

NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY

P-1080: National Judicial Conference for Newly Elevated High Court Justices on Public Law
19th – 21st January, 2018

Programme Coordinator : Ms. Ankita Pandey, Law Associate, NJA, Bhopal
No. of Participants : 17
No. of forms received : 09

I. OVERALL				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The objective of the Program was clear to me	88.89	11.11	-	-
b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	77.78	22.22	-	-
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	77.78	22.22	-	-
e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	77.78	22.22	-	-
II. KNOWLEDGE				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
The program provided knowledge (or provided links / references to knowledge) which is:				
a. Useful to my work	77.78	22.22	-	-
b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	55.56	44.44	-	-
c. Up to date	75.00	25.00	-	-

d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice	88.89	11.11		
e. Related to International Legal Norms	37.50	62.50		
III. STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM				
PROPOSITIONS	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	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.				
(i) Group discussion cleared many doubts	55.56	44.44		-
(ii) Case studies were relevant	62.50	37.50		
(iii) Interactive sessions were fruitful	88.89	11.11		
(iv) Audio Visual Aids were beneficial	66.67	16.67	16.66	-
<i>(To be modified as per the sessions planned)</i>				
IV SESSIONS WISE VETTING				
Parameters				
Session	Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized		The Session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons	
	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory
1	77.78	22.22	100.00	-
2	87.50	12.50	100.00	-
3	87.50	12.50	100.00	-
4	75.00	25.00	100.00	-
5	62.50	37.50	100.00	-
6	87.50	12.50	100.00	-
7	100.00	-	100.00	-
8	100.00	-	100.00	-
9	80.00	20.00	80.00	20.00

V. PROGRAM MATERIALS				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The Program material is useful and relevant	77.78	22.22	-	-
b. The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/ current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area	88.89	11.11	-	-
c. The content was organized and easy to follow	88.89	11.11	-	-

VIII. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS	
1. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understood that a judge should have a much wider perspective of different branches despite being posted in a particular subject. Court Management with emphasis on time constraints. Court craft to handle judges. 2. Overview of Public law with updates on recent Case Laws. Discussion with participant judges. Learnt the art of interpretation of constitution. 3. Orientation of legal thoughts to judicial; work. Broadening of outlook. Interaction with participants. 4. Chance to offer critical analysis. Interaction between Bench, Bar and Academics. Thought provoking. 5. Updation of knowledge. 6. Participant did not comment. 7. Participant did not comment. 8. All sessions were good and useful. 9. Got back to learning and refreshed my knowledge.
2. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interaction with speakers and co-participant judges. 2. Group Discussion. 3. Interactive process helped to enhance theoretical and practical knowledge. 4. Both the resource persons who opened the discussion and the interactive part. 5. Fundamental Rights were made interesting by Mr. Krishnan Venugopal.

	<p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Constitutional vision of Justice was most interactive.</p>
<p>3. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>	<p>1. None for the present.</p> <p>2. All the sessions were useful.</p> <p>3. Prolonged time given to individual judges and chair to respond elaborately on individual queries.</p> <p>4. Volume of material, Summary would have sufficed. All the same very thorough research.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Participant did not comment.</p>
<p>4. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p>	<p>1. Shall send detailed suggestions later.</p> <p>2. Materials could have been circulated in advance for effective participation.</p> <p>3. Meticulous and well organized. I could not find scope for improvement. Please keep up the good work.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. It has to be little longer.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>8. Some topics should be on the suggestion of participants.</p> <p>9. More skills on day-to-day disposal need to be imparted to clear pendency.</p>