



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER


No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and diploma in Public

a professional Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM-degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

W H I T E B L A C K
L E G A L

ADMINSTRATION OF JUSTICE IN CONSTITUTIONAL BENCH CASES

Authored By – Niharika pradhan
L.L.M Scholar At Indian Law Institute .
Email Id: Pradhan.Niharika@Ymail.Com
Contact No:8376952980.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	
..... 3-4	
2. JANHIT ABHIYAN V UNION OF INDIA.....	5-6
3. M Siddiq(D) thrlrs v manat Suresh das	7-8
4. INDIAN YOUNG LAWYER ASSOCIATION V STATE OF KERALA.....	9-10
5. PM COLD STORAGE PRIVATE LIMITEDV MONOTRONE LEASING PRIVATE LIMITED.....	11-12
6. Sukhpal Singh Khaira v The State Of Punjab.....	13-14
7. Conclusion	
.....	15

INTRODUCTION

A bench of the Supreme Court with five or more judges is known as a Constitution Bench. These seats are not a normal peculiarity. The majority of Supreme Court cases are heard and decided by a bench of two or three judges (called a Division Bench). Constitutional benches are a rare exception, and they are only used in one or more of the following situations:

According to Article 145(3) of the Constitution, which mandates that such matters be heard by a bench of not less than five judges, the case involves a substantial legal question regarding the interpretation of the Constitution;¹

In accordance with Article 143² of the Constitution, the Indian President has sought the Supreme Court's opinion on a factual or legal issue [again, see Article 145(3)];

The Supreme Court's three-judge benches have issued contradictory rulings on the same legal issue, necessitating a more comprehensive decision;

A later three-judge bench of the Supreme Court questions whether a decision made by a previous three-judge bench of the Court was correct and decides to refer the case to a larger bench for a new decision. At the moment, Constitution Benches are established on an as-needed basis. The concept of a Constitution Bench is simple: Rarely, it is formed to resolve significant issues of fact or legal and/or constitutional interpretation.

Due to the fact that the only way to overturn a Constitution Bench verdict is to first persuade a subsequent five-judge Supreme Court bench that the view previously taken was incorrect, have the matter referred to a larger bench of seven judges, and then persuade that bench of seven judges to overrule the previous judgment of the Constitution Bench, it is also abundantly clear in the majority of cases that the pronouncement of a Constitution Bench is unlikely to be disturbed or overruled for a long time

Therefore, it would not be an exaggeration to say that Constitution Benches have a great deal of authority and responsibility to set the course that the law will follow for a significant amount of time to come.

In fact, being a good judge on the country's highest constitutional court is all about being able to do this job well. A Supreme Court Judge is not appointed solely to rule on trivial issues like whether a landlord's petition against his tenant was filed within the statute of limitations, how much money Messers Goons & Co. should pay Messer's Irrelevant & Co. for using their property without permission, and so on. Tragically by far most of cases under the watchful eye of our adjudicators end up being this unremarkable, and further, that they are recorded solely after a High Court has

¹ ARTICLE 145(3) constitution of India .

² Article 143 constitution of India .

proactively given a judgment regarding this situation to the best of its legal capacity (leaving little degree for the High Court's impudence).

However, when a person is chosen to serve as a judge on the Supreme Court, it is expected that they will be able to resolve larger, more intricate issues of legal and constitutional significance and that they will do a good job.³

JANHIT ABHIYAN V UNION OF INDIA

FACTS:

The Constitution (103rd) Amendment Act of 2019 was questioned in the current case. In the January 2019 amendment approved by Parliament, economic reservation in employment and education was proposed to be provided by inserting clause (6) into Articles 15 and 16. The state was able to make special provisions for the advancement of economically disadvantaged citizens under Article 15(6), such as reservations for educational institutions.

ISSUES :

- Reservations for a specific segment of society cannot be based solely on economic criteria, which violates the constitution's fundamental structure.
- Inexplicably discriminatory, the exclusion of Socially and Educationally Backward Classes (SEBCs), also known as SCs, STs, and OBCs, from these special provisions for EWS is against the constitution's fundamental structure.
- The 10% upper limit on reservation for EWS directly violates the 50% cap on reservation, which goes against the constitution's ethos and jurisprudence on reservation, violates the Equality Code, and thus again violates the fundamental structure of the constitution.

INTERPRETATION :

it was first filed In 18 Jan 2019 and subsequently various petition was filled under different petitioners every matter was connected with the civil writ petition no: 55 of 2019. Because the issues and question of laws was same. On 05 august 2018, this matter was referred to 3 judges bench and with all the collective cases it was heard and than also it referred to higher benches which is constitutional bench. But if we see the trend than from 2019 to 2020 it has taken 1 year gap but does not resolve the essential question which is pertaining to the case but after 2 year on 07

³ Lokendra Malik, "Appointment of 'Distinguished Jurist' as Judges in the Supreme Court of India : A Squandered Constitutional Mandate", 62 JILI (2020) 168 .

November 2022, it has solve the essential question of laws ⁴. in recent trend there are 4 years time taken for deciding a case of civil writ petition was never seen before some important cases which holds important questions of law has taken place takes a time of 15 years for deciding whether it is not infringing Any constitutional provision or interpretate a new undermine definitions from it. And this a landmark performance of supreme court judges to produce a judgement in a small tenure .the work of judges is not to create burden on the court but to dispose off the case and give relevant solution to the problem of the case related . according to the justice Benjamin N Cardozo “it is when the colour do not match, when the reference index fail, when there is no decisive precedent , that the serious business of the judge begins”. ⁵The judges work is not to match with the similar fact and issues but to resolve the complexities of law with there knowledge and skills . supreme court should act as an actual guardian and not just for the mere formality only. a Constitution bench can be formed when a two-judge bench and later a three-judge bench deliver conflicting judgements on the same issue. ⁶But here no judgement has been a dissenting judgement but it is referred to higher judges if we see the trend from 2018 it was seen that every case was declined to pass any relief and transfer it to civil writ petition, delay the pronouncement every time, from every other petition there was one application of change implementation which was clubbed with this petition⁷. There was the trend of pendency to dispose off the case with the relevant and appropriate relief. It creates the burden on different high court due to pendency and they are not having the authority to solve such kind of complexities , so they were entertained but they were put under stay⁸.

M Siddiq(D) thrlrs v manat Suresh das

FACTS :

According to the Ramayana, it was believed that Shri Ram Janmabhoomi, also known as Lord Ram, was born in Ayodhya. Hindus also held the belief that Ram's birthplace contained an ancient temple. However, the first Mughal Emperor Babur demolished the temple in 1528 and constructed the Babri Masjid mosque there. Following that, the kar savaks demolished it in 1992. Hindus and Muslims are at odds because of the construction and deconstruction of religious structures. Both groups claim that the disputed location belongs to their religious denomination.

⁴ Ashutosh Mishra, “evolving role of the doctrine of basic structure in contemporary times” , RGNLU student research review (RSRR).

⁵ Benjamin N. Cardozo, THE NATURE OF THE JUDICIAL PROCESS, 334

⁶ *Janhit Abhiyan v Union Of India*, 5 August, 2020.

⁷ Rajnish Jindal, Amit raj Agarwal , “delays and pendency of court cases in India – an analysis”, PJAEE, 18(8) (2021).

ISSUE :

- 1) Whether or not suit 3, 4, and 5 or any one of them is prohibited by the 1908 limitation Act?
- 2) Does the Ram Janmabhoomi constitute a legal entity?
- 3) Does the temple lie beneath the questionable structure? If so, does existence grant Hindu parties title?⁹

INTERPRETATION :

It is a civil appeal case and its first filled in 2010 and has essentially important perspective of law to be dealt adequately according to my findings in case of *Bir Singh v Delhi Jal board*¹⁰ and others has taken time of 6yrs approximately from the date of its filling and in the case of public interest litigation v union of India, I analyse the huge gap as this case is depicting the journey from criminal to civil appeal and the gap of 11 years has being noted for deciding case and giving its judgement. So captured different trend has being observed specifically for the cases of civil appeal cases one of the most famous case *KS puttawamy*¹¹ case which was first filled in 2012 and it has being decided in 2018. Observing this trend there is an uncalculated and no estimation is fixed for such kind of the cases how much time taken by constitutional bench.

With this analysis , “we must come to see with the distinguish jurist of yesterday , that justice too delayed is justice to denied”. According to martin Luther king jr¹². these analysis and quotes fit with this findings / analysis it is the judge who should work speedily to resolve the questions of laws which create less pendency/ delays in the court of law and keeping this in consideration upon the view point given by athur von Mehran from the quotation I quote “Indian society will not understand nor enjoy such contribution that of the judicial process could make to the solution with great complexities”. From the researcher point of view on the analysis of data , there are matters of civil appeal in large number but it does not go always to the constitutional bench but rather create , in total 64,000 appeal cases are pending in supreme court in which 18,016 are appeal cases which are civil in nature . In a large majority of pending cases it may not be necessary to write a detailed judgment particularly if the appeal is to be dismissed. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Court generally should pronounce its judgment by a short order dictated in the open court. Only in cases

⁹ *M.Siddiq (D) Thr. Lrs. vMahant Suresh Das* on 26 February, 2019.

¹⁰ *Bir Singh v Delhi Jal Board* . on 30 August, 2018.

¹¹ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy and Anr. v. Union of India (UOI) and Ors.* (2019) 1 SCC 1.

¹² The Legacy Of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. ,[https://www.naacpldf.org/naacp-publications/ldf-blog/legacy-dr-martin-luther-king-jr/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CWe%20must%20come%20to%20see,and%20God%2Dgiven%20rights.%E2%80%9D,\(last visited 22nd December 2022\).](https://www.naacpldf.org/naacp-publications/ldf-blog/legacy-dr-martin-luther-king-jr/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CWe%20must%20come%20to%20see,and%20God%2Dgiven%20rights.%E2%80%9D,(last%20visited%2022nd%20December%202022).)

where the question of law involved is of general importance a detailed judgment may be delivered as early as possible after conclusion of hearing as early as possible after conclusion of hearing.¹³

INDIAN YOUNG LAWYER ASSOCIATION

V STATE OF KERALA,

FACTS:

The Indian Young Lawyers Association brought the case to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India via public interest litigation (PIL) in 2006. The "Entry of Women in Sabarimala Temple" aspect of the case is crucial. The petitioners raised a number of issues in which they argued that the restrictions on women's entry into the temple are unconstitutional because they violate Articles 14, 15, 17, 25, and 26 of the Indian Constitution. The Sabarimala Temple is in the Pathanamthitta District of Kerala's Periyar Tiger Reserve, in the western ghat mountain ranges. Lord Ayyappa is what makes this temple famous. Because it is a place of worship, it prohibits women between the ages of 10 and 50 who are menstruating from entering.

ISSUES :

- Whether the exclusionary practice, which is based on a biological factor that only affects women, violates Article 14, Article 15, and Article 17 at their core and is protected by "morality" as defined in Articles 25 and 26[6] of the Constitution.
- Is it possible that this restriction goes against the Kerala Hindu Place of Public Worship Act of 1965?
- Does the Sabarimala Temple have a religious bent?
- Is it permissible for a "religious denomination" to prohibit women between the ages of 10 and 50 from entering Hindu places of worship in Kerala under rule 3 (Authorization of Entry)?¹⁴

INTERPRETATION

it was first filed in 18th August 2006, and it was since this time only hearing takes place than there is the journey from referring to constitutional bench , it took the journey to end is 13 yrs. for a particular trial of writ petition which is in civil nature.

¹³ Over 64,000 appeals pending in Supreme Court, The economic times, Dec 09, 2021.

¹⁴ *Indian young lawyer association v state of Kerala* (2019)11SCC 1.

There is no written mandate expressly that the judges has to act expeditiously and to look into the matter in a given time frame .

As we see the time frame which is concerned for my initial finding I trace the earlier trend from 1970 and before 2022 as well the court took an approximate time of 10 – 14 yrs. Before This judgement of economic weaker section , which itself created the history in the constitutional bench to dispose of the matter within 4 years from its filling.

With such peculiar observation “the ascertainment of intention may be at least of the judges trouble in ascribing meaning to the statues.” With this line the work of the judges should be appreciated as they are the one who ascertain the true or different meaning from the statues in which they have to interpret the law like for example any article of the constitution which raises an important question of law. The judges act accordingly to the current trend and scenario of the law.¹⁵

But if we see the recent trend than supreme court is taking serious concern to resolve the matter within 1 year of the filing and chief justice of India also emphasize the importance of district court judges functioning and it should be taken into serious account "District judges are not subordinates; they must change their mindset", so it would resolve the pendency of the cases in the courts.

There work is also important in describing the particular meaning of the law/ statues and not for creating the pendency in the court , fear of irrational inquiry in which they are being threaten by others and sacrificing there work ethics and following colour matching of the case and not going to solve actual question of law pertaining in it. It is not necessarily that the court sets precedent for the similar nature and the supreme court hold the power not to follow the decision on like we see in current trend that dy chandrachud overruled his father y.v chandrachud in case of adultery , article 368 admjabalpur case.

In case of *Tamil nandu medical officer v union of India* ¹⁶, this case was filled in 2018 and its judgement was delivered its judgement in 2020, so we see that now the judiciary is taking active participation.

¹⁵ SUMEDA, The Constitution Benches of the Supreme Court, the Hindu , October 14, 2022.

¹⁶ *Tamil nandu medical officer v union of India* 31 August, 2020.

PM COLD STORAGE PRIVATE LIMITEDV

MONOTRONE LEASING PRIVATE LIMITED

FACTS :

M/s. Pvt. Monotrone Leasing Ltd., also known as the "Financial Creditor," provided M/s with a loan of Rs.25,000,000. Pvt. PM Cold Storage Ltd., which was to be returned to the Financial Creditor within 90 days at a rate of 15% per year and be referred to as the "Corporate Debtor" in this document. That the money was sent through RTGS, that the Corporate Debtor properly acknowledged it in a letter to the Financial Creditor, and that a check for the same amount was also given to the Financial Creditor in exchange for the loan. However, after paying the interest for a few months, the Corporate Debtor defaulted by not repaying the amount within that time frame.

ISSUE :

The Financial Creditor presented a case to the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Mumbai Bench, in accordance with Section 7 of the IBC. That the same was rejected because the Financial Creditor did not have any evidence regarding the loan application and could not produce the certificate under the Information Utility, so the Adjudicating Authority cannot serve as a Recovery Tribunal. Due to the Financial Creditor's failure to provide evidence regarding how the loan was obtained from the NBFC, the Hon'ble Adjudicating Authority also drew a negative conclusion against the Financial Creditor. The Hon'ble Adjudicating Authority assumed that the Corporate Debtor could not default due to their financial stability, and as a result, the Section 7 petition was denied.¹⁷

INTERPRETATION

This case filled in the year 2020 and it is a curative petition and from all the analysis , I find out that within 2 years this cases are disposed by constitutional bench. The Indian Constitution's Article 137. When technical difficulties or other concerns about reopening a case prevent reviewing judgments, a curative petition is required to provide a final means of correcting any judgment errors¹⁸. Yes the curative petition are for reviewing purpose in the judgement if that judgement is harming the party interest at the larger interest but as a researcher I am not able to find out why curative petition cases takes 2 years time for giving or reversing the judgement which was already

¹⁷ Between the Lines, <https://www.vaishlaw.com/nclat-the-occurrence-of-a-default-and-not-the-inability-to-pay-debt-is-relevant-for-admitting-or-rejecting-an-application-for-initiation-of-cirp-unde>, (last visited 26 October 2022).

¹⁸ ARTICLE 137 CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

given. It give certain specification specifically that the cited grounds were taken into account in the review petition and that it was circulated to be rejected.¹⁹ Curative petition does not hold any interpretation or essential question of law which has to be settled by the constitutional bench specifically in my research I have limited my research with limited curative petition case were I found that these cases are disposed off within 2 years from its admission of the case , and whereas curative petition in criminal case According to Article 72 of the Indian Constitution²⁰, the President has the authority to commute the punishment imposed by the Apex court, also known as the Supreme Court of India. However, the council of masters must be consulted before making any decision, so pardons cannot be granted at will. There are very less number of curative petition in criminal cases has being admitted by the supreme court mostly they dismissed. The 2002 case *Rupa Ashok Hurra v. Anr. and Ashok Hurra*²¹ over the question of whether an individual who has been wronged can get relief from the Supreme Court's final judgment or order after a review petition is dismissed. In the case of *Navneet Kaur v. State of NCT of Delhi*²², the curative petition, which was filed by Navneet Kaur without Devender Pal Singh against the dismissal of the review petition and prayed for the setting aside of his death sentence on the grounds of the preceding circumstance of delay of 8 years in disposal of mercy petition, was granted. The zenith court for this situation permitted the remedial appeal by driving capital punishment to life detainment on the ground of exorbitant postponement of 8 years in removal of kindness request and on the ground of madness. In a nine-judge Supreme Court bench made a decision in 1966 *Naresh Shridhar Mirajkar and Others,. v. State of Maharashtra and Anr.*²³ in which it was determined that a judicial order cannot be challenged as violating a fundamental right, it has taken 5yrs time to resolve the case.²⁴ A writ petition was filed for the second time in the same case under Article 32 of the Constitution before the Rupa Hurra case's curative petition was initiated. The purpose of the petition was to ask the Supreme Court to reconsider a final judgment and overturn the injustice. In the case of *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak & Anr.*²⁵, this was done. where the majority of the judges (5:2) decided that a petition under Article 32 or 136 of the Constitution could be used to overturn an earlier decision. Thus, it can be said that the curative petition concept is a Constitutional remedy that was created as a last resort to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on their own as a legal and moral obligation to decide the rarest of cases.

¹⁹K.N BHAT,“ Possibilities for procedural reforms in the administration of justice- supreme court”, (1984) 3 SCC J-32.

²⁰ARTICLE 72 constitution of India .

²¹ *Rupa Ashok Hurra v. Anr. and Ashok Hurra*, A.I.R. 2002 S.C. 177.

²² *Navneet Kaur v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 31 March 1947.

²³ *Naresh Shridhar Mirajkar and Others,. v. State of Maharashtra and Anr* 1967 AIR 1 .

²⁵ *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak & Anr*

Sukhpal Singh Khaira v The State Of Punjab

FACTS:

It was first filed in 2005 , For violations of the NDPS Act, the Arms Act, and the Information Technology Act, a FIR was filed against eleven individuals. In the police's charge sheets, the appellants were not named, The prosecution requested the recall of a witness under Section 311 of the Criminal Procedure Code, who in 2017 identified the appellants as the accused. In 2019, the Supreme Court's two-judge bench decided that the case should be heard by a larger bench because of the issues.

ISSUE:

- Is it possible for the trial court to summon additional accused under Section 319 of the Criminal Procedure Code when the other co-accused's trial has ended and the judgment of conviction has been issued on the same date before issuing the summoning order?
- Whether the trial court has the authority to summon additional accused under Section 319 of the Criminal Procedure Code when the trial of certain other absconding accused, whose presence is later secured, is ongoing or pending after being split from the main trial?²⁶

INTERPRETATION :

This case took the journey of 17 years as it uphold the most crucial and important laws where express mandates were not given Article 136 of the Indian Constitution governs the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India. The Supreme Court is authorized by this article to grant leave to appeal against any and all orders made by the various Indian High Courts, including criminal appeals, criminal revision petitions, and so on. A Special Leave Petition can be filed in the Supreme Court of India to contest any criminal court order made by the High Court. Typically, matters are heard for admission within two weeks of the Special Leave Petition's numbering when an appeal is filed and numbered. The aforementioned petition must be submitted within sixty days of the High Court's decision. The Supreme Court has the authority to accept the Special Leave Petition and excuse the delay if it finds sufficient justification for the delay. All parties must be notified and the case must be listed for final disposition if the Court decides to hear it. The Court may postpone the matter for a final hearing on a non-miscellaneous day if it is of the opinion that the case may take

²⁶ *Sukhpal Singh Khaira v The State Of Punjab*, <https://www.scobserver.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Section-319-amicus.pdf>.(last visited 23 december2022).

longer. Even on a day off, short matters are resolved in the second or third hearing. In most cases, petitions challenging final judgments are heard by the Supreme Court, but in some cases, SLPs are heard even against interim orders. Thousands of Criminal SLPs in India's Supreme Court have been handled by the firm and its lawyers.²⁷

CONCLUSION:

At the moment, Constitution Benches are established on an as-needed basis. The concept of a Constitution Bench is simple: Rarely, it is formed to resolve significant issues of fact or legal and/or constitutional interpretation. According to Nick Robinson, a legal researcher at Harvard Law School's Program on the Legal Profession, who looked at data from 50 years of Supreme Court cases, the number of Constitution Benches decreased from an average of 134 cases per year in the 1960s to an average of 6.4 cases per year in the second half of the 2000s. Even though Constitution benches are less frequent, we discovered that their judgments have become longer, more prone to split decisions, delayed more, and more likely to have been brought under both appellate and writ jurisdictions. In fact, "it has become increasingly difficult to even determine the winning party given the more convoluted nature of these decisions in recent years," the authors stated. There are 488 pending Constitution Bench matters. 54 of these cases directly involve legal and constitutional interpretation issues, and 434 related cases are pending. According to official SC statistics, 338 cases are pending before five-judge benches, 15 cases pending before seven-judge benches, and 135 cases pending before nine-judge benches. The cases that are connected are resolved by a decision in the main case. Due to the fact that the only way to overturn a Constitution Bench verdict is to first persuade a subsequent five-judge Supreme Court bench that the view previously taken was incorrect, have the matter referred to a larger bench of seven judges, and then persuade that bench of seven judges to overrule the previous judgment of the Constitution Bench, it is also abundantly clear in the majority of cases that the pronouncement of a Constitution Bench is unlikely to be disturbed or overruled for a long time. This year's conclusion was that, despite a slight increase in the number of major cases pending before Constitution Benches, the increase in related cases has been significant. It came to two conclusions: "First, the court is not able to keep up with the inflow of new cases, even though it is deciding such cases. As a result, the overall pendency has either remained unchanged or slightly increased. Second, more cases have been assigned the main matters pending before these courts due to the increase in the number of connected matters.

²⁷ Arthad Kurlekar, Jaimini Vyas, "Special leave petitions , an impediment to justice : need for structural changes ensures efficient time allocation of the court " , Nirma university law Journal: Volume-3, Issue-2.