Tide Line along with inland tidal water bodies would attract the provisions of CRZ notification of 1991 from the date of the order of the Supreme Court, i.e., from April 18, 1996. In spite of the receipt of abovementioned communication, the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority did not act upon the directions issued by the MOEF. Therefore, the Petitioner No.1 made another representation to the Central Government with a request to issue necessary clarifications to the

A B C D E F G H

A authorities. A further clarification dated February 13, 2007 was issued by the Additional Director of the MOEF. In the said clarification, earlier communication dated January 24, 2007 was referred to and it was clarified that any developmental activity which had been initiated between August 16, 1994 and
B April 18, 1996 after obtaining all the requisite clearances from concerned agencies including the Town and Country Planning Authority should be construed as an on-going project. Even after this clarification, the stop work order was not lifted. The Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority ('GCZMA', for short)
C addressed a communication dated March 28, 2007 to the Additional Collector stating that it was decided that on the property of the petitioner No.I, 'No Development Zone' should be marked at 100 meters and the stop work order, if any, in operation beyond such 'No Development Zone' should be
D vacated. On receipt of communication dated March 28, 2007 from Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority, the Additional Collector, Goa, passed an order dated May 23, 2007 purporting to vacate the stop work order dated December 12, 2006 but, in fact, permitting the construction beyond 100 meters and not 50 meters. The petitioners, therefore, made third
E representation to MOEF and requested to issue fresh clarifications. The petitioners had also annexed copy of the letter dated March 28, 2007 addressed by the G.C.Z.M. Authority to the Additional Collector. On receipt of the said representation, the MOEF, Government of India, issued clarification dated May
F 16, 2007. A reference was made to its earlier letter dated February 13, 2007, it was mentioned therein that it was not clear as to why GCZMA had not taken into consideration the clarification dated February 13, 2007 of MOEF before addressing letter dated March 28, 2007 to the Additional
G Collector, Goa in relation to the development made in property bearing Survey No.12/1 (pt.) 12/2 and 99/2 of Village Bambolim Taluka Tiswadi, Goa. By the said communication, the Member-Secretary, Department of Science, Technology and Environment of Government of Goa was requested to get the
H matter examined by the Goa Coastal Zone Management

Authority keeping in view the clarifications issued by the Ministry vide letter dated February 13, 2007. A

6. In spite of the receipt of the communication from MOEF, the stop work orders were not lifted and allowed to operate. Therefore, the petitioners filed writ petition No.365 of 2007 in the High Court of Bombay at Goa challenging the stop work orders dated December 22, 2006 and May 23, 2007 passed by the Additional Collector, Goa. During the course of hearing of the writ petition on July 24, 2007, the learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the MOEF made a statement before the Court that from the records it was clear that the project of the petitioners had been treated by the Central Government acting through the MOEF as an on-going project. In view of this statement made on behalf of the Central Government, the learned Advocate-General appearing for the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority and for the State of Goa stated at the Bar that the State of Goa would withdraw the stop work orders dated December 22, 2006 and May 23, 2007 to the extent, they imposed an embargo on construction between 50 meters and 100 meters and that the withdrawal letter would be issued to the petitioners within a period of one week from the date of the order. The record shows that the statements made at the Bar by the learned Additional Solicitor General and learned Advocate-General were accepted by the Court and, therefore, the petitioners had not pressed the said writ petition. The writ petition was accordingly disposed of by order dated July 24, 2007. B C D E F

7. The record further shows that thereafter writ petition No.403 of 2007 was filed by People's Movement for Civic Action and Goa Foundation, a society registered under the Societies Registration Act challenging the order dated October 8, 1998 passed by the Panchayat of Curca, bambolim and Talaulim, Goa by which permission to construct was renewed in favour of the petitioners. Initially, the Court had directed the parties to maintain status quo. The Court had also directed the G H

A Secretary, MOEF to place the stand of the Environment Ministry of the Central Government on the record by filing an affidavit. The record shows that in compliance of the said direction, an affidavit affirmed on September 12, 2007 by Mr. K. Uppily, Additional Director in the MOEF, Government of India was filed B expressing the view of the Ministry that any developmental activity which had been initiated between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 after obtaining all the requisite clearances from the concerned agencies including the Town and Country Planning Development should be construed as an on-going C project. In the said affidavit, it was also mentioned that the Ministry had decided to place the matter before the National Coastal Zone Management Authority in its meeting which was scheduled to be held in October 2007 and the contentions of the People's Movement for Civic Action etc. as also the D communications dated July 17, 2007 of Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority and the contentions of the petitioners would be examined by the said Authority.

In the light of the facts mentioned in the affidavit filed on behalf of the Ministry, the High Court directed the National E Coastal Zone Management Authority to consider the matter referred to it by the Ministry and submit a report to the Court after giving a personal hearing to all the concerned parties. The High Court clarified that the National Coastal Zone Management Authority should decide the matter on merits without being F influenced in any way by the filing of writ petition or the observations made by the Court. It was also clarified that if the order was adverse to the petitioners, they would be at liberty to challenge the same. Further, the Goa Coastal Management was directed to take action in accordance with law subject to G the rights of the petitioners to challenge the said report. The Court further stated in its order that the Peoples Movement for Civic Action and Goa Foundation would also be at liberty to move the court for appropriate relief in case the report of National Coastal Zone Management Authority was adverse to H it.

8. The record shows that the National Coastal Zone Management Authority considered the matter in detail in its meeting held on October 30, 2007. The Authority, after detailed discussions, was of the view that there would be several cases all over the coast wherein there would be some instances indicating that constructions work had been completed or was in progress pursuant to the Notification dated August 16, 1994. Therefore, the Authority concluded that the stand taken by the MOEF vide letters dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 was correct one and was in accordance with the CRZ notification of 1991. The Authority also noticed that the clarification given by the MOEF was applicable to all cases in the coastal areas of the country. What was reported by the said Authority was that this Court while setting aside two out of six amendments dated August 16, 1994 in Writ Petition No.664 of 1993 had not passed any orders with regard to cases in which the construction had been completed or was in progress and, therefore, all the properties and assets constructed or under construction in the period between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 during which the set back line was changed from 100 meters to 50 meters was valid. The Authority noted that if it would have been otherwise, this Court would have passed specific orders. The Authority ultimately expressed the view that the interpretation of phrase 'on-going' by the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority was incorrect and all the properties and assets constructed or under construction during the period between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 should be maintained and should not be destroyed.

Thereafter, the public interest Litigation was placed for final hearing before the High Court. The Court was of the opinion that as the Supreme Court had struck down the notification amending the earlier notification, ordinarily all activities between 50 meters and 100 meters from the high tide line must cease. Having expressed this view, the Court considered the report of the National Coastal Zone

A Management Authority ('NCZMA' for short) and noticed that the said report/order was not challenged by the petitioners who had instituted the public interest litigation. On the request of the petitioners, the Court permitted them to amend the petition so as to enable them to challenge the order of the NCZMA. The B said order permitting the original petitioners to amend the petition was challenged by the present petitioners by filing SLP (C) No.16728 of 2008 before this Court.

9. The petitioners were also directed to maintain status quo and, therefore, feeling aggrieved by the said order, they have C preferred SLP (C) No.19767 of 2008 which is also heard along with this writ petition.

10. The case of the petitioners is that this Court in its judgment dated April 18, 1996 had not specifically directed D demolition of the existing structures nor the directions of the Court had affected the on-going constructions which were coming up as per plans sanctioned during the period when the said amending notification dated August 16, 1994 was valid and in force. It is mentioned by the petitioners that the Central E Government and thereafter NCZMA after considering the facts and circumstances of the case and in the larger public interest had concluded that the stand taken by the MOEF vide its letters dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 was correct and, therefore, a case is made out for issuance of F a clarification that the judgment of this Court rendered in *Indian Council for Inviro-Legal Action* (supra) on April 18, 1996 does not prejudice or affect either the completed construction or on-going construction. Under the circumstances, the petitioners have filed the instant petition and claimed the relief to which G reference is made earlier.

11. On service of notice, Dr. A Senthil Vel, Additional Director, Ministry of Environment and Forest has filed reply affidavit and supported the case of the petitioners. After filing of Additional Affidavit by the petitioners, Mr. Claude Alvares, H

has filed affidavit in opposition on behalf of the respondent No.5 whereas affidavit in rejoinder is filed by Mr. Vijender Kumar Sharma, on behalf of the petitioners. A

12. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties at great length and in detail. This Court has also considered the documents forming part of the petition and other proceedings. B

13. The question which falls for consideration is whether the constructions made or on-going pursuant to the plans sanctioned on the basis of Notification dated August 16, 1994 would be affected or not. For this purpose, it will be necessary to construe the judgment rendered in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* (supra). A critical study of the judgment in *Indian Council For Enviro-Legal Action* (supra) makes it clear that this Court had examined validity of six amendments made by Notification dated August 16, 1994 in the Notification dated February 19, 1991. Two out of the six amendments were found by this Court to be arbitrary and illegal and, therefore, they were struck down. When one part of the Notification was found to be legal and another part of the said Notification to be bad in law, it would not be proper to construe the judgment affecting past transactions. C D E

Tenor of the judgment indicates that this Court intended to give prospective effect to the judgment dated April 18, 1996 rendered in the case of *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* (supra). It is to be noted that this Court in its judgment dated April 18, 1996 had not specifically directed demolition of existing structures. It is also pertinent to note that this Court had not stated as to what will be the fate of ongoing constructions which were coming up or on-going as per sanctions during the period when the said amending Notification dated August 16, 1994 was valid and in force. In view of the circumstances, now it has become essential to understand the real intention of this Court ingrained in the judgment dated April 18, 1996. *It is well* F G H

A settled that an order of Court must be construed having regard to the text and context in which the same was passed. For the said purpose, the judgment of this Court is required to be read in its entirety. A judgment, it is well settled, cannot be read as a statute. Construction of a judgment should be made in the B light of the factual matrix involved therein. What is more important is to see the issues involved therein and the context wherein the observations were made. Observation made in a judgment, it is trite, should be read in isolation and out of context. On perusal of paragraph 10 of the judgment, it is C abundantly clear that even under 1991 Notification which is the main Notification, it was stipulated that all development and activities within CRZ will be valid and will not violate the provisions of the 1991 Notification till the Management Plans are approved. Thus, the intention of legislature while issuing D Notification of 1991 was to protect the past actions/ transactions which came into existence before the approval of 1991 Notification.

In paragraph 39 of the judgment, this Court considered the argument proposed by the learned Additional Solicitor General E that construction has already taken place along such rivers, creeks etc. at a distance of 50 meters and more. This plea was specifically answered by observing that even if this be so, such reduction would permit new constructions to take place and this reduction could not be regarded as a protection only to the F existing structures. Thus, on perusal of the above statement, it is clear that this Court had quashed the amendment because the amendment would permit new constructions to take place which was contrary to the provisions of the Environment Act, 1986 and not because of the reason that there was evidence G before the Court that constructions already made or on-going pursuant to the plans sanctioned on the basis of Notification of 1994 had, in fact, frustrated the object of the Act. Thus, paragraph 39 clearly reflects intention of this Court that Court wanted to give the judgment prospective effect.

H

On perusal of the judgment in entirety, it is abundantly clear that the judgment is in form of directions to the Central Government and other authorities formed within the purview of Environment Act, 1986 and those directions are to be followed *in* future.

While interpreting the judgment, it is important to take into consideration the view expressed over the matter in controversy by various Governmental Authorities formed under the purview of Environment Act, 1986 to implement the provisions of Environment Act, 1986 although such view or opinion is not binding on the Court. By communication dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 issued by Additional Director of Ministry of Environment and Forests and decision of National Coastal Zone Management Authority dated October 30, 2007, it is brought on record that all the authorities unanimously opined that judgment of this Court dated April 18, 1996 will operate prospectively and further clarified that any developmental activity which has been initiated between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 after obtaining all requisite clearances from the concerned agencies including the Town and Country Planning should be construed as on-going projects and are not hit by the judgment of this Court dated April 18, 1996.

It is pertinent to note that while interpreting the judgment, public interest should be taken into consideration. In *Managing Director, ECIL, Hyderabad & Ors. v. B. Karunakar & Ors.* (1993) 4 SCC 727, this Court considered the factors which are to be taken into consideration while giving prospective operation to a judgment. When judicial discretion has been exercised to establish a new norm, the question emerges whether it would be applied retrospectively to the past transactions or prospectively to the transactions in future only. This process is limited not only to common law traditions, but exists in all jurisdictions. It is, therefore, for the Court to decide, on a balance of all relevant considerations, whether a decision

A which unsettles the previous position of law should be applied retrospectively or not. The Court would look into the justifiable reliance on the previous position by the Administration; ability to effectuate the new rule adopted in the overruling case without doing injustice, whether its operation is likely to burden the B administration of justice substantially or would retard the purpose. All these factors are to be taken into account while determining whether a judgment is prospective or otherwise. The Court would adopt either the retroactive or non-retroactive effect of a decision after evaluating the merits and demerits of C a particular case by looking to the prior history of the rule in question, its purpose and effect and whether retroactive operation will accelerate or retard the object of the judgment. The purpose of the old rule, the mischief sought to be prevented by the judgment and the public interest are equally germane and D should be taken into account in deciding whether the judgment has prospective or retrospective operation. It is well known that the courts do make the law to prevent administrative chaos and to meet ends of justice. Taking into consideration all these factors, this Court refuses to interpret the 1996 judgment in a manner which would give it a retrospective effect. It is clear from E the tenor of judgment and from other background circumstances, more importantly in view of decisions of NCZMA which is a statutory body that Three Judge Bench decision in 1996 case intended to give it prospective effect.

F 14. The contention of Mr. K.K. Venugopal, learned senior counsel for the respondents that decision should not have been taken by the NCZMA on October 30, 2007 stating that all the properties and assets constructed or under construction during the period between August 16, 1994 and April 18, 1996 when G the set back line stood changed from 100 meters to 50 meters, is valid and the said authority should have directed the parties to approach the High Court for appropriate orders, cannot be accepted. As observed earlier, the whole matter was reconsidered by the NCZMA pursuant to the order passed by H the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court. It is well to

remember that the said order was never challenged by the respondents before higher forum and by their conduct, the respondents had permitted the said order to attain finality. A

15. The contention raised on behalf of the respondents that the construction already completed would not be affected in any manner by decision of this Court in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* (supra) but incomplete construction cannot be permitted to be completed is devoid of merits. Two amendments made in the year 1994 were declared to be illegal vide judgment dated April 18, 1996. Till then, its operation was neither stayed by this Court nor by the Government. Therefore, a citizen was entitled to act as per the said notification. This Court finds that the rights of the parties were crystallized by the amending notification till part of the same was declared to be illegal by this Court. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that part of the amending notification was declared illegal by this Court, all orders passed under the said notification and actions taken pursuant to the said notification would not be affected in any manner whatsoever. B C D

16. The plea that the petitioner would get benefit of interpretation placed by statutory bodies and others would not get any benefit and, therefore, the petition should be dismissed has no substance. A bare glance at the minutes of the 16th meeting of the NCZMA held on October 30, 2007 makes it more than clear that it was concluded by the authority that the stand taken by the Ministry vide letters dated January 24, 2007, February 13, 2007 and May 16, 2007 was correct and was in accordance with Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 1991. What is relevant to notice is that the said authority has in terms held that the clarification given by the MOEF is applicable to all such cases in the coastal areas of the country. Therefore, the plea that only petitioners have been favoured by the authority and, therefore, the petition should be dismissed cannot be accepted. E F G H

A 17. On the facts and in the circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that a good case has been made out by the petitioners for issuance of a declaration that the judgment dated April 18, 1996 rendered in the case of *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* (supra) will not affect the on-going B constructions or completed constructions pursuant to the plans sanctioned under the amending Notification of 1994 till two clauses of the same were set aside by this Court.

18. For the foregoing reasons, the petition partly succeeds. C It is declared that the judgment dated April 18, 1996 in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action vs. Union of India,* (1996) 5 SCC 281, declaring part of the amending Notification dated August 16, 1994 to be illegal, will not affect the completed or the on-going constructions being undertaken pursuant to the said Notification The rule is made absolute to the extent D indicated hereinabove. There shall be no order as to costs.

N.J. Writ Petition Partly allowed.

P.S.C. 4 III 2010 (4)
1,000

Annual Subscription for 2010
(For 12 Volumes, each Volume consisting of
4 Parts and an Index)
In Indian Rupees : 3600/-
In UK £ : 121
In US $: 197

Each Additional Volume:
In Indian Rupees : 300/-
In UK £ : 10
In US $: 16
(Individual Volumes or Parts not available for Sale)

To Subscribe please Contact :

Assistant Controller of Publications (Periodicals)
Department of Publication, Govt. of India,
Civil Lines, Delhi-110054
Tel. : 011-23817823, 23813761-62, 64, 65 Fax : 91-011-23817846

Regd. No. D-(D)155.

Printed by : J.R. Computers,
477/7, Moonga Nagar, Karawal Nagar Road, Delhi.

SUBJECT-INDEX

ABKARI ACT 61 OF 1977 [KERALA]:

Grant of FL-3 Licence.

(See under: Foreign Liquor Rules [Kerala]) ....

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE:

(1) Advocate – Responsibility of – Failure of counsel to render assistance to Court – Held: In case counsel for the petitioner is not able to render any assistance, Court may decline to entertain the petition – If a factual/legal issue is not raised, court should not decide the same as its decision may be violative of principles of natural justice – In the petition under Article 32 of the Constitution challenging order of Family Court in a case u/s 13-B(1) of Hindu Marriage Act asking the parties to wait for six months, the counsel were unable to explain as to how writ petition was maintainable – Such a practice is tantamount to not only disservice to the institution, but it also affects administration of justice – Conduct of all of them was reprehensible – Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 – ss.13-B(1) and (2) – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 32 and 142 – Supreme Court Rules, 1966 – Orders 4 and 18 – Advocate-on-Record – Practice and Procedure – Natural Justice.

Smt. Poonam v. *Sumit Tanwar* 557

(2) Criminal Justice – Exercise of clemency powers – Held: Considerations of public policy and humanitarian impulses support the concept of executive power of clemency.

State of Haryana and Ors. v. *Jagdish* 716

(3) Justice Delivery system.
(See under: Judgment/Order) 190

(4) Open trial.
(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 911

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW:
(1) Delegated legislation.
(See under: Electricity Act, 2003) 609

(2) Expert Body/Committee – Decision of – Scope for judicial review – Held: It would normally be wise and safe for the Courts to leave the decision to experts who are more familiar with the problems.

The Secretary & Curator, Victoria Memorial Hall v. *Howrah Ganatantrik Nagrik Samity and Ors.* 190

(3) Policy decision.
(See under: Foreign Liquor Rules [Kerala]) 1

(4) Principles of natural justice – Dismissal order – Neither the copy of inquiry report was made available to dismissed employee nor the reason for dismissal disclosed in show cause notice – Held: There was violation of principles of natural justice – Service law – Dismissal.

L.I.C. of India and Anr. v. *Ram Pal Singh Bisen* 438

(5) Promissory estoppel – Applicability of.
(See under: Service Law) 1106

(6) (i) Rules and Regulations *vis-à-vis* law enacted

by legislature – Nature of – Similarity between.

(ii) Quasi judicial orders and judicial decisions – Similarity between.

(iii) Order and 'Regulation' – Distinction between.

PTC India Ltd. v. *Central Electricity Regulatory Commission Through Secretary* 609

(7) (See under: Tenders) 863

ADVOCATES:

Responsibility of advocates.

(See under: Administration of Justice) 557

ANDHRA PRADESH TENANCY ACT, 1956:

ss. 2(c), (f) and 13 – Landlord-tenant relationship – Suit for eviction on ground of non-payment of rent – Resisted on ground of *res judicata* and permanent lease patta – Held: In the earlier litigation, High Court had held that it did not have jurisdiction in the matter in view of the special process prescribed in the Act and, that the title with respect to tenancy rights had been perfected owing to adverse possession – Earlier decision of High Court was merely with respect to tenancy title and would not bar instant eviction proceedings u/s 13 – It cannot be said that a permanent lease would not result in tenant-landlord relationship since it is implied that in such an agreement non-fulfillment of prescribed terms (non-payment of rent in the instant case) would give right to landlord to evict the tenant – The finding of the appellate authority that tenants committed default in payment of rent was rightly – affirmed by High Court – Eviction of tenant not interfered with – Code of

Civil Procedure, 1908 – s.11 – *Res judicata* – Deeds and documents – Permanent lease patta – Tenant-Landlord relationship.

Chittoor Chegaiah & Ors. v. *Pedda Jeeyangar Mutt & Anr.* 123

APPEAL:

Appellate tribunal – Jurisdiction of.

(See under: Electricity Act, 2003) 609

ARBITRATION ACT, 1940:

ss. 14(2), 17, 29, 30 and 33 – Petition for making the Arbitration Award a Rule of Court – Objections u/ss. 30 and 33 to set aside the Award – Rejection of objection since it was filed prior to filing of the Award – Held: Justified – Filing objection against something which did not exist on the date when objection was filed cannot be accepted – Limitation Act, 1963 – Schedule – Article 119.

Union of India & Ors. v. *M/s. Neelam Engineering & Construction Company* 280

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996:

ss.7 and 11 – Government contracts – Tender – Allegation of arbitrariness in tender process – Aggrieved bidder filed application for referring matter to arbitration – Held: On facts, arbitration clause was applicable only to contract awarded by placing a purchase order and not in regard to any dispute to the tender or bid or non-placing of purchase order – Thus, arbitration clause did not exist in regard to tender stage dispute or pre-contract differences, at a stage when there was no privity of contract – Since a purchase order was not placed, there was no contract or

agreement and the terms of arbitration clause did not come into existence – Government contracts – Tender.

Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. v. *Telephone Cables Ltd.* 291

ARMS ACT, 1959:
s.35(c).
(See under: Evidence Act, 1872) 1149

BENGAL FINANCE (SALES TAX) ACT, 1941:
s.11-E(2) – Show-cause notice – Issuance of – Furnishing of incorrect statement of turnover/ incorrect particulars of sales by dealer-assessee – Show cause notice issued proposing to re-open deemed assessment for the period – Challenged by assessee on the ground that time period of 15 days not given and reasons justifying the issuance of notice not given – Held: Show cause notice is issued to the assessee when Commissioner is satisfied that the assessee has furnished incorrect statement of his turnover or incorrect particulars of his sales in the return submitted, so as to enable the assessee to reply to the show cause notice – Assessee would not in any manner be prejudiced due to issuance of the notice – Assessee can file an effective reply – Time given by the authority for filing the reply can be further extended – Non-mentioning of reasons justifying issuance of notice does not invalidate the notice.

Supreme Paper Mills Ltd. v. *Asstt. Commnr. Commercial Taxes Calcutta & Ors.* 798

BURDWAN UNIVERSITY ACT, 1981:
s. 21(xiii) – Promotions to different grades of non-

teaching staff – Resolution of the Execution Council of the University as regards criteria for promotion – Challenge to – Subsequently, approval of Resolution by State Government – Held: As per the wordings of s. 21(xiii), Executive Council of the University could determine the terms and conditions of services of the staff and obtain approval of State Government subsequently – In case, State Government did not grant approval subsequent to the Resolution, action taken on the basis thereof, would be invalid – On facts, the promotions on the basis of the Resolution are valid since the Resolution was approved by State Government.

Ashok Kumar Das & Ors. v. *University of Burdwan & Ors.* 429

CARRIERS OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, 1925:
ss.2 and 4.
(See under: Consumer Protection Act, 1986) 460

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL (PROCEDURE) RULES, 1987:
r. 17.
(See under: Jurisdiction) 572

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION (FIXATION OF TRADING MARGIN) REGULATIONS, 2006:
(See under: Electricity Act, 2003) 609

CHILD WELFARE:
Custody of child – Welfare of child is most important.
(See under: Hindu Marriage Act, 1955) 775

CIRCULARS/GOVERNMENT ORDERS
NOTIFICATIONS:
(1) Circular dated 3.7.1996 issued by Food Corporation of India regarding compassionate appointment.
(See under: Service Law) 580

(2) Notification dated 7.6.2006 issued by Bihar Government for establishing magistrate court inside District jail.
(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 911

(3) Notification issued by MOEF in 1991 declaring coastal stretches as CRZ and for regulating activities in such areas.
(See under: Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, 1991) 315

COASTAL REGULATION ZONE NOTIFICATION, 1991:
(i) Paragraph 3(3)(i) – Uppanar river and its banks adjacent to the plant in Thiyagavalli village where the pipeline crosses Uppanar river does not come under the CRZ area – Coastal Zone Management Plan of Tamil Nadu, 1996 – Environment Protection Act, 1986 – s.2(d).

(ii) Paragraph 2(ii) – Transfer of VCM (hazardous substance) beyond port area to the PVC plant through pipelines – Permissibility – Held: Paragraph 2(ii) permits transfer of hazardous substances from ships to ports, terminals and refineries and *vice-versa*, in the port areas.
(Also see under: Interpretation of Statutes)

M. Nizamuddin v. *M/s. Chemplast Sanmar Ltd. and Ors.* 315

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PLAN OF TAMIL NADU, 1996:
Demarcation plan prepared by National Institute of Oceanography – Held: Shall not prevail over the 1996 Plan.
(Also see under: Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, 1991)

M. Nizamuddin v. *M/s. Chemplast Sanmar Ltd. and Ors.* 315

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, 1908:
(1) s.11.
(See under: Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act, 1956) 123

(2) O. 12, r.2 – Mere marking of exhibit on a document does not dispense with its proof – Evidence Act, 1872.

L.I.C. of India and Anr. v. *Ram Pal Singh Bisen* 438

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, 1973:
(1) s.2(n).
(See under: Words and Phrases) 70

(2) (i) ss.9(6), 11, 407 and 465 – Notification by High Court shifting the venue of Court of Session inside District Jail, and Notification by State Government establishing Court of Judicial Magistrate inside District Jail to try cases pending against accused – Held: Are valid – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and 21 – Principle of natural justice – Rule of audi alteram partem – Judicial Review – Practice and Procedure.

(ii) s. 327 – Open trial/Court to be open – Trial of

accused inside the jail – Held: Open trial is an important part of judicial system – However, there is no presumption that a trial in prison is not an open trial – Apart from the large number of lawyers of the accused, press and those who want to watch the trial have free access to the venue during the court proceedings – Thus, no prejudice is caused to the appellant – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and 21 – Administration of Justice – Open trial.

(Also see under: Evidence Act, 1872 as also under: Constitution of India, 1950)

Md. Shahabuddin v. *State of Bihar & Ors.* 911

(3) ss.156(3) and 202 – Power of Magistrate to order investigation – Held: Powers u/s. 156(3) can be invoked by Magistrate at pre-cognizance stage whereas powers u/s. 202 are to be invoked after cognizance is taken but before issuance of process – Once the Magistrate takes cognizance he is thereafter precluded from ordering investigation u/s. 156(3) – In the instant case, on the complaint filed, the Magistrate having taken cognizance, rightly postponed the issuance of process and kept the complaint for court inquiry u/s 202.

Rameshbhai Padurao Hedau v. *State of Gujarat* 522

(4) s. 378 (1) and (3) – Prosecution u/ss. 447, 504, 302 r/w s. 34 IPC – Acquittal by trial court – Reversed by High Court – Accused convicted u/s. 304 (Part-II) r/w s. 34 IPC – Held: The manner in which High Court disposed of appeal against acquittal is not correct – High Court altered the

acquittal order without discussing and re-appreciating the evidence and without giving reasons for convicting the accused u/s. 304(Part-II) r/w s. 34 – Judgment of High Court set aside and matter remitted to it for consideration afresh – Penal Code, 1860 – ss. 447, 504, 302 r/w s.34.

Sangappa & Ors. v. *State of Karnataka* 213

(5) s.432 r/w ss.433 and 433-A – Clemency power of Executive cannot be restricted by s. 432 r/w ss.433 and 433-A.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 716

(6) ss.482, 190 and 239 – Charge-sheet u/ss.406 and 494 IPC – Quashed by High Court, even before exercise of discretion by Magistrate u/s.190, CrPC – Held: On facts, High Court ought not to have interfered when the Magistrate had not even examined as to whether the accused persons deserved to be discharged in terms of s.239 CrPC – High Court ought to have allowed the provisions of CrPC its full play – Penal Code, 1860 – ss.406 and 494.

K. Neelaveni v. *State Rep. by Insp. of Police and Ors.* 548

(7) Investigation – Initiation of, sought for, by invoking writ jurisdiction under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

COMPENSATION:

(1) Compensation – Award of – Only when there is deficiency in service.

(See under: Consumer Protection Act, 1986) 836

(2) Fatal accident – Claim for compensation.
(See under: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988) 872

(3) Land acquisition – Court in lieu of monetary compensation giving additional FAR to land owners.
(See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, 1950:
(1) Article 14 – Last proviso to r.13(3) of Foreign Liquor Rules (Kerala) as substituted on 20.02.2002 – Constitutionality of.
(See under: Foreign Liquor Rules [Kerala]) 1

(2) (i) Article 14 – Equality before law – Reasonable classification – Held: A classification may be reasonable even though a single individual is treated as a class by himself – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s.9(6).
(ii) Article 21.
(Also see under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973)

Md. Shahabuddin v. *State of Bihar & Ors.* 911

(3) Articles 14 and 16 – Reasonable classification.
(See under: Service Law) 1086

(4) Article 20(1) – Protection under, against ex-post facto law – When available – Held: It is available only where the person concerned is held guilty of having committed an "offence" and is subjected to "penalty".

Securities and Exchange Board of India v. *Ajay Agarwal* 70

(5) Article 32 – Public Interest Litigation – Against Chief Minister – By persons belonging to political parties – Alleging possession of assets disproportionate to known source of income – Seeking initiation of investigation by CBI – Held: Writ petition in nature of PIL not maintainable – Status of petitioners as belonging to political party leads to apprehension that petition is not the result of public-spirited concern – Alleged acts can come within the ambit of statutory offences under Prevention of Corruption Act – Court cannot in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 32, direct initiation of investigation – Scope of intervention by court of first instance is controlled by statutory provisions i.e. Cr.P.C. – Public Interest Litigation – Investigation – Prevention of Corruption Act. 1988 – Constitution of India, 1950 – Article 14 – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – Locus Standi.

Kunga Nima Lepcha & Ors. v. *State of Sikkim & Ors.* 787

(6) Article 32.
(See under: Environmental Law) 1161

(7) Articles 32 and 21 – Writ of Habeas Corpus – Pakistani national, convicted by Court of Session in India – Continued to be in prison in India, after serving the full sentence – Held: In view of specific information that the Government of India has taken a decision to repatriate the petitioner, no further direction is required – International Law – Repatriation.

Jafaria v. *Union of India & Ors.* 714

(8) (i) Articles 32 and 142 – Writ petition against order of Family Court by which it asked the parties to abide by s.13-B(2) of Hindu Marriage Act – Held: Not maintainable – Judicial orders passed by courts are not amenable to be corrected by issuing a writ under Article 32 – Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 – ss. 13-B(1) and (2) – Judgment.

(ii) Article 32 and 226 r/w Article 12 – Writ jurisdiction of Supreme Court and High Courts – Scope of – Explained.

(Also see under: Administration of Justice)

Smt. Poonam v. *Sumit Tanwar* 557

(9) (i) Articles 87, 118 and 122 – President's special address at the commencement of session – Requirement of, when the House resumed after it was adjourned sine die – Held: Resumption of House for the purpose of continuing its business would not amount to commencement of new session – No special address by President required – Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha – Rule 15.

(ii) Articles 122, 32 – Speaker's decision directing resumption of House which was adjourned sine die – Writ petition questioning the propriety of Speaker's decision – Maintainability of – Held: Courts are precluded from making inquiry into proceedings of Parliament on the ground of any irregularity of procedure – Question whether the resumed sitting was to be treated as the second part of the session was essentially a matter relating purely to the procedure of Parliament and cannot be tested and gone into in a proceeding under Article 32 – Judicial review – Scope of.

(iii) Article 122 – Speaker – Powers and duties – Held: Speaker is the guardian of the privileges of the House and is its spokesman and representative upon all occasions – He is the interpreter of its rules and procedure of Parliament, and is invested with the power to control and regulate the course of debate and to maintain order.

(iv) Article 32 – Scope of – Held: Petition under Article 32 not entertainable unless it is shown that the petitioner had some fundamental right.

(v) Article 85 – Prorogation and adjournment – Distinction between.

Ramdas Athawale v. *Union of India and Ors.* 1059

(10) Article 136 – Jurisdiction under – Scope of – Held: Supreme Court can re-appraise the evidence and set aside concurrent findings of fact – However, appreciation of evidence is resorted to, in exceptional circumstances – Where High Court analyzed the evidence in great detail and found the evidence reliable, there is no scope for interference.

Dharamveer and Ors. v. *State of U.P.* 162

(11) Article 136.
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 220

(12) Article 136 – Scope of – Held: Concurrent findings of fact are not usually interfered with in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 136 by re-appreciation of evidence unless it is clearly established that courts below altogether ignored

vital piece of evidence and rested their conclusion placing reliance on the evidence which could not be accepted on the face of it.

Javed Masood and Anr. v. *State of Rajasthan* 236

(13) Article 136 and 145(3) – Discretion of Supreme Court to entertain petitions under Article 136 – Petition filed against the order of High Court dismissing writ petition, challenging the order of trial court rejecting the application of the defendant in a suit – Held: Prima facie such special leave petitions should not be entertained by Supreme Court – Matter referred to Constitution Bench to lay down broad guidelines as to when the discretion under Article 136 of the Constitution should be exercised.

Mathai @ Joby v. *George & Anr.* 533

(14) Article 141.
(See under: Jurisdiction) 572

(15) Articles 142 r/w O. 47, Supreme Court Rules, 1966 – Curative petition – In the appeals filed by State against acquittal, only four, out of eight accused impleaded – Supreme Court, by its judgment dated 7.11.2008, reversing the acquittal of all the accused including those who were not impleaded as respondents and were not issued notice – Held: There is a serious violation of principles of natural justice – Judgment dated 7.11.2008 is recalled – Accused-respondent directed to be released, if in custody – Appeals restored to the file for being heard afresh with a direction that the said four accused be impleaded

as respondents and all the accused be served with notice afresh – Practice and Procedure – Supreme Court Rules, 1966 – O.47 – Natural justice – Judgment – Recalled.

State of M.P. v. *Sughar Singh & Ors.* 159

(16) (i) Articles 161 and 72 – Life convict – Pre-mature release – Remission of sentence – Clemency – Power of Executive – Respondent convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment as a Class 3 prisoner – He sough pre-mature release after serving more than 10 years of imprisonment – Whether to be considered as per policy prevailing on date of conviction i.e. policy dated 4-2-1993 or as per remission policy subsequently introduced on 13-8-2008 – Held: Power exercised under Article 161 is a mandate of the Constitution while the policy dated 13-8-2008 is under a rule of procedure which is subordinate to the Constitution – Policy dated 13-8-2008 therefore cannot override the policy dated 4-2-1993 – Also, State authority is under an obligation to at least exercise its discretion in relation to an honest expectation perceived by convict, at the time of his conviction that his case for pre-mature release would be considered after serving the sentence, as prescribed in the policy existing on that date – Thus, case of respondent to be considered on the strength of policy dated 4-2-1993 and not in terms of policy dated 13-8-2008 – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s. 432 r/w ss.433 and 433-A – Prisons Act, 1894 – s.59(5) – Sentencing.

(ii) Articles 161 and 72 – Clemency power of Executive – Held: Is absolute and unfettered –

The provisions contained under Article 72 or 161 cannot be restricted by ss.432, 433 and 433-A CrPC – Even if, a life convict does not satisfy the requirement of remission rules/short sentencing schemes, there can be no prohibition for the President or the Governor to exercise the power of clemency under Article 72/161 – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – ss. 432, 433 and 433-A.

State of Haryana and Ors. v. *Jagdish* 716

(17) Article 227 – Jurisdiction under – Sale deed executed pursuant to decree passed in a suit for specific performance of contract – Report of Joint Sub-Registrar that property was under-valued – Finding of fact recorded by District Collector and upheld by Commissioner that suit for specific performance of contract was filed to evade substantial stamp duty, set aside by High Court – Held: High Court, under its limited jurisdiction under Article 227, erred in interfering with concurrent findings of fact of authorities below – Judgment of High Court set aside – Vendee directed to pay differential stamp duty – Transfer of property – Circle rates – Registration of sale deed in pursuance of decree passed by court – Liability to pay differential stamp duty, if property found to have been under-valued in the suit.

State of Haryana & Ors. v. *Manoj Kumar* 175

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1986:

(1) ss. 2(1)(c), (g) and 14 – 'Complaint' – 'Deficiency' in service – Complaint filed alleging deficiency in service of providing loan – National Commission holding that there was no deficiency in rendering service to complainant, but directing

the Corporation to pay complainant, compensation amounting to Rs.1,50,000/- along with 12% interest – Held: National Commission failed to appreciate that complainant had repeatedly acted fraudulently in providing bills and receipts to Corporation – National Commission erred in awarding compensation with interest @ 12 per cent – Impugned order cannot be sustained and is set aside.

The Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Rajasthan Financial Corporation and Anr. v. *Commander S.C. Jain (Retd.) & Anr.* 836

(2) Claim for compensation for non-delivery of consignment – Liability of insurance company and/or carrier of goods – On facts, held: Insurance company not liable as the insured obtained insurance policy on misrepresentation and thus failed to maintain utmost good faith – However, service provided by carrier was deficient – Carrier is liable to pay compensation of rupee equivalent of 666.67 Special Drawing Rights – Carriers of Goods by Sea Act, 1925 – ss.2, 4 – Export-Import – Bill of Lading.

(Also see under: Insurance)

Contship Container Lines Ltd. v. *D.K. Lall and Ors.* 460

CONTRACT:

(1) CIF contract and FOB contract – Distinction between – Discussed.

(Also see under: Insurance)

Contship Container Lines Ltd. v. *D.K. Lall and Ors.* 460

(2) Government contracts.

(i) (See under: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996) 291

(ii) (See under: Tenders) 863

COURT FEES ACT, 1870:

s. 7(iv)(c) and (v) – Court fee – Computation of – In suits for a declaratory decree and consequential benefits – Held: Prayer was not for cancellation of sale deed but for a declaration that sale deed not binding on co-parcenary, and for joint possession – Plaintiff was non-executant of sale deed – Thus, court fee was computable u/s. 7(iv)(c).

Suhrid Singh @ Sardool Singh v. *Randhir Singh & Ors.* 1121

CRIMINAL LAW:

(1) Benefit of doubt.

(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 271

(2) Motive.

(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 599

(3) Remission policy.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 716

CUSTODIAL DEATH:

Burden of proof.

(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 883

DEEDS AND DOCUMENTS:

(1) Deed executed in respect of suit property – Nature of – Held: The form or nomenclature of the deed is not conclusive – Court has to very carefully examine the document as a whole – On facts, by executing the deed in question, the original owner expressed his intention to settle the suit property

in favour of 16 persons, in praesenti – The deed, read as a whole, shows that it is clearly a 'Settlement Deed' and not a 'Will'.

P.K. Mohan Ram v. *B.N. Ananthachary and Ors.* 401

(2) Permanent lease patta –

Tenant-Landlord relationship.
(See under: Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act, 1956) 123

(3) Sale deed – Registration of, pursuant to decree passed by Court.
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950 as also under: Transfer of Property) 175

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT, 1957:
s. 15 – Shifting/relocation of polluting industries from Delhi – Land available as a result of shifting – Direction of Court by various orders to use the land partly by land-owner and part of it to be surrendered to Development Authority (DDA) for development of green belt – Land-owners' plea that DDA should acquire the land and pay compensation – Court in lieu of monetary compensation giving additional FAR to land-owners – Petition for review of previous orders of Court taking plea that DDA could not take the land without resorting to compulsory acquisition – Held: Plea regarding acquisition repeatedly rejected by Court – Review not maintainable – Land surrendered by land-owners need not be acquired and additional FAR was the only compensation – Land is surrendered by land-owners to DDA in Trust for development of green belt and for benefit of the community – If DDA in

deviation to the Trust, uses the land for any other purpose, land-owner entitled to compensation – Since the land-owner already received some consideration in the form of additional FAR, DDA and land-owner to share the compensation at 50% each – Urban Development – Environmental Law – Doctrine of trust.

Siel Foods & Fertilisers Industries v. *Union of India & Ors.* 809

DOCTRINES/PRINCIPLES:

(1) Doctrine of legitimate expectation – Applicability of.

State of Haryana and Ors. v. *Jagdish* 716

(2) Doctrine of promissory estoppel/equitable estoppel – Applicability of.

(See under: Service Law) 1106

(3) Doctrine of reasonable accommodation.

(See under: Jammu and Kashmir Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1998) 250

(4) Doctrine of *res judicata.*

(See under: Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act, 1956) 123

(5) Doctrine of trust.

(See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

(6) Principle of *ejusdem generis* – Applicability of.

(See under: Maharashtra University Health Sciences Act, 1998 as also under Interpretation of Statutes) 91

(7) Principle of "generality versus enumeration".
(See under: Electricity Act, 2003) 609

(8) Principles of natural justice.
(i) (See under: Administration of Justice) 557

(i) (See under: Administrative law) 438

(iii) (See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 911

(iv) (See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 159

(v) (See under: Judgment/Order) 190

EDUCATION/EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS:
(i) Complaint by unapproved teachers against management of college.
(ii) 'Teachers' – Connotation of.
(See under: Maharashtra University Health Sciences Act, 1998) 91

ELECTRICITY ACT, 2003:
(i) ss.111, 178, 121 and 79(1) – Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Fixation of Trading Margin) Regulations, 2006 framed u/s. 178 – Vires of the Regulation challenged before appellate tribunal – Jurisdiction of appellate tribunal u/s.111 to examine the validity of the Regulations – Held: Regulations u/s.178 are made under the authority of delegated legislation and its validity can be tested only in judicial review and not by way of appeal before the appellate tribunal u/s.111 – s.121 does not confer power of judicial review

of the validity of the Regulations made u/s.178, on the appellate tribunal – Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Fixation of Trading Margin) Regulations, 2006.

(ii) s.178 – Power of CERC to cap the trading margins by making Regulations – Held: Applying the principle of "generality versus enumeration", CERC empowered to cap the trading margin under the authority of delegated legislation u/ s.178.

PTC India Ltd. v. *Central Electricity Regulatory Commission Through Secretary* 609

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION ACT, 1986:
(1) s.2(d).
(See under: Central Regulation Zone Regulation, 1991) 315

(2) Coastal areas – Construction on.
(See under: Environmental Law) 1161

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW:
(1) Constructions on coastal area – Coastal Regulation Zone Notification declaring area upto 100 meters from High Tide Line as 'No Development Zone' – Amendment to the Notification in 1994, relaxing 'No Development Zone' to 50 meters from 100 meters – In 1996, Supreme Court declaring part of the amending Notification as illegal – Effect on constructions made and on-going constructions by real estate owners pursuant to the plans sanctioned on the basis of amended CRZ Notification – Held: Judgment of 1996 declaring part of the amended Notification to be illegal, will not affect the

completed or the on-going constructions being undertaken pursuant to the said Notification – Operation of 1994 amendment neither stayed by this Court nor by Government – The 1996 judgment is to be given prospective effect – Constitution of India, 1950 – Article 32.

Goan Real Estate & Construction Ltd. & Anr. v. *Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Ors.* 1161

(2) Shifting/relocation of polluting industries.
(See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

(3) Transfer of VCM (hazardous substance) beyond port area to PVC plant.
(See under: Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, 1991) 315

EVIDENCE:

(1) Circumstantial evidence – Appreciation of.
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) .... 271 and 599

(2) Testimony of hostile witness – Held: Normally should not be considered in support of prosecution case, however, such evidence, if corroborated by reliable independent witness, can be taken into consideration for determining whether prosecution case is proved or not.
(Also see under: Penal Code, 1860)

K.H. Shekarappa & others v. *State of Karnataka* 883

(3) Testimonies of interested and independent witnesses – Conviction based on – Propriety.

(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 236

EVIDENCE ACT, 1872:

(1) s.25 – Confessional statement recorded in a case relating to offences under TADA Act would not be admissible in evidence against the accused in his prosecution for offences under any other law if the said offences and the offences under the TADA Act are tried separately – Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act, 1987 – ss. 12 and 15 – Penal Code, 1860 – ss. 302, 307 and 353 – Arms Act, 1959 – s.35(c).

Sunderlal Kanaiyalal Bhatija v. *State of Maharashtra and Ors.* 1149

(2) s.35 – Relevancy of entry in public records – Claim to be a juvenile – Evidence regarding date of birth – Held: The entry of date of birth in the admission form, the school records and transfer certificate did not satisfy the conditions laid down in s.35 inasmuch as the entry was not in any public or official register and was not made either by a public servant in the discharge of his official duty or by any person in performance of a duty specially enjoined by law – The entry was not relevant u/s. 35 for the purpose of determining the age of the applicant at the time of commission of the alleged offence – Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 – ss. 49 and 53.

(Also see under: Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000)

Jabar Singh v. *Dinesh & Anr.* *353*

(3) s.106.

(See under: Evidence as also under: Penal Code, 1860) 883

(4) s.114, Illustration (e) – Presumption that official act has been regularly performed – In the Notification issued by State Government stating that Court of Session would hold its sitting inside District Jail, apart from mentioning s.9(6) CrPC, s.14(1) of Bengal, Assam and Agra Civil Courts Act, 1887 also referred – Held: If the notification refers to a wrong provision, the same cannot be held to be invalid when its validity could be upheld on the basis of some other provision – In the instant case, notification was valid in view of provisions of s.9(6) CrPC – Besides, statutory presumption as envisaged by s. 114 illustration (e) would also be available – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s.9(6) – Practice and Procedure.

Md. Shahabuddin v. *State of Bihar & Ors.* 911

(5) Contents of documents are required to be proved either by primary or by secondary evidence – Admission of documents may amount to admission of contents but not its truth – Documents when not produced and marked as required under the Evidence Act cannot be relied upon by the court – Contents of the document are not proved by merely filing the same in a court – Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

(See also under: Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

L.I.C. of India and Anr. v. *Ram Pal Singh Bisen* 438

(6) Presumption.

(See under: West Bengal Sales Tax Act, 1994) 1030

EXPORT-IMPORT:

Bill of lading – Relevance of.

(See under: Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as also under Insurance) 460

FATAL ACCIDENT:

Fatal accident – Claim for compensation.

(See under: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988) 872

FIR:

Cryptic message – Not containing details regarding the manner in which incident took place or name of the deceased or accused – Held: Cannot be termed as FIR – An FIR must at least contain some information about the crime committed as also some information about the manner in which the cognizable offence was committed – Penal Code, 1860 – ss.302/34.

Patai @ Krishna Kumar v. *State of U.P.* 1135

FOREIGN LIQUOR RULES [KERALA]:

(i) r.13(3), last proviso (as substituted on 20.2.2002 w.e.f. 1.7.2001) – Effect of on pending applications for FL-3 Licence – Applications for grant of licence made in the years 2000 and 2001 – Rejected on 20.2.2002, keeping in view the Rules as in force on 20.2.2002 – Held: Having regard to the fact that the State has exclusive privilege of manufacture and sale of liquor, and no citizen has a fundamental right to carry on trade or business in liquor, the applicant did not have a vested right to get a licence – The application for licence requires verification, inspection and processing – In such circumstances, application for FL-3 licence should be decided only with reference to the rules/law prevailing or in force on the date of consideration of the application and

not as on the date of application – Abkari Act 61 of 1977 [Kerala] – Liquor.

(ii) r.13(3), last proviso (as substituted on 20.2.2002) – Proviso challenged as being beyond the main provision in r.13(3) – Held: A proviso has to be construed upon its terms – Merely because it suspends or stops further operation of the main provision, the proviso does not become invalid – If the policy is not open to challenge, the amendments to implement the policy are also not open to challenge – When the amendment was made on 20.2.2002, object of the newly added proviso was to stop the grant of fresh licences until a policy was finalized – If on account of the fact that sufficient licences had already been granted or in public interest, the State takes a policy decision not to grant further licences, it cannot be said that the same would defeat the Rules – Challenge to the validity of the proviso rejected.

State of Kerala & Anr. v. *B. Six Holiday Resorts (P) Ltd. & Etc.* 1

GENERAL CLAUSES ACT, 1897:
(See under: Words and Phrases) 70

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS:
(1) (See under: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996) 291

(2) (See under: Tender) 863

GUIDELINES:
Guidelines regarding entertainability of petitions under Article 136 of the Constitution – Matter referred to Constitution Bench for laying down guidelines.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 533

HERITAGE:

Monuments – Historic Museum – Writ petition filed alleging mismanagement, misuse and various types of abuses of the Victoria Memorial Hall (VMH) – High Court constituted Expert Committee for improving the environment of VMH – Recommendation made by Expert Committee regarding further construction within VMH area, rejected by High Court while disposing of the writ petition – Application for modification of the order, also rejected – Held: High Court did not give any specific or relevant reason for rejecting recommendation made by Expert Committee or while rejecting application for modification – Special facts and circumstances of the case warrant review – Application for modification of the earlier order passed in the writ petition allowed, albeit with clarifications – Victoria Memorial Act, 1903 – Public Interest Litigation.

The Secretary & Curator, Victoria Memorial Hall v. *Howrah Ganatantrik Nagrik Samity and Ors.* 190

HINDU MARRIAGE ACT, 1955:

(1) ss.13-B(1) and (2).

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950 as also under: Administration of Justice) 557

(2) s.26 – Custody of minor child – Divorce by mutual consent – Settlement between parties as regards custody of minor child – Visitation rights granted to father – Application u/s. 26 seeking modification of terms and custody of minor – Courts below allowing wife to take child to

Australia where she was employed for gain with a direction to bring child back to India twice in a year for allowing visitation rights of father – Interference with – Held: Not called for – Welfare of child is of paramount importance in matters of custody – Custody orders are interlocutory orders and are capable of being altered and moulded keeping in mind the needs of child – Judicial discretion has been properly balanced between the rights of husband and those of wife – Visitation rights of father have been so structured as to be compatible with the educational career of the child.

Vikram Vir Vohra v. *Shalini Bhalla* 775

HYDRO-ELECTRIC PROJECTS:
(See under: Tender) 863

INCOME TAX ACT, 1961:
(1) (i) s.37(1) – AY 1991-92 to 1994-95 and 1997-98 – Deduction on account of fluctuations in rate of exchange – Assessee availed foreign loans to cover its expenses, both capital and revenue, on import of machinery on capital account and for payment to non-resident contractors in foreign currency – Additional liability on account of fluctuations in the rate of exchange, in respect of loans taken for revenue purpose – Assessee – followed mercantile system of accounting – Held: "Loss" suffered by assessee on account of fluctuation in the rate of foreign exchange as on the date of balance-sheet could be allowed as expenditure u/s.37(1) notwithstanding the fact that the liability had not been actually discharged in the year in which the fluctuation in the rate of foreign exchange had occurred.

(ii) s.43A – AY 1991-92 to 1994-95 and 1997-98 – Adjustment in actual cost of asset on account of change in the rate of exchange subsequent to acquisition of asset in foreign currency – Assessee availed foreign loans to cover its expenses, both capital and revenue, on import of machinery on capital account and for payment to non-resident contractors in foreign currency – Held: Assessee entitled to adjust the actual cost of imported capital assets acquired in foreign currency on account of fluctuation in the rate of exchange at each balance-sheet date, pending actual payment of the varied liability.

Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd., Dehradun Through Managing Director v. *The Commissioner of Income Tax, Dehradun* 386

(2) s.43-A, Explanation 3 – Assessment year 1986-87 – Roll over premium charges paid in respect of foreign exchange forward contracts for purchase of fixed assets – Held: To be capitalised.

Assistant C.I.T., Vadodara v. *Elecon Engineering Co. Ltd.* 108

(3) s.271(1)(c) – Penalty on concealment of income or furnishing 'inaccurate particulars' – Assessee claiming in the return a certain sum as expenditure, on the basis of expenditure made for paying interest on the loan for purchase of IPL shares – Claim not accepted – Show cause notice u/s 271(1)(c) – Held: There is no finding that any details supplied by assessee were found to be incorrect – A mere making of the claim, which is not sustainable in law, by itself will not amount to

furnishing inaccurate particulars – Penalty u/s 271(1)(c), not attracted.

C.I.T., Ahmedabad v. *Reliance Petroproducts Pvt. Ltd.* 510

INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE (APPOINTMENT BY PROMOTION) REGULATIONS, 1955:
(See under: Indian Administrative Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954) 755

INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE (CADRE) RULES, 1954:
r. 4(2) – Cadre review – Compliance of r.4(2) – Members of U.P. State Civil Service seeking promotion – Issuance of Notification in 2000, fixing cadre strength of U.P. – Another Notification in 2005, re-fixing the cadre strength – Challenged on the ground that since the last cadre review of I.A.S. in UP cadre conducted in 1998, next cadre review was due in 2003, thus, cadre review conducted in 2005 to be given retrospective effect – Held: Statutory duty cast on State and Central Government to undertake cadre review exercise every 5 years is ordinarily mandatory subject to exceptions – Both Central and State Government under r. 4(2) accepted on principle that cadre review in U.P. was due in 2003 – Reason for delay in review was total in-action on the part of State and lackadaisical attitude in discharging its statutory responsibility – Delayed exercise cannot be justified within the meaning of 'ordinarily'– Thus, members not responsible for the delay – r. 4(2) will operate prospectively and not retrospectively – Directions issued by High Court reasonable – Indian Administrative Service (Appointment by Promotion) Regulations, 1955 – Indian

Administrative Service (Recruitment) Rules, 1954 – Rule 4(1)(b).

Union of India & Anr. v. *Hemraj Singh Chauhan & Ors* 755

INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE RECRUITMENT) RULES, 1954:
r. 4(1)(b).
(See under: Indian Administrative Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954) 755

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947:
(1) ss.10(1) and (3) and 25N – Lock-out – On the basis of three demands i.e. agitational activities of workmen, ceiling on dearness allowance and retrenchment – Complaint made in respect of agitation activities under the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act – Order of Government prohibiting lock-out – Order challenged on the ground that lock-out was prohibited without referring the disputes viz. agitational activities of workmen and retrenchment, for adjudication u/s. 10(1) – Held: Appropriate Government empowered and competent to issue the order prohibiting lock-out – There was no dispute on the basis of demand in respect of retrenchment – Retrenchment can be effected only after following statutory provisions provided therefor – Reference u/s. 10(1) cannot be used to bypass the Scheme u/s. 25N – Once having taken resort to Maharashtra Act with regard to agitational activities any proceeding under ID Act barred by s. 59 of Maharashtra Act – Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971 – s. 59.

(ii) ss. 10(1) and 25N – Distinction between – Explained.

M/s. Empire Industries Ltd. v. *State of Maharashtra & Ors.* 687

(2) ss.25-F and 11-A – Termination of workman without notice – Labour Court held that termination was illegal and directed reinstatement with 50% back wages – High Court set aside the award and directed employer to pay compensation of Rs.50,000/- – Held: The decision of High Court has no basis.

Krishan Singh v. *Executive Engineer, Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board, Rohtak (Haryana)* 344

INSURANCE:

(i) Marine insurance – Export of goods – FOB contract – Right of seller of goods upon delivery of goods to carrier – Held: In case of FOB contracts, goods are delivered free on board – Once seller places the goods safely on board at his cost and thereby hand over possession of goods to the ship, responsibility of seller would cease and delivery of goods to buyer is complete – Goods from that stage onwards would be at the risk of buyer and seller would no more have insurable interest in the goods – Sale of Goods Act, 1930 – ss.46 and 47 – Marine Insurance Act, 1963 – s.7 – Contract – Consumer Protection Act, 1986 – Export-Import.

(ii) Misrepresentation by exporter while obtaining insurance cover that the goods were dispatched on CIF basis whereas the goods were, in fact,

sent on FOB basis – Held: Material departure breached the duty of utmost good faith cast upon the exporter towards insurance company – Insurance company stood absolved of its liability under the contract to reimburse loss to him.

(Also see under: Consumer Protection Act, 1986)

Contship Container Lines Ltd. v. *D.K. Lall and Ors.* 460

INTERLOCUTORY ORDER:

Custody orders are interlocutory orders.

(See under: Hindu Marriage Act, 1955) 775

INTERNATIONAL LAW:

Repatriation.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 714

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES:

(1) General Rules and Special Rules governing the same subject – Applicability of – Rules of interpretation – Explained – Special Rules for the Keraia State Homeopathy Services, 1989 – r.3, Table, Entry 5, Note (2) inserted in 1999 – Kerala State and Subordinate Services Rules, 1958 – r.5, Note (3) inserted in 1992.

(Also see under: Special Rules for the Kerala State Homeopathy Services, 1989)

Maya Mathew v. *State of Kerala & Ors.* 16

(2) Interpretation of a statutory provision – Legislative intent – Determination of – Held: A statutory provision to be read as a whole keeping in view other relevant provisions, to correctly arrive at the legislative intent – Court cannot read anything into a statutory provision which is plain

and unambiguous – It is not proper for courts to add words to a provision and evolve some legislative intent, not found in the statute.

Pallawi Resources Ltd. v. *Protos Engineering Company Pvt. Ltd.* 847

(3) Legislative intent – Held: Language employed in a statute itself determines and indicates the legislative intent – If language is clear and unambiguous, it is not proper for the court to add any words thereto and evolve some legislative intent not found in the statute.

Supreme Paper Mills Ltd. v. *Asstt. Commnr. Commercial Taxes Calcutta & Ors.* 798

(4) Mischief rule – If exception is added to remedy the mischief or defect, it should be so construed that remedies the mischief and not in a manner which frustrates the very purpose – Purposive construction to be employed to avoid a *lacuna* and to suppress the mischief and advance the remedy – Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, 1991 – Paragraph 2(ii).

M. Nizamuddin v. *M/s. Chemplast Sanmar Ltd. and Ors.* 315

(5) Proviso – Interpretation of.
(See under: Foreign Liquor Rules (Kerala) 1

(6) Social welfare legislation – Interpretation of – Duty of court – Held: When court is called upon to interpret provisions of a social welfare legislation, its paramount duty is to adopt an interpretation to further the purposes of law and if possible eschew

the one which frustrates it.

Securities and Exchange Board of India v. *Ajay Agarwal* 70

(7) Strict interpretation – Held: Courts have to avoid a construction of an enactment that leads to an unworkable, inconsistent or impracticable results – In the instant case, strict interpretation of r.10 of 1969 Rules and r.18 of 1974 Rules was unworkable and literal interpretation would have resulted in absurd results – Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service) Recruitment Rules, 1969 – Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service Recruitment Examination) Rules 1974 – Maxim 'ut res magis valeat quam pereat'.

(Also see under: Rangers (Subordinate Forest Services) Recruitment Rules, 1969)

H. S. Vankani and Ors. v. *State of Gujarat and Ors.* 485

(8) Interpretation of words used in a statutory provision – When general words are juxtaposed with specific words, general words cannot be read in isolation – Their colour and contents are to be derived from their context – The ejusdem generis principle applies only when a contrary intention does not appear – No Statute can be interpreted in such a way as to render a part of it otiose – Doctrines/Principles – Principle of "ejusdem generis", applicability of – Discussed.

Maharashtra University of Health Sc. & Ors. v. *Satchikitsa Prasarak Mandal & Ors.* 91

INVESTIGATION:

(1) Prayer for investigation by CBI – Declined by Supreme Court.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

(2) Power of Magistrate to order investigation.

(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 522

JAMMU AND KASHMIR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, PROTECTION OF RIGHTS AND FULL PARTICIPATION) ACT, 1998:

ss. 2(d)(v), 2(p), 22 and 27 r/w s.31 – Person suffering from cerebral palsy – Appointed as Rehbar-e-Taleem (Teaching Guide) – Writ petition challenging the appointment – High Court summoning the teacher in Court, and on assessment, directing the education authorities to identify some other suitable job to accommodate him – Services of the appointee as Rehbar-e-Taleem disengaged – Held: High Court dealt with the matter mechanically without even referring to the provisions of the Act, and chose a rather unusual method in assessing the capacity of the appointee to function as a teacher by calling him to appear before the Court and to respond to questions put to him, inspite of the fact that the Committees constituted to assess his performance as a teacher found him suitable – Orders of High Court and Chief Education Officer disengaging the appointee from functioning as Rehbar-e-Taleem set aside – Authorities directed to allow the teacher to resume his duties with continuity of service from the date of his disengagement – Doctrine of reasonable accommodation – Social justice – Practice and

procedure.

Syed Bashir-ud-din Qadri v. *Nazir Ahmed Shah & Ors.* 250

JUDGMENT/ORDER:

(1) Amenability of a judgment given by a judicial tribunal to jurisdiction under Article 32.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 557

(2) Duty and obligation of courts to record reasons while disposing of a case – Administration of Justice – Justice Delivery system – Principles of natural justice.

The Secretary & Curator, Victoria Memorial Hall v. *Howrah Ganatantrik Nagrik Samity and Ors.* 190

(3) (i) Interpretation of judgment – Held: Judgment is to be read in its entirety – It cannot be read as a statute – It is to be construed having regard to the text and context in which the same was passed.

(ii) Judgment – Retrospective or prospective – Determination of – Held: Court is to decide on a balance of all relevant considerations – It would look into the justifiable reliance on the previous position by administration; ability to effectuate the new rule adopted in the overruling case without doing injustice, whether its operation is likely to burden the administration of justice substantially or would retard the purpose.

(Also see under: Environmental Law)

Goan Real Estate & Construction Ltd. & Anr. v. *Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Ors.* 1161

(4) Observations of courts reserving liberty to litigant to seek further remedy – Duty of court while making such observations – Held: Courts should take care to ensure that reservation of liberty is made only where it is necessary – Such reservation should always be subject to a remedy being available in law, and subject to remedy being sought in accordance with law – Such liberty should not be allowed to be misused by litigants.

Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. v. *Telephone Cables Ltd.* 291

(5) Recalling of judgment.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 159

JUDICIAL REVIEW:

(1) Notification issued by State Government – Scope of judicial review.

(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 911

(2) Scope of judicial review.

(i) (See under: Administrative Law) 190

(ii) (See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 1059

(3) (See under: Electricity Act, 2003) 609

JURISDICTION:

Service dispute – Application before CAT – Writ petition by appellants who were not parties before CAT – Impleadment of appellants by High Court – Held: Appellants approaching High Court for the first time in respect of the disputes over which CAT has jurisdiction, is legally not sustainable – In service matters, High Court is not the court of first instance – On facts, despite having knowledge of pendency of the proceedings before CAT,

appellants could not have approached High Court at the first instance – Appellants also had alternative remedy of review before CAT – Impugned judgment was in violation of judgment in *L. Chandra Kumar* which embody a rule of law in view of Article 141 of Constitution – Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 – r. 17 – Constitution of India, 1950 – Article 141 – Service Law.

Rajeev Kumar & Anr. v. *Hemraj Singh Chauhan & Ors.* 572

JUVENILE JUSTICE (CARE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN) ACT, 2000:

(i) ss.7 and 49 – Juvenile – Determination of age – Jurisdiction of competent authority and trial court – Held: Trial court after taking into the material produced and the evidence adduced rightly rejected the claim of the applicant that he was juvenile – s.7-A and r.12 laying down the procedure to be – followed in the case of claim for juvenility had not come into force on 14.2.2006, the date of the order of the trial court and, therefore, the trial court was not required to follow the procedure laid down therein – The court rightly decided the claim of juvenility on the materials or evidence brought on record by the parties and s.35 of the Evidence Act – Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Rules 2007 – r.12 – Evidence Act, 1872 – s.35.

(ii) s. 53 – Revisional jurisdiction of High Court – Order of trial court rejecting the claim of applicant that he was a juvenile on the date of commission of the offence – Set aside by High Court – Held: The age of applicant was a question of fact, which

was to be decided on the evidence – While exercising revisional powers, High Court cannot convert itself into an appellate court and reverse the findings of fact on the basis of evidence or material on record, except where the High Court is not satisfied as to the legality or propriety of the order passed by the trial court – Matter remitted to trial court for trial of applicant in accordance with law treating him not to be a juvenile at the time of the commission of the alleged offence – Evidence Act, 1872 – s. 35.

(Also see under: Evidence Act, 1872)

Jabar Singh v. *Dinesh & Anr.* 353

JUVENILE JUSTICE (CARE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN) RULES 2007:
r.12.

(See under: Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000) 353

KERALA STATE AND SUBORDINATE SERVICES RULES, 1958:
r.5, Note (3).

(See under: Interpretation of Statutes as also under: Special Rules for the Kerala State Homeopathy Services, 1989) 16

LABOUR LAWS:

(1) Daily wage workers – Over 10 years service – Claim for regularization on the basis of judgment in *Uma Devi's* case – Entitlement – Held: Not entitled since the workers not appointed on any sanctioned post.

Satya Prakash & Ors. v. *State of Bihar & Ors.* 450

(2) Lock-out.
(See under: Industrial Disputes Act, 1947) 687

(3) Termination of services of workman without notice.
(See under: Industrial Disputes Act, 1956) 344

LAND ACQUISITION ACT, 1894:
(1) ss. 4, 18, 23 (1-A) and 54 – Land Acquisition for public purpose – Property situated in Karol Bagh, Delhi – Compensation fixed by Collector – Reference u/s.18 seeking enhancement of compensation dismissed – High Court enhancing compensation @ Rs. 3000/- per sq. yd. with all other statutory benefits – Held: Market value of acquired lands cannot be fixed merely on basis of circle rate – Nature of land, locality and prevailing circumstances are relevant – Evidence of the attorney of claimant that the acquired plot was located within the developed commercial hub of Karol Bagh having all facilities – Thus, the amount determined by High Court is just, reasonable and acceptable.

Thakur Kuldeep Singh (D) Thr. L.R. & Ors. v. *Union of India & Ors.* 141

(2) ss. 4 and 23(1A) r/w. s. 30(1)(b) – Land acquired – Claim for compensation – High Court relying on its previous judgment, awarded compensation @ Rs. 39,300/- per bigha and denied benefit u/s. 23(1A) – In another case in respect of identical land, High Court had awarded compensation @ Rs. 3.45 lacs per bigha, which was scaled down to Rs. 76,550/- per bigha by Supreme Court – Held: Claimants are entitled to the compensation u/s. 23(1-A) r/w. s. 30(1)(b),

since the award had not been made on or before 30.04.1982 – In view of the judgment in the case of identical land, compensation @ Rs. 39,300/- not justified – However, the compensation is scaled down by deducting 10% of the rate of Rs. 76,550/- considering the fact that the lands have been already developed into plots.

Prem Chand & Ors. v. *Union of India* 1128

(3) s. 23 – Market value of acquired land – Determination of – Lands acquired for construction of houses – They were potential house sites – Even at the time of acquisition, there were buildings on the lands – Held: Market value of the acquired lands was determinable by classifying the same as house sites and not as agricultural land.

Sangunthala (Dead) Thr. Lrs. v. *Special Tahsildar (L.A.) & Ors.* 50

(4) (See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

LEGISLATION:

Substitution of a statutory provision – Effect of – Held: Substitution of a provision is a combination of repeal and fresh enactment.

PTC India Ltd. v. *Central Electricity Regulatory Commission Through Secretary* 609

LEGISLATIVE INTENT:

(1) Determination of.

(See under: Interpretation of Statutes) 847

(2) Language employed in a statute itself determines and indicates the legislative intent.
(See under: Interpretation of Statutes) 798

LIBERTY:
Liberty to litigant to seek further remedy.
(See under: Judgment/Order) 291

LIMITATION ACT, 1963:
Article 119.
(See under: Arbitration Act, 1940) 280

LIQUOR:
Grant of FL3 licence.
(See under: Foreign Liquor Rules (Kerala)) 1

LOCUS STANDI:
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

MAHARASHTRA RECOGNITION OF TRADE UNIONS AND PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOUR PRACTICES ACT, 1971:
s. 59.
(See under: Industrial Disputes Act, 1947) 687

MAHARASHTRA UNIVERSITY HEA5LTH SCIENCES ACT, 1998:
ss. 2(35) and 53 – Complaint by unapproved lecturers against college and its authorities – Grievance Committee constituted u/s.53 taking action against the authorities – High Court, following the principle *of ejusdem generis* held that since unapproved teacher do not come within the definition of 'teachers' u/s. 2(35), the Committee has no jurisdiction to take cognizance of the complaint – Held: definition of teacher u/s. 2(35) is wide enough to include even unapproved teacher – Grievance Committee has

the jurisdiction to entertain complaint and undertake the statutory exercise conferred u/s. 53 of the Act – Matter remitted to High Court – Doctrines.

Maharashtra University of Health Sc. & Ors. v. *Satchikitsa Prasarak Mandal & Ors.* 91

MARINE INSURANCE ACT, 1963:
s.7.
(See under: Consumer Protection Act as also under Insurance) 460

MARITIME LAW:
(See under: Consumer Protection Act as also under Insurance) 460

MAXIM:
(1) '*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*'.
(See under: Interpretation of Statutes) 485

(2) "*Vana est illa potentia quae nunquam venit in actum*" and "*Veniae facilitas incentivum est delinquendi*" – Discussed.

State of Haryana and Ors. v. *Jagdish* 716

MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE:
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 594

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, 1988:
s.166 and Schedule II – Fatal accident – Rash and negligent driving – FIR also lodged – Pillion rider of the scooter driven by deceased, deposing that deceased was driving the scooter cautiously and driver of the offending vehicle was driving in a rash and negligent manner – Claim for compensation – Tribunal awarded four lakh rupees

applying multiplier of 16 – High Court held that accident was not due to rash and negligent driving; and that application of multiplier from Schedule-II was not correct, as the Schedule did not exist on the day of accident – However, awarded compensation for Rs. 75,000/- – Held: Order of High Court contradictory and unsustainable – There is no basis, logic and rationality in arriving at the conclusions – Application of multiplier from Schedule II is permissible – Award passed by tribunal restored.

Manam Saraswathi Sampoorna Kalavathi & Ors. v. *Manager, APSRTC Tadepalligudem A.P. & Anr.* 872

NATURAL JUSTICE:

(1) Non-impleadment of some accused as respondents – Still order of acquittal in their favour set aside – Propriety.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 159

(2) Principle of – *Rule of audi alteram partem.*

(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 911

(3) Violation of.

(See under: Administrative law) 438

(4) (See under: Administration of Justice) 557

NOTICE:

(1) Show cause notice.

(See under: Administrative law) 438

(2) Non-mentioning of reasons to justify issuance of notice – Validity of such notice.

(See under: Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Act, 1941) 798

PARTIES:

Impleadment of parties.

(See under: Jurisdiction) 572

PENAL CODE, 1860:

(1) ss.148, 302/149 and 307/149 – Prosecution under – Eye-witnesses to the incident – Conviction by courts below – On facts, held: Justified – Delay in dispatch of FIR, enmity between parties and non-examination of one of the witnesses was not fatal to prosecution case.

Dharamveer and Ors. v. *State of U.P.* 162

(2) s.302 – Conviction of appellant for killing his parents-in-law, on the basis of circumstantial evidence – Held: Circumstances of the case did not point out towards the guilt of appellant, without any other inference being probable – Evidence of PWs suggested that appellant was on visiting terms with his parents-in-law, thus enmity cannot be relied upon as an incriminating circumstance – Blood stains on clothes of appellant of no consequence since clothes of appellant or deceased persons were never sent to Forensic Science Laboratory – Mere presence of appellant in the village also not an incriminating circumstance, particularly, when he was on visiting terms with his parents-in-law – Appellant entitled to get benefit of doubt and is acquitted – Evidence – Circumstantial evidence – Appreciation of.

Jiten Besra v. *State of West Bengal* 271

(3) s.302 – Conviction under, on the basis of evidence of eye witnesses – Justification of – Held: On facts, not justified – Entire prosecution case rested upon the Parcha Bayan lodged by

PW-5, the brother of deceased and a highly interested witness – Evidence of PW-6 completely ruled out presence of PW-5 at the scene of offence – The police personnel who reached the spot after incident and took deceased to hospital, deposed that PWs were not present at the scene of offence – Police personnel were independent witnesses and there was no reason for them to depose falsely.

Javed Masood and Anr. v. *State of Rajasthan* 236

(4) s.302 – Death of victim caused by bomb, firing a pistol and cutting his neck – Out of four accused, one absconding – Conviction by trial court of two of the accused – Death sentence awarded – Death reference declined by High Court and appeal of accused also dismissed – Held: Two courts below having found the accused guilty, there is no reason to interfere with the findings of fact recorded – Medical jurisprudence.

Panney @ Pratap Narain Shukla & Anr. v. *State of U.P.* 594

(5) ss.302/34 – Common intention – Appellants-accused committed act of accosting the deceased with pistols and dragging him away to the place of incident – The other two accused persons armed with pistols fired at the deceased which resulted in his death on the spot – Conviction under ss.302/34 – Challenged by appellants on the ground that they were only holding the deceased and consequently, there was no pre-conceived or pre-concerted meeting of minds – Held: Appellants actively participated in the commission of the offence by doing acts in furtherance of common

intention of killing the deceased – Conviction upheld.

(Also see under: FIR) Patai @ Krishna Kumar v. *State of U.P.* 1135

(6) ss.302/34 – Conviction under – Eight accused persons armed with deadly weapons forming unlawful assembly to kill deceased – Infliction of fatal injuries on deceased – Conviction and sentence of four accused u/s. 302/34 – Upheld by High Court but acquittal of one of the accused – Held: There is no infirmity either in the appreciation of evidence or apparent miscarriage of justice – Thus, order of conviction of three accused by courts below does not call for interference – Presence and participation of the accused acquitted by High Court in the crime doubtful, thus, order of High Court in that regard upheld – Constitution of India, 1950 – Article 136.

Khilan & Anr. v. *State of M.P.* 220

(7) ss. 302/149 and ss.307/149 – Eight persons involved in causing death of one of the victims and injuring the other by gunshot – Conviction by trial court – High Court convicting only one accused who fired the shots and acquitting others giving them benefit of doubt – Plea that since the High Court itself had opined false implication of other persons who had not caused injuries, accused should also be acquitted – Held: Merely because some of the accused who had not caused any injuries to the deceased or the witnesses have been given benefit of doubt would not mean that they were not present – The manner and time of attack indicate that it could not be made by one or two persons – In any case, High Court has, by

way of abundant caution, given benefit of doubt to those who had not caused any injury, but appellant who is stated to have caused gun shot wounds to the deceased and to PW-1 cannot be treated in the same manner – Criminal Law.

Kailash Nath v. *State of U.P.* 599

(8) ss.302, 307 and 353.
(See under: Evidence Act, 1872) 1149

(9) ss.304(part-II)/34 and 324/34 – Custodial death – Burden of proof – Five persons beaten up by police officials in police station – Two of them died and three sustained injuries – Held: By ocular version and medical evidence, prosecution has proved its case against accused beyond reasonable doubt – When the deceased were brought alive tc the police station but were produced dead before medical officer, it is for the accused-police officials to explain the circumstance in which the victims died – Conviction and sentence upheld – Evidence Act, 1872 – s.106 – Evidence – Testimony of hostile witness.

K.H. Shekarappa & others v. *State of Karnataka* 883

(10) ss.406 and 494.
(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 548

(11) ss. 447, 504, 302 r/w s.34.
(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) 213

PLEA:

New pleas regarding constitutional validity of s.9(6) CrPC and delay in publication of notification in official gazette and in supply of copy thereof to accused raised at the time of hearing of appeal before Supreme Court – Held: Not maintainable.

Md. Shahabuddin v. *State of Bihar & Ors.* 911

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE:

(1) Assessment by High Court of capacity of petitioner to function as teacher.

(See under: Jammu and Kashmir Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1998) 250

(2) Conviction of some of the accused in appeal against acquittal without impleading them as respondents and issuing them any notice.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 159

(3) Open trial.

(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 as also under: Evidence Act, 1872) 911

(4) (See under: Administration of Justice) 557

PRECEDENTS:

(See under: Jurisdiction) 572

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT, 1988:

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

PRESUMPTIONS:

(See under: West Bengal Sales Tax Act, 1994) 1030

PRISONS ACT, 1894:

s.59(5).

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 716

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION:
(1) Mis-management of Victoria Memorial Hall.
(See under: Heritage) 190

(2) Writ petition in nature of PIL – Maintainability of.
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS:
Problems faced by public undertakings – Discussed.

Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. v. *Telephone Cables Ltd.* 291

PUNJAB CIVIL SERVICES RULES:
r.3.17(ii) – Employee working in different departments and projects of State Government on work-charged basis – Superannuated from the service under Electricity Board, where initially employed on work-charged basis and later regularized – Demanding pensionary benefits after taking into account the entire service rendered by him on work-charged basis under the State Government – Held: The entire service rendered by the employee was qualified for grant of pension under the rules – Service Law.

Punjab State Electricity Board & Anr. v. *Narata Singh & Anr.* 27

RANBIR PENAL CODE:
s.364 r/w s.120-B.
(See under: Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987) 589

RANGERS (SUBORDINATE FOREST SERVICE RECRUITMENT EXAMINATION) RULES 1974:
(See under: Service Law as also under: Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service) Recruitment Rules, 969 as also under Interpretation of Statutes) 485

RANGERS (SUBORDINATE FOREST SERVICE) RECRUITMENT RULES, 1969:
rr. 7, 10, 13 and 14 – Range forest officers in State of Gujarat – Seniority of non-graduates and graduates – Held: Government rightly deputed the non-graduates to a two year training course and graduates to a one year training course – Seniority of both the batches was rightly settled placing graduates above non-graduates – Seniority so re-determined having attained finality, the Government committed an error in unsettling the seniority – Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service Recruitment Examination) Rules 1974 – rr. 7, 8 (as amended in 1979) and 18 (as amended in 1983), 21 and 22 – Interpretation of statutes.
(Also see under: Service Law as also under Interpretation of Statutes)

H. S. Vankani and Ors. v. *State of Gujarat and Ors.* 485

REFERENCE TO LARGER BENCH:
Reference to Constitution Bench to lay down broad guidelines as regards entertainability of petitions under Article 136 of the Constitution.
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 533

REGISTRATION:
Registration of sale deeds pursuant to decree passed by court – Stamp duty.
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950 as also under: Transfer of Property) 175

REMEDY:
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 787

RENT CONTROL AND EVICTION:
(1) Eviction suit on account of non-payment of rent.
(See under: Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act, 1956) 123

(2) Revision of fair rent.
(See under: West Bengal Premises Tenancy Act, 1997) 847

RES JUDICATA:
(See under: Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act, 1956) 123

RETROSPECTIVE EFFECT:
s. 11-B of Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 – Applicability of, with retrospective effect.
(See under: Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992) 70

REVIEW:
Maintainability of.
(See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

REVISION:
Revisional jurisdiction of High Court.
(See under: Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000) 353

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA:
Rule 15.
(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 1059

SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1930:
ss.46 and 47.
(See under: Insurance) 460

SALES TAX:
Non-production of declaration – Consequence of.
(See under: West Bengal Sales Tax Act, 1994) 1030

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA ACT, 1992:
(i) Purpose of enactment – Held: The Act was enacted to achieve the twin purposes of promoting orderly and healthy growth of securities market and for protecting the interest of investors – The Act is pre-eminently a social welfare legislation.

(ii) s.11 – Amendment of – Amendment made in sub-section (4) of s.11 in 2002 – Objects and reasons discussed.

(iii) s.11B – Objects and reasons discussed.

(iv) s.11B – Applicability of – With retrospective effect – Held: s.11-B being procedural in nature can be applied retrospectively – If law affects matters of procedure, then prima facie it applies to all actions, pending as well as future.

Securities and Exchange Board of India v. *Ajay Agarwal* 70

SENTENCE/SENTENCING:
(1) Death sentence.
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) 594

(2) (i) Object and relevancy of sentencing.
(ii) Remission policy.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 716

(3) (See under: Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987) 589

SERVICE LAW:

(1) Appointment/Recruitment/Selection:

(i) Appointment.

(See under: Special Rules for the Kerala State Homeopathy Services, 1989) 16

(ii) Compassionate appointment – Offer of voluntary retirement and request for compassionate appointment when not interlinked or conditional – Each request to be decided independently even if both the requests made in same letter – On facts, voluntary retirement on medical grounds sought after completion of 55 years of age – Application of son of retiree for compassionate appointment rightly rejected as circular dated 3.7.1996 provided that benefit of compassionate appointment was available to the dependents of departmental workers who sought voluntary retirement on medical grounds within the age limit of 55 years – Circular dated 3.7.1996 issued by Food Corporation of India.

Food Corporation of India and Anr. v. *Nizamuddin and Anr.* 580

(2) Cadre Review.

(See under: Indian Administrative Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954) 755

(3) Deputation – Post of JAO in DoT – Filling up of vacant post of JAO by deputation and by appointment/promotion of departmental candidates – Claim of parity by deputationists with

the departmental candidates, for relaxation of minimum qualifying marks in the examination – Held: Criteria for declaration of results for the departmental candidates was different from the deputationists – The classification had a clear nexus with the objects sought to be achieved, i.e., to fill in as many vacant posts from the departmental candidates working on lower ranks provided they reached bare minimum qualifying standards in the JAO, Part-II Examination – Thus, the higher criteria for deputationists was not arbitrary or discriminatory – Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 and 16.

M. Jagdish Vyas and Ors. v. *Union of India and Ors.* 1086

(4) Lien – Government Company transferring its permanent employees to joint venture company (JVC) without any monetary loss and alteration of service conditions – Subsequent closure of JVC – Employees seeking reversion back to Government Company – Held: Claim of employees not covered by the principle of promissory/equitable estoppel – After permanent transfer, fresh letters of appointment were served upon the employees – Services of employees having been terminated, their lien in Government Company also stood terminated – Order of Division Bench directing Government company to absorb employees with continuity of service on the basis of promissory estoppel set aside – Service Rules of the Tamil Nadu Magnesite Limited – Doctrines – Doctrine of promissory/ equitable estoppel – Applicability of.

M.D., M/s. T. Nadu Magnesite Ltd. v. *S. Manickam & Ors.* 1106

(5) Pay scale – Parity in – Claimed by Inspectors-AWM (subject posts) with Inspector (Co-operative Societies), Extension Officers (Panchayat) and KGO-JLRO (Revenue Officers)-reference categories in same pay scale No. 9 – Under 1981 Rules, reference category posts – Held: Benefit of parity in pay scale can only be claimed by establishing that holders of subject post and reference category posts, discharge identical or similar duties and functions and that the continuation of disparity is irrational and unjust – Inspectors-AMW neither pleaded nor proved the same – State Government directed to extend the benefit of Pay Scale No.10 (4500-9700) to Inspectors-AMW as recommended by Fourth Pay Commission – West Bengal Services Revision of Pay and Allowances Rules, 1981.

State of West Bengal & Anr. v. *West Bengal Minimum Wages Inspectors Association & Ors.* 367

(6) Pension.
(See under: Punjab Civil Services Rules) 27

(7) Promotion.
(See under: Burdwan University Act, 1981) 429

(8) Seniority – Held: Is a civil right which has an important and vital role to play in one's service career and is also significant for good and sound administration – Seniority once settled, should not be unsettled – Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service) Recruitment Rules, 1969 – Rangers (Subordinate Forest Service Recruitment Examination) Rules 1974.
(Also see under: Rangers (Subordinate Forest

Service) Recruitment Rules, 1969 and interpretation of Statutes)

H.S. Vankani and Ors. v. *State of Gujarat and Ors.* 485

(9) Termination/Dismissal/Removal from service/ Discharge:

(i) Dis-engagement due to physical disability.

(See under: Jammu and Kashmir Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1998) 250

(ii) Dismissal from service.

(See under: Administrative law) 438

(10) (See under: Jurisdiction) 572

SERVICE RULES OF THE TAMIL NADU MAGNESITE LIMITED:

(See under: Service Law) 1106

SOCIAL JUSTICE:

Appointment of person suffering from cerebral palsy.

(See under: Jammu and Kashmir Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1998) 250

SPECIAL RULES FOR THE KERALA STATE HOMEOPATHY SERVICES, 1989:

r. 3, Table, Entry 5, Note (2) – Appointment to the posts of Medical Officers by direct recruitment and by transfer in the ratio prescribed – Held: Ratio of direct recruitment and appointment by transfer has to be applied with reference to vacancies which were notified and not with reference to the cadre

strength – Kerala State and Subordinate Services Rules, 1958 – r.5, Note (3) inserted in 1992 – Interpretation of Statutes.

(Also see under: Interpretation of Statutes)

Maya Mathew v. *State of Kerala & Ors.* 16

SUPREME COURT RULES, 1966:

(1) Orders 4 and 18.

(See under: Administration of Justice) 557

(2) O. 47.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 159

TENDERS:

Tehri Hydro Development Corporation – Inviting tenders – Acceptance of bid challenged – Direction by High Court for inviting fresh bids – Challenged before Supreme Court – Corporation directed to invite fresh bids and process the matter accordingly – Objections filed – Held: Contractual rights of the companies are not more important than national interest – In the interest of the project, Panel of Experts to give fresh report after giving one more final opportunity of hearing to the parties – Corporation would then, without loss of time take the decision regarding the award of contract, considering the report of Panel of Experts – Exercise of bidding before the Supreme Court was ordered with the sole objective of saving time and to give the transparency to the whole exercise – It is not for Supreme Court to award the contracts by accepting or rejecting the tender bids – It is exclusively for the Corporation to do that – Hydro-Electric Projects.

Tehri Hydro Development Corporation v. *Alstom Hydro France & Anr.* 863

(2) (See under: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996) 291

TERRORIST AND DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITIES (PREVENTION) ACT, 1987:

(1) s.3(2)(ii) and s.364/120-B of Ranbir Penal Code – Out of several persons prosecuted for abduction and murder of an MLA, only 3 brought to trial – Two acquitted – Only one convicted u/s 3(2)(ii) TADA and s.364/120-B, RPC – Sentence of 14 years imprisonment u/s 3(2)(ii) of TADA and 5 years u/s 364/120-B RPC imposed – Plea that the sentence be reduced to the period already undergone – Held: Conviction under TADA is a very serious matter and calls for a deterrent punishment – At the same time, the facts of each case cannot be ignored – All the co-accused of the appellant have either been acquitted or have not been brought to trial – Appellant has expressed his regrets – Trial court has given a positive finding that the appellant was only involved with the abduction part and had nothing to do with the murder of the MLA – Appellant has undergone more than 11½ years of sentence after facing protracted trial spread over almost 20 years – In the circumstances, while dismissing the appeal, sentence reduced from 14 years to that already undergone – Sentence/Sentencing – Ranbir Penal Code – s.364/120-B.

Mohd. Maqbool Tantray v. *State of J & K* 589

(2) ss. 12 and 15.
(See under: Evidence Act, 1872) 1149

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY:

Sale deed – Registration of – Circle rate/Collector rate – Held: In order to ensure that there is no

evasion of stamp duty, issuance of notification fixing circle rates or collector rates has become imperative.

(Also see under: Constitution of India, 1950)

State of Haryana & Ors. v. *Manoj Kumar* 175

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY ACT, 1882:
ss.19 and 21 – "Vested interest" and "contingent interest" – Difference between – Discussed.

P.K. MohanRam v. *B.N. Ananthachary and Ors.* 401

UNIVERSITIES:
(1) (See under: Burdwan University Act, 1981) 429

(2) 'Unapproved teachers' – Connotation of.
(See under: Maharashtra University Health Sciences Act, 1998) 91

URBAN DEVELOPMENT:
Shifting/relocation of polluting industries.
(See under: Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957) 809

VICTORIA MEMORIAL ACT, 1903:
Mis-management of Victoria Memorial Hall.
(See under: Heritage) 190

WEST BENGAL PREMISES TENANCY ACT, 1997:
ss. 17(4-A) and 20 – Commercial premises – 'Fair rent' – Revision of – Held: Under s.17(4A) there is no automatic fixation of fair rent – Order in this regard is required to be passed by Rent Controller on the basis of an application filed – West Bengal Premises Tenancy Rules, 1999 – r.

8– Rent Control and Eviction.

Pallawi Resources Ltd. v. *Protos Engineering Company Pvt. Ltd.* 847

WEST BENGAL PREMISES TENANCY RULES, 1999:

r. 8.

(See under: West Bengal Premises Tenancy Act, 1997) 847

WEST BENGAL SALES TAX ACT, 1994:

s.68(3) – Transport from port, airport etc., of consignment of goods dispatched from any place outside West Bengal and bound for any place outside West Bengal – Penalty for non-production of declaration – Consignment of imported goods to be transported through State of West Bengal to Mumbai – Appellant was the Customs House Agent (CHA) of the importer – Declaration made by appellant in prescribed format as per r. 211-A before taking delivery of the goods – Penalty on appellant for failure to produce before the Assessing Authority the endorsed counter-signed copy of the declaration – Held: Imposable – With the making of declaration, appellant undertook the obligation to transit the consignment to a destination outside the State, for which the proof was the countersigned copy of the declaration – Non-production thereof, raised a legal presumption of tax evasion, which the appellant failed to rebut – Sales Tax – West Bengal Sales Tax Rules, 1995 – r. 211A(6) – Presumptions.

Kamal Kumar Agarwal v. *Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, West Bengal & Ors.* 1030

WEST BENGAL SALES TAX RULES, 1995:
r. 211-A(6).
(See under: West Bengal Sales Tax Act, 1994) 1030

WEST BENGAL SERVICES REVISION OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES RULES, 1981:
(See under: Service Law) 367

WILL:
Execution of a deed – Intention of owner as reflected in the deed was to settle suit property in favour of 16 persons in praesenti – Deed is not a Will.
(See under: Deeds and documents) 401

WORDS AND PHRASES:
(1) Expression 'inaccurate particulars' as occurring in s.271(1)(c) of Income Tax Act, 1961 – Connotation of.

C.I.T., Ahmedabad v. *Reliance Petroproducts Pvt. Ltd.* 510

(2) Expression 'insurable interest' – Meaning of, in the context of marine insurance.

Contship Container Lines Ltd. v. *D.K. Lall and Ors.* 460

(3) 'Market value' – Meaning of, in the context of s. 23 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

Sangunthala (Dead) Thr. Lrs. v. *Special Tahsildar (L.A.) & Ors.* 50

(4) "Offence" – Meaning of – Discussed – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s.2(n) – General

Clauses Act, 1897.

Securities and Exchange Board of India v. *Ajay Agarwal* 70

(5) Word 'ordinarily' – Meaning of – In the context of r. 4(2) of the Indian Administrative Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954.

Union of India & Anr. v. *Hemraj Singh Chauhan & Ors* 755

(6) 'Teacher' – Connotation of.

(See under: Maharashtra University Health Sciences Act, 1998) 91

WRIT:

(1) Writ of Habeas Corpus.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950) 714

(2) Writ jurisdiction of High Court and Supreme Court – Scope of.

(See under: Constitution of India, 1950 as also under: Administration of Justice) 557