

National Judicial Academy

P-999: Annual National Seminar on Functions of Registrar (Vigilance/ Inspection)
in Different High Court
5th – 6th November, 2016

Name of Programme Coordinator : Mr. Shivaraj S. Huchhanavar, Research Fellow
No of Participants : 16
No of Evaluation Forms : 16

I. Overall				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The objective of the Program was clear to me	93.75	6.25	-	-
b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	100.00	-	-	-
c. Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	100.00	-	-	-
d. I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	93.75	6.25	-	-
e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	87.50	12.50	-	-
II. Knowledge				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. Useful to my work	93.75	6.25	-	-
b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	86.67	13.33	-	-
c. Up to date	86.67	13.33	-	-
d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice	73.33	26.67	-	-
e. Related to international Legal Norms	66.67	33.33	-	-
III. Structure of the Programme				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The structure and sequence of the program was logical	87.50	12.50	-	-
b. The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz. Group discussions	57.14	35.72	7.14	-

Case Studies	80.00	13.33	6.67	-
Interactive sessions	66.67	26.67	6.67	-
Simulation Exercises	54.55	36.36	9.09	-
Audio Visual Aids	36.36	63.64	-	-
IV. Individual Sessions				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized	75.00	25.00	-	-
b. The session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons	81.25	18.75	-	-
V. Programme Materials				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The Program material is useful and relevant	93.75	6.25	-	-
b. The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/current thinking/research/ policy in the discussed area	81.25	18.75	-	-
c. The content was organized and easy to follow	93.75	6.25	-	-

VI. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS	
a. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme	<p>1. I am fresher, it is useful for my future prospects; 2. The reading materials; 3. By sharing experience, e.g. .-Resource Persons.</p> <p>2. 1. I got updated relevant case law; 2. I had a panoramic view of practice of vigilance cell of other High Courts.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. To ensure transparency, accountability and objectivity in the work of Registrar Vigilance.</p> <p>5. Role of Registrar General in various High Courts are discussed which will improve the work in future.</p> <p>6. 1. Role and responsibility of Registrar (Vigilance); 2. It would help us in our day to day working on R.V.; 3. This programme has guided us on some areas to be followed while conducting inquires.</p> <p>7. Role and responsibility subject greatly inspired & motivated me to do my best.</p> <p>8. 1. Role of the Registrar Vigilance; Session-5 <i>Utility of inputs from Inspection Report to the Vigilance Cell</i>; with discussed, preliminary and departmental enquiry.</p>

	<p>9. All lecture was very useful.</p> <p>10. Knowledge Skill.</p> <p>12. 1. Updating of Knowledge; 2. Good practices of other States/High Courts; 3. Clarity on procedures.</p> <p>13. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. 1. Sharing of practices; 2. Interacting with peers from across; 3. Understanding the dynamics of vigilance function, seen from various levels of the Institution.</p> <p>16. 1. Provided guidance is conducting the function of the Registrar (Vigilance); 2. Up-to-date case law discussed.</p>
<p>b. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why</p>	<p>1. All most all</p> <p>2. Session-5 <i>Utility of inputs from Inspection Report to the Vigilance Cell;</i> Session-6 <i>Cognizance and Investigation of Anonymous Complaints;</i> Session-7 <i>Impact of Transparency and Accountability of Vigilance Cell on.</i></p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. All sessions.</p> <p>5. All sessions.</p> <p>6.All</p> <p>7.1. Mechanism to do deal with anonymous complaints; 2. Whether Police needs to be associated in functioning of vigilance.</p> <p>8. Session-1 <i>Understanding 'Judicial Integrity', 'Discipline', 'Accountability' and 'Conduct Unbecoming of a Judge'.</i></p> <p>9. All the part was very useful.</p> <p>10. All Sessions & deliberation</p> <p>12. All were important & useful.</p> <p>13. All the Sessions.</p> <p>14. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>15. The effort towards making vigilance functions robust, effective yet transparent across all High Courts.</p> <p>16. Session-2 <i>Conducting Discreet Inquiries: Role and Responsibilities of Registrar (Vigilance) on discreet inquiries. This session provided guidance is the matter of conducting discreet inquiries.</i></p>
<p>c. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>	<p>1. All most all</p> <p>2. Nil</p> <p>3. All</p> <p>4. All parts.</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. All programme was useful.</p> <p>7. None</p> <p>8. None</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>10. None</p>

	<p>11. N.A. 12. All were useful 13. Participant did not comment. 14. Participant did not comment. 15. Discussions on ‘Staff- Vigilance’ were negligible and hence of less utility. 16. Session-5 <i>Utility of inputs from Inspection Report to the Vigilance Cell</i></p>
<p>d. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p>	<p>1. Participant did not comment. 2. More interactions all required. 3. Participant did not comment. 4. NJA is trying its best and there is also scope for improvement. 5. To allow the spouse to accompany during the journey. 6. Programme was most effective. Note- Spouse should be allowed. 7. Participant did not comment. 8. Participant did not comment. 9. 1. Programmes were very effective; 2. The participants should be allowed to bring their spouse. 10. Participant did not comment. 12. The participants may be allowed to bring their spouse along. 13. Participant did not comment. 14. Participant did not comment. 15. 1. Duration must be increased- will be more effective and cost beneficial for public exchequer; 2. Participants must be encouraged to make presentations/ group – projects or even submit brief notes on ‘classified’ case studies. 16. Participant did not comment.</p>