

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED : 11.06.2018

CORAM

The HON'BLE MS.INDIRA BANERJEE, CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
The HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

W.P.No.13921 of 2018

M.Radhakrishnan

... Petitioner

Vs

1. Union of India
rep. by the Secretary to
the Government of India
Ministry of Law and Justice
(Department of Justice)
Jaisalmer House
No.26, Man Singh Road
New Delhi - 110 011.
 2. The High Court of Judicature at Madras
rep. by the Registrar General
High Court, Chennai - 600 104.
 3. The Hon'ble Mr.Justice Subramonium Prasad
Additional Judge
High Court of Judicature at Madras
Chennai - 600 104.
- ... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of Declaration, declaring that the appointment of the third respondent as an Additional Judge of the second respondent High Court with effect from 4th June, 2018 is null and void.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner

: Mr.M.Radhakrishnan
Party-in-person

For Respondents

: Mr.G.Rajagopalan
Additional Solicitor General
assisted by
Mr.G.Karthikeyan
Assistant Solicitor General
for 1st respondent

Mr.S.Thangavel
for 2nd respondent

ORDER

(Made by Ms.Indira Banerjee, Chief Justice)

This writ petition, by way of public interest, has been filed by an advocate practising in this Court challenging the appointment of the third respondent as Additional Judge of this Court and seeking a declaration that the appointment of the third respondent as Additional Judge of this Court with effect from 4.6.2018 is null and void.

2. At the very inception, the petitioner, appearing in person, has stated that he has no objection to the writ petition being taken up by this Bench presided by the Chief Justice, since the decision to recommend the third respondent for elevation as Judge was taken by a Collegium of which the present Chief Justice was not party and long before the present Chief Justice assumed office as a Judge of this Court.

3. The appointment and conditions of the office of a Judge of a High Court are governed by Article 217 of the Constitution of India. Article 217(2) of the Constitution of India provides:

"Article 217. Appointment and conditions of the office of a Judge of a High Court.-

(1) ...

(2) A person shall not be qualified for appointment as a Judge of a High Court unless he is a citizen of India and-

(a) has for at least ten years held a judicial office in the territory of India;

or

(b) has for at least ten years been an advocate of a High Court or of two or more such Courts in succession.

Explanation.-For the purposes of this clause-

(a) in computing the period during which a person has held judicial office in the territory of India, there shall be included any period, after he has held any judicial office, during which the person

has been an advocate of a High Court or has held the office of a member of a tribunal or any post, under the Union or a State, requiring special knowledge of law;

(aa) in computing the period during which a person has been an advocate of a High Court, there shall be included any period during which the person has held judicial office or the office of a member of a tribunal or any post, under the Union or a State, requiring special knowledge of law after he became an advocate;

(b) in computing the period during which a person has held judicial office in the territory of India or been an advocate of a High Court, there shall be included any period before the commencement of this Constitution during which he has held judicial office in any area which was comprised before the fifteenth day of August, 1947, within India as defined by the Government of India Act, 1935, or has been an advocate of any High Court in any such area, as the case may be."

4. In order to be eligible for appointment as a Judge of a High Court, a person, apart from being a citizen of India, is required to have held a judicial office in the territory of India for at least ten years or alternatively, have been an advocate of a High Court or of two or more of such Courts in succession for at least ten years. We need not go into the Explanations, as the Explanations are not attracted in the instant case, since the third respondent has been elevated from the bar.

5. It is not in dispute that the third respondent is a citizen of India. In the affidavit in support of the writ petition, it is contended that the third respondent did not practise as an advocate either in this High Court (impleaded second respondent) or in any Subordinate Court or Tribunal within the jurisdiction of this Court for a minimum period of ten years and, therefore, not eligible. It is, however, not in dispute that the third respondent had been an advocate with practice far exceeding the requisite ten years required under Article 217(2) of the Constitution of India.

6. The entire challenge is on the purported ground that the third respondent has not practised in this High Court or in any court subordinate to this High Court, for at least ten years. The petitioner appearing in person submits that the expression "an advocate of a High Court" would have to be given an expanded interpretation after introduction of the Advocates Act, 1961 also to include persons practising in Courts subordinate to a

High Court. On a parity of reasoning, advocate of a High Court would obviously include an advocate practising in the Supreme Court, which is a higher court.

7. The entire thrust of the challenge to the appointment of the third respondent is on the premises that if an advocate has not practised in the High Court, it cannot be said that there has been proper consideration by the Collegium which recommends the Advocate for appointment as a Judge, since the Members of the Collegium would have had no occasion to assess the performance of the advocate concerned.

8. In support of the argument that the appointment of the third respondent is liable to be declared null and void and set aside, the petitioner has referred to Article 217(2) of the Constitution of India and also cited the following judgments of the Supreme Court:

- (i) Special Reference No. 1 of 1998, Re, reported in (1998) 7 SCC 739;
- (ii) Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association. v. Union of India, reported in (1993) 4 SCC 441;
- (iii) Shri Kumar Padma Prasad v. Union of India, reported in (1992) 2 SCC 428 (Paragraph 25);
- (iv) N.Kannadasan v. Ajay Khose, reported in (2009) 7 SCC 1;
- (v) Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Assn. v. Union of India, reported in (2016) 5 SCC 1 (@ Page 513, 523 and 289); and
- (vi) Mahesh Chandra Gupta v. Union of India, reported in (2009) 8 SCC 273.

9. In Shri Kumar Padma Prasad, supra, cited by the petitioner (paragraph 25), the Supreme Court held:

"25. It is thus, clear that the expression 'judicial office' under Article 217(2)(a) of the Constitution has to be interpreted in consonance with the scheme of Chapters V and VI of Part VI of the Constitution. We, therefore, hold that expression 'judicial office' under Article 217(2)(a) of the Constitution means a 'judicial office' which belongs to the judicial service as defined under Article 236(b) of the Constitution of India. In order to qualify for appointment as a Judge of a High Court under Article 217(2)(a) a person must hold a 'judicial office' which must be a part of the judicial service of the State."

10. In the instant case, the petitioner was a practising advocate and has been elevated from the Bar. Paragraph 25 of Shri Kumar Padma Prasad, supra, can have no application in the facts and circumstances of this case. The issue in the aforesaid case was eligibility of appointment of a Judicial Officer and there is no whisper in the said judgment with regard to direct elevations from the Bar.

11. As several of the judgments cited by the petitioner are public interest litigations filed by the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, the judgment reported in (2016) 5 SCC 1 is hereinafter referred to as "the NJAC Act case". In Paragraph 518.2 of NJAC Act case, supra, referred to by the petitioner, Lokur, J. observed:

"518.2. The appointment of a Judge is a serious business and is recognised as a very vital component of the independence of the judiciary.

'27. ... What is necessary is to have Judges who are prepared to fashion new tools, forge new methods, innovate new strategies and evolve a new jurisprudence, who are judicial statesmen with a social vision and a creative faculty and who have, above all, a deep sense of commitment to the Constitution with an activist approach and obligation for accountability, not to any party in power nor to the opposition nor to the classes which are vociferous but to the half-hungry millions of India who are continually denied their basic human rights. We need Judges who are alive to the socio-economic realities of Indian life, who are anxious to wipe every tear from every eye, who have faith in the constitutional values and who are ready to use law as an instrument for achieving the constitutional objectives. This has to be the broad blueprint of the appointment project for the higher echelons of judicial service. It is only if appointments of Judges are made with these considerations weighing predominantly with the appointing authority that we can have a truly independent judiciary committed only to the Constitution and to the people of India.'"

12. There can be no doubt that the appointment of a Judge is a serious business and is recognized as a very vital component of the independence of the Judiciary. It is absolutely necessary to have Judges who are prepared to fashion new tools,

forge new methods, innovate new strategies and evolve a new jurisprudence; to have Judges who are judicial statesmen with a social vision and a creative faculty and who have a deep sense of commitment to the Constitution with an activist approach and obligation for accountability, not to any party in power nor to the opposition nor to the classes which are vociferous but to the half-hungry millions of India who are continually denied their basic human rights. We certainly need Judges who are alive to the socio-economic realities of Indian life, who are anxious to wipe every tear from every eye, who have faith in the constitutional values and who are ready to use law as an instrument for achieving the constitutional objectives. However, there is no reason at all to suppose that the appointment of the third respondent has not been made seriously or has been made ignoring the aforesaid factors.

13. The petitioner also cited paragraph 539 of the NJAC Act case, supra, set out herein below:

"539. In the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record v. Union of India, reported in (1993) 4 SCC 441, certain norms were laid down by Verma, J. in the matter of appointment of Judges. These norms were: For the appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court, the Chief Justice of India must ascertain the views of the two seniormost Judges of the Supreme Court and of the seniormost Judge in the Supreme Court from the High Court of the candidate concerned. Through this process, the individual opinion of the Chief Justice of India was substituted by the collective opinion of several Judges. In this sense the opinion of the Chief Justice of India in the consultative process was made broad-based and ceased to be individualised. At this stage it is worth recalling the words of Dr Ambedkar that 'the Chief Justice, despite his eminence, had all the failings, sentiments and prejudices of common people'. The apprehension or fear that Dr Ambedkar had in this regard in case the Chief Justice of India were to act in an individual or personal capacity was now buried. A somewhat similar norm was laid down for consultation for the appointment of a Judge of the High Court. This is what was said: (SCC pp. 701-02)

'478.(1) This opinion has to be formed in a pragmatic manner and past practice based on convention is a safe guide. In matters relating to appointments in the Supreme Court, the opinion given by the Chief Justice of India in the consultative process

has to be formed taking into account the views of the two seniormost Judges of the Supreme Court. The Chief Justice of India is also expected to ascertain the views of the seniormost Judge of the Supreme Court whose opinion is likely to be significant in adjudging the suitability of the candidate, by reason of the fact that he has come from the same High Court, or otherwise. Article 124(2) is an indication that ascertainment of the views of some other Judges of the Supreme Court is requisite. The object underlying Article 124(2) is achieved in this manner as the Chief Justice of India consults them for the formation of his opinion. This provision in Article 124(2) is the basis for the existing convention which requires the Chief Justice of India to consult some Judges of the Supreme Court before making his recommendation. This ensures that the opinion of the Chief Justice of India is not merely his individual opinion, but an opinion formed collectively by a body of men at the apex level in the judiciary.

In matters relating to appointments in the High Courts, the Chief Justice of India is expected to take into account the views of his colleagues in the Supreme Court who are likely to be conversant with the affairs of the High Court concerned. The Chief Justice of India may also ascertain the views of one or more senior Judges of that High Court whose opinion, according to the Chief Justice of India, is likely to be significant in the formation of his opinion. The opinion of the Chief Justice of the High Court would be entitled to the greatest weight, and the opinion of the other functionaries involved must be given due weight, in the formation of the opinion of the Chief Justice of India. The opinion of the Chief Justice of the High Court must be formed after ascertaining the views of at least the two seniormost Judges of the High Court."

14. The requisites of appointment of High Court Judges, as laid down in NJAC Act case, supra, and in particular paragraph

539 thereof, cited by the petitioner have apparently been complied with. The decision to recommend the third respondent was taken by the then Chief Justice heading the Collegium of this Court along with two senior-most Judges of this Court. The appointment was cleared by a Collegium of the Supreme Court comprising the Chief Justice and two senior-most Judges and also cleared by the Executive (Union Government).

15. In *N.Kannadasan v. Ajay Khose*, reported in (2009) 7 SCC 1, the Supreme Court held:

"85. This Court in *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India*, reported in 1981 Supp SCC 87, opined that the principles as regards consultation for appointment of Judges in terms of Article 217 of the Constitution of India would be the same as laid down in *State of Gujarat v. Sankalchand Khodidas Patel*, reported in (1977) 4 SCC 590, and other cases, stating: (*S.P. Gupta case*, SCC p. 227, para 30)

'30. ... '2. ... The word "consult" implies a conference of two or more persons or an impact of two or more minds in respect of a topic in order to enable them to evolve a correct, or at least, a satisfactory solution.'

and added:

'39. ... In order that the two minds may be able to confer and produce a mutual impact, it is essential that each must have for its consideration full and identical facts, which can at once constitute both the source and foundation of the final decision'.

Krishna Iyer, J. speaking on behalf of himself and Fazal Ali, J. also pointed out that:

'103. ... all the materials in the possession of one who consults must be unreservedly placed before the consultee.

and further

'103. ... a reasonable opportunity for getting information, taking other steps and getting prepared for tendering effective and meaningful advice must be given to him.

and

'103. ... The consultant, in turn, must take the matter seriously since the subject is of grave importance.

The learned Judge proceeded to add:

'103. ... Therefore, it follows that the President must communicate to the Chief Justice all the material he has and the course he proposes. The Chief Justice, in turn, must collect necessary information through responsible channels or directly, acquaint himself with the requisite data, deliberate on the information he possesses and proceed in the interests of the administration of justice to give the President such counsel of action as he thinks will further the public interest, especially the cause of the justice system.

These observations apply with equal force to determine the scope and meaning of 'consultation' within the meaning of clause (2) of Article 124 and clause (1) of Article 217. Each of the constitutional functionaries required to be consulted under these two articles must have for his consideration full and identical facts bearing upon appointment or non-appointment of the person concerned as a Judge and the opinion of each of them taken on identical material must be considered by the Central Government before it takes a decision whether or not to appoint the person concerned as a Judge.'

In regard to the position of the Additional Judges, it was clearly held that same process must be followed."

16. There can be no dispute with the proposition laid down in N.Kannadan, supra. The recommendation made for appointment of a Judge of a High Court has to be preceded by discussions in the Collegium based on materials collected by the Collegium, which would necessarily include the age and experience of the proposed candidate; the professional income of the candidate; the volume of litigation handled by the candidate; the reported and unreported judgments of cases in which the candidate may have appeared; and may be also other factors such as educational background and the like. There is no reason to suppose that the Collegium had not taken these factors into consideration. In any case, no one except the Judges constituting the Collegium can possibly have personal knowledge of what transpired in the Collegium meetings.

17. In Mahesh Chandra Gupta v. Union of India, reported in (2009) 8 SCC 273, the Supreme Court held.

"39. At this stage, we may state that, there is a basic difference between 'eligibility' and 'suitability'. The process of judging the fitness of a person to be appointed as a High Court Judge falls in the realm of suitability. Similarly, the process of consultation falls in the realm of suitability. On the other hand, eligibility at the threshold stage comes under Article 217(2)(b). This dichotomy between suitability and eligibility finds place in Article 217(1) in juxtaposition to Article 217(2). The word 'consultation' finds place in Article 217(1) whereas the word 'qualify' finds place in Article 217(2)."

18. It is axiomatic that there is a basic difference between eligibility and suitability. A person may be eligible, yet not suitable. The suitability was required to be adjudged by the Collegium taking into account all relevant factors. As observed in Mahesh Chandra Gupta, supra, eligibility is an objective factor. Who could be elevated is specifically answered by Article 217(2) of the Constitution. When eligibility is put in question, it could fall within the scope of judicial review. However, the question as to who should be elevated essentially involves the aspect of suitability and stands excluded from the scope judicial review.

19. The Supreme Court in Mahesh Chandra Gupta, supra, further held:

"44. At this stage, we may highlight the fact that there is a vital difference between judicial review and merit review. Consultation, as stated above, forms part of the procedure to test the fitness of a person to be appointed a High Court Judge under Article 217(1). Once there is consultation, the content of that consultation is beyond the scope of judicial review, though lack of effective consultation could fall within the scope of judicial review. This is the basic ratio of the judgment of the Constitutional Bench of this Court in Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Assn. v. Union of India, reported in (1993) 4 SCC 441 and Special Reference No. 1 of 1998, Re, reported in (1998) 7 SCC 739."

(emphasis supplied)

20. In paragraph 65 of Mahesh Chandra Gupta, supra, the Supreme Court observed that "once a person is enrolled by any one of the State Bar Councils, he becomes entitled to practise in all courts including the Supreme Court. The 1961 Act creates one common Bar, all its members being of one class, namely, advocates." and that "The legal implication of the Advocates Act, 1961 is that any person whose name is enrolled on the State Bar Council would be regarded as 'an Advocate of the High Court.' The substance of Article 217(2)(b) is that it prescribes an eligibility criteria based on 'right to practise' and not actual practice." (Paragraph 66).

21. The petitioner also drew our attention to paragraph 70 of Mahesh Chandra Gupta, supra, set out herein below:

"70. To complete our discussion, we may also mention that the expression "two or more such courts in succession" in Article 217(2)(b) is not of any real relevance. Prior to the 1961 Act, when a person was an advocate enrolled in a High Court, the words "in succession" suggested that a person enrolled in more than one High Court could not multiply his years of enrolment by the number of courts in which he stood enrolled. For example, a person enrolled for five years in two High Courts simultaneously would not be an advocate of ten years' standing. If he was enrolled in more than one court in succession only then would this be satisfied."

22. The aforesaid passage pertains to the situation prevailing prior to enactment of the Advocates Act, 1961 and has no application in the facts of the case, where the third respondent was not even born in 1961, let alone born as an advocate.

23. In paragraph 81 of Mahesh Chandra Gupta, supra, the Supreme Court referred to the earlier decision in Special Reference No. 1 of 1998, Re, reported in (1998) 7 SCC 739, where the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (1993) 4 SCC 441 (Second Judges case) was quoted with approval and the Supreme Court observed that judicial review in the case of an appointment or a recommended appointment to Supreme Court or High Court was available if the recommendation concerned was not a decision of the Chief Justice of India or his senior-most colleagues, which is constitutionally requisite. The Supreme Court held:

"81. In this connection, reliance has been placed on paras 29 to 32 of the judgment in Special Reference No. 1 of 1998, Re., which read as under:

(SCC pp. 767-68)

"29. The majority judgment in Second Judges case⁴ requires the Chief Justice of a High Court to consult his two seniormost puisne Judges before recommending a name for appointment to the High Court. In forming his opinion in relation to such appointment, the Chief Justice of India is expected

'to take into account the views of his colleagues in the Supreme Court who are likely to be conversant with the affairs of the High Court concerned. The Chief Justice of India may also ascertain the views of one or more senior Judges of that High Court...'
' (Second Judges case, SCC p. 702, para 478c-d)

The Chief Justice of India should, therefore, form his opinion in regard to a person to be recommended for appointment to a High Court in the same manner as he forms it in regard to a recommendation for appointment to the Supreme Court, that is to say, in consultation with his seniormost puisne Judges. They would in making their decision take into account the opinion of the Chief Justice of the High Court which 'would be entitled to the greatest weight', the views of other Judges of the High Court who may have been consulted and the views of colleagues on the Supreme Court Bench 'who are conversant with the affairs of the High Court concerned'. Into that last category would fall Judges of the Supreme Court who were puisne Judges of the High Court or Chief Justices thereof, and it is of no consequence that the High Court is not their parent High Court and they were transferred there. The objective being to gain reliable information about the proposed appointee, such Supreme Court Judge as may be in a position to give it should be asked to do so. All these views should be expressed in writing and conveyed to the Government of India along with the recommendation.

30. Having regard to the fact that information about a proposed appointee to a High Court would best come from the Chief Justice and Judges of that High Court and from Supreme Court Judges conversant with it, we are not persuaded to alter the strength of the decision-making Collegiums' size; where appointments to the High Courts are concerned, it should remain as it is, constituted of the Chief Justice of India and the two seniormost puisne

Judges of the Supreme Court.

31. In the context of the judicial review of appointments, the majority judgment in Second Judges case said: (SCC pp. 707-08, para 480)

'480. ... Plurality of Judges in the formation of the opinion of the Chief Justice of India, as indicated, is another inbuilt check against the likelihood of arbitrariness or bias, ... The judicial element being predominant in the case of appointments ... as indicated, the need for further judicial review, as in other executive actions, is eliminated.'

The judgment added: (SCC p. 708, para 482)

'482. ... Except on the ground of want of consultation with the named constitutional functionaries or lack of any condition of eligibility in the case of an appointment, ... these matters are not justiciable on any other ground, ...'

32. Judicial review in the case of an appointment or a recommended appointment, to the Supreme Court or a High Court is, therefore, available if the recommendation concerned is not a decision of the Chief Justice of India and his seniormost colleagues, which is constitutionally requisite. They number four in the case of a recommendation for appointment to the Supreme Court and two in the case of a recommendation for appointment to a High Court. Judicial review is also available if, in making the decision, the views of the seniormost Supreme Court Judge who comes from the High Court of the proposed appointee to the Supreme Court have not been taken into account. Similarly, if in connection with an appointment or a recommended appointment to a High Court, the views of the Chief Justice and senior Judges of the High Court, as aforesaid, and of Supreme Court Judges knowledgeable about that High Court have not been sought or considered by the Chief Justice of India and his two seniormost puisne Judges, judicial review is available. Judicial review is also available when the appointee is found to lack eligibility."

24. After quoting the aforesaid passage, the Supreme Court observed "Before concluding, we may state that 'continuity of an

institution' is an important constitutional principle in the institutional decision-making process which needs to be insulated from opinionated views based on misinformation. At the end of the day 'trust' in the decision-making process is an important element in the process of appointment of Judges to the Supreme Court and the High Court, which, as stated above, is the function of an integrated participatory consultative process."

25. We may also refer to a Division Bench judgment of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in Prabhunath Vasireddy v. Union of India, reported in 2013 6 ALT 172, where the Division Bench held:

"The justiciability of the recommendation of the name of a person for being appointed a Judge of the High Court, on the one hand, and the order of appointment as such, were dealt with by the Supreme Court in several cases. Recently, the Supreme Court in Mahesh Chandra Gupta v. Union of India ((2009) 8 SCC 273), examined the matter in detail. Their Lordships maintained distinction between the 'eligibility', on the one hand, and 'suitability', on the other hand, of an individual to be considered for appointment of a Judge of High Court. Clause (2) of Article 217 of the Constitution of India deals with the 'eligibility', whereas clause (1) thereof pertains to the 'suitability'. It was held that the aspect of 'eligibility' of an individual to be considered the Office is very much within the purview of judicial review, but 'suitability' is not amenable to such scrutiny. In Shri Kumar Padma Prasad v. Union of India ((1992) 2 SCC 428), the Supreme Court did interdict the appointment of the individual as a Judge of High Court, on finding that he was not qualified, and thereby, not eligible.

The justiciability of the appointment of Judge of High Court once made, virtually becomes prohibited. The reason is that the tenure of a Judge, on being appointed, gets protected, till he attains the age of superannuation, or submits resignation. The only involuntary cessation of a Judge of High Court from the Office can be through impeachment, as provided for under Article 124 (4) & (5) read with Article 217 (1) (b) of the Constitution of India if successfully carried out. The provision reads :

'124 (4) A judge of the Supreme Court shall not be removed from his office except by an order of the President passed after an address by each House of Parliament supported by a majority of the total

membership of that House and by a majority of not less than two thirds of the members of that House present and voting has been presented to the President in the same session for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity.

(5) Parliament may by law regulate the procedure for the presentation of an address and for the investigation and proof of the misbehaviour or incapacity of a Judge under clause (4) '.

No instance of the appointment of a Judge of the Supreme Court or High Court having been set aside, in a writ petition, is brought to our notice."

26. The argument of the petitioner in person that there has not been proper consideration by the Collegium of the candidature of the third respondent, since they had no occasion to assess his performance, is not sustainable.

27. Consideration by the Collegium is not based only on appearance of the advocate concerned, but on a whole lot of other facts, based on information, supported by materials on record. It is the strength of the materials on record, which render a decision unquestionable.

28. It is the petitioner's own case that advocates practising in Courts subordinate to the High Court are also eligible to be appointed Judges if they have the requisite years of practise. If consideration were only to be based on Court appearance, it would be impossible for any Collegium to consider advocates practising in Courts subordinate to the High Court, or even advocates practising in the same High Court, with very good practise, but inadequate number of appearances before the Chief Justice or Collegium Judges, for a meaningful assessment of their suitability to be elevated to the Bench.

29. This is not a case where an appointment has been made in patent contravention of Article 217(2) of the Constitution. It cannot be said that the third respondent is not eligible for appointment. The question of suitability has been decided by

the authorities concerned and is beyond the scope of judicial review. This Court cannot sit in appeal over the decision of the Collegium of the High Court or of the Supreme Court.

The writ petition is, thus, dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government of India
Union of India, Ministry of Law and Justice
(Department of Justice)
Jaisalmer House
No.26, Man Singh Road
New Delhi - 110 011.
2. The Registrar General
High Court of Judicature at Madras
High Court, Chennai - 600 104.

+1cc to Mr.RadhaKrishnan, Advocate Sr.36893
+1cc to Mr.Karthikeyan, Advocate Sr.36678

W.P.No.13921 of 2018

srg 25/06/2018

WEB COPY