

**NATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAMME FOR ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES**

**[P-866] TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| S.No.             | Description  | Page No. |
|-------------------|--|----------|
| <b>ARTICLES</b>   |  |          |
| 1.                | Justice R. V. Raveendran " <i>How To Be A Good Judge</i> " (2012) 9 SCC J-1  | 1        |
| 2.                | Prof. N.R. Madhava Menon " <i>Law And Justice : A Look At The Role And Performance Of Indian Judiciary</i> "   | 23       |
| 3.                | Justice R. V. Raveendran " <i>Rendering Judgments</i> " (2009) 10 SCC J-1  | 35       |
| 4.                | Justice Ranjan Gogoi, " <i>Challenges facing the Indian Judiciary –Identification and Resolution</i> "   | 51       |
| <b>JUDGEMENTS</b> |  |          |
| 1.                | <b>Ashok Rai Vs. State of U.P. and Ors. (2014)5SCC713</b> [ <i>A perverse order of acquittal replete with gross errors of facts and law will have to be set aside to prevent miscarriage of justice, because just as the court has to give due weight to the presumption of innocence and see that innocent person is not sentenced, it is equally the duty of the court to see that the guilty do not escape punishment. -- Evidence of interested witnesses is not infirm. It would be good to have corroboration to their evidence as a matter of prudence. But corroboration is not always a must. If the evidence of interested witnesses is intrinsically good, it can be accepted without corroboration.--- The general feeling of the society has no relevance to a criminal case. A court deciding a criminal case must go by the legal evidence adduced before it.</i> ] | 59       |
| 2.                | <b>Prem Kumar Gulati Vs. State of Haryana MANU/SC/0865/2014</b> [ <i>It is well settled that a truthful and reliable dying declaration may form the sole basis of conviction even though it is not corroborated. However, the reliability of declaration should be subjected to a very close scrutiny, keeping in view the fact that the statement has been made in the absence of the accused who had no opportunity of testing the veracity of the statement by cross-examination--- If two views are possible on the evidence adduced in the case, one pointing to the guilt of the accused and the other to his innocence, the view which is favourable to the accused should be adopted. This principle has a special relevance in cases where in the guilt of the accused is sought to be established by circumstantial evidence</i> ]                                       | 67       |
| 3.                | <b>Subhash Chand Vs. State (Delhi Administration) (2013)2SCC17</b> [ <i>Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 - Sections 378(1)(a) and 378(4)-- Complainant can challenge order of acquittal by filing application for leave to appeal in High Court and not in Court of Session---- [State Government cannot direct the Public Prosecutor to file an appeal against an order of acquittal passed by a Magistrate in respect of a cognizable and non-bailable offence. Such appeals, that is appeals against orders of acquittal passed by a Magistrate in respect of a cognizable and non-bailable offence can only be filed in the Sessions Court at the instance of the Public Prosecutor as directed by the District Magistrate.]</i> ]   | 75       |
| 4.                | <b>Ramesh Vithal Patil Vs. State of Karnataka and Ors. 2014(4) SCALE438</b> [ <i>There should be logical and legal conclusions---Reformulation of the principles of Appellate Court</i> ]  | 83       |
| 5.                | <b>Ramdhan Dang Vs. State of U.P. MANU/UP/1604/2014</b> [ <i>Enactment of Sub-section (1) to Section 399 of the Code brings the Sessions Judge on the same footing with that of the High Court in many aspects including its power to take additional evidence. Evidence shall include documentary evidence also and not merely oral evidence. ----- Sessions Judge's powers of revision.--Has also ample power to take additional evidence on record.</i> ]   | 91       |

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 6.  | <b>Gurdev Singh Vs. Surinder Singh</b> 2014(9)SCALE556 [The dismissal of complaint by the Magistrate under Section 203 --although it is at preliminary stage--nevertheless results in termination of proceedings in a complaint against the persons who are alleged to have committed the crime. Once a challenge is laid to such order at the instance of the complainant in a revision petition before the High Court or the Sessions Judge, by virtue of Section 401(2) of the Code, the suspects get the right of hearing before the Revisional Court although such order was passed without their participation.]  | 95  |
| 7.  | <b>Sandesh @ Sainath Kailash Abhang Vs. State of Maharashtra</b> (2013)2SCC479 [The doctrine of rehabilitation and doctrine of prudence are the other two guiding principles for proper exercise of judicial discretion. ----- where the Court is of the opinion that penalty of death should be imposed which is in line with the provisions of Section 354(3) which places a mandate upon the Court to apply its judicious mind and record 'special reasons' for imposing death penalty]  | 99  |
| 8.  | <b>Santa Singh Vs. The State of Punjab</b> AIR1976SC2386 [Criminal Procedure code -Non compliance of section 235(2)--Not a mere irregularity but is an illegality which vitiates the sentence--- [The hearing contemplated by Section 235(2) is not confined merely to hearing oral submissions, but it is also intended to give an opportunity to the prosecution and the accused to place before the court facts and material relating to various factors bearing on the question of sentence and if they are contested by either side, then to produce evidence for the purpose of establishing the same]  | 107 |
| 9.  | <b>Duryodhan Rout Vs. State of Orissa</b> 2014(8) SCALE96 [A person sentenced to life imprisonment is bound to serve the remainder of his life in prison unless the sentence is commuted by the appropriate Government in terms of the Section 55, 433 and 433A of the Code of Criminal Procedure]  | 115 |
| 10. | <b>State of Punjab Vs. Prem Sagar and Ors</b> (2008)7SCC550 [The principle that the court in awarding the sentence must take into consideration a large number of relevant factors; sociological backdrop of the accused being one of them. ---. It would depend upon the circumstances in which the crime has been committed and his mental state. Age of the accused is also relevant.----- The facts and given circumstances in each case, the nature of the crime, the manner in which it was planned and committed, the motive for commission of the crime, the conduct of the accused, the nature of weapons used and all other attending circumstances are relevant facts which would enter into the area of consideration.] | 125 |
| 11. | <b>Anvar P.V. Vs. P.K. Basheer</b> MANU/SC/0834/2014 [Only if the electronic record is duly produced in terms of Section 65B of the Evidence Act, the question would arise as to the genuineness thereof and in that situation, resort can be made to Section 45A - opinion of examiner of electronic evidence]   | 133 |
| 12. | <b>Major S. S. Khanna Vs. Brig. F.J. Dillon.</b> AIR1964SC497 [The expression "case" is a word of comprehensive import: it includes civil proceedings other than suits, and is not restricted by anything contained in the section to the entirety of the proceeding in a civil court].   | 147 |
| 13. | <b>Shiv Shakti Coop. Housing Society, Nagpur Vs. Swaraj Developers and Ors.</b> (2003)6SCC659 [A plain reading of Section 115 as it stands makes it clear that the stress is on the question whether the order in favour of the party applying for revision would have given finality to suit or other proceeding. If the answer is 'yes' then the revision is maintainable. Suit on the contrary, if the answer is 'no' then the revision is not maintainable. Therefore, if the impugned order is of interim in nature or does not finally decide the lis, the revision will not be maintainable]   | 159 |

Note: The emphasis on certain paragraphs or sentences in the judgments has been made in the form of bold fonts. Please read the full judgment for conclusive opinion.