SC will hear today Speaker’s plea against HC order
He has challenged deferring of anti-defection proceedings against Pilot camp

Too early to review | Speaker C.P. Joshi moved the SC against the Rajasthan High Court’s order directing him to give 19 MLAs time to reply till July 24, when the court will deliver its verdict. His main contentions are:
- HC’s intervention is premature because he is yet to decide the issue of disqualification but has only issued notices
- SC in the Kihoto Hollahan case specifically barred any judicial review of final decision is available only on limited grounds
- SC cannot interfere in his designated power to decide questions of disqualification under the
topple the State government. The Centre was creating a “raid raj”, it said.

Speaker C.P. Joshi expressed the hope that the top court would pass directions before July 24, when the High Court is scheduled to give its verdict on the writ petition filed by Mr. Pilot’s camp. “Else, my special leave petition will be ren...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>News Articles</th>
<th>Page Number*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tyagi calls for unified bond market, moots G-Secs in demat</td>
<td>C: 13 B: 13 D: 15 H: 13 T: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45 RS members take oath</td>
<td>C: 9 B: 9 D: 9 H: 9 T: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24% RS members face criminal cases</td>
<td>C: 11 B: 11 D: 11 H: 11 T: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Post-law, 82% fall in triple talaq cases: Naqvi</td>
<td>C: 10 B: 10 D: 10 H: 10 T: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Court allows teen to terminate pregnancy</td>
<td>C: 4 B: - D: - H: - T: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Set up a High Court for Puducherry (Editorial)</td>
<td>C: 6 B: 6 D: 6 H: 6 T: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prelims Practice Question(s)</td>
<td>C: - B: - D: - H: - T: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Page Number*: C – Chennai; B – Bengaluru; D – Delhi; H – Hyderabad; T – Thiruvananthapuram
Tyagi calls for unified bond market, moots G-Secs in demat

SEBI chief urges first-time retail investors to invest in government debt

LALATENDU MISHRA

Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) chairman Ajay Tyagi on Wednesday called for unification of the financial markets, adding that the corporate bond market needed reforms without any further delay.

“Unification of financial markets is an idea whose time has come. The market infrastructure for corporate bond and G-Secs markets should be integrated,” Mr. Tyagi said in his inaugural address at the FICCI Capital Market Conference ‘Atmanirbhar Bharat: Role of Capital Markets’.

“Having two separate ecosystems results in artificial segmentation of investors and divergent governance and regulatory norms for institutions in the two markets performing similar functions,” the SEBI chief noted. The market infrastructure institutions dealing with these two types of securities should follow the same rules and regulations, he said, adding that the economies of scale and scope would also dictate such unification.

Observing that the equity markets had seen a big surge in participation of retail investors in the last few months, he said that the rise in new demat accounts indicated the entry of first-time retail investors.

He said it would be ideal for first-time investors to begin their capital markets journey by investing in risk-free government bonds. “I would suggest that, to achieve this, the G-Secs may be issued in demat form,” Mr. Tyagi added.

“These new demat account holders, after gaining experience of investing in G-Secs could then gradually add other securities to their demat accounts,” he added. Observing that the government planned to borrow an additional 14 trillion this year on account of COVID-19, he said the issuance of G-Secs in demat form would facilitate easier borrowing.

Corporate bond market

Stating that the corporate bond repo market had not taken off as expected, he said SEBI was examining policy options to make it work, including a central clearing facility for tri party repo trades in corporate bonds.

He said development and deepening of the corporate bond market ought to be one of the topmost agendas of the policymakers, more so considering the problems with the banking sector.

Since the market was getting restricted to top-rated corporate bonds, there was a dire need to move down the rating curve, he said.
What is a Government Security (G-Sec)?

- A tradeable instrument issued by the Central Government or the State Governments.
- It acknowledges the Government’s debt obligation.
- short term or long term
- Central Government issues both, treasury bills and bonds or dated securities
- State Governments issue only bonds or dated securities, which are called the State Development Loans (SDLs).
- G-Sees carry practically no risk of default and, hence, are called risk-free gilt-edged instruments.

Treasury bills

- Short term debt instruments issued by the Government of India
- presently issued in three tenors, 91-day, 182 day and 364 day.
- Treasury bills are zero coupon securities and pay no interest.
- Instead, they are issued at a discount and redeemed at the face value at maturity.

Dated securities

- Government paper with tenor beyond one year is known as dated security - carry either a fixed interest rate or floating interest rate which is paid on the face value, on half-yearly basis.
How the G-Secs are issued?

- G-Secs are issued through auctions conducted by RBI.

- Auctions - conducted on the electronic platform called the E-Kuber.

- All members of E-Kuber can place their bids in the auction through this electronic platform. The results of the auction are published by RBI at stipulated time.

- All non-E-Kuber members can also participate in the primary auction but through scheduled commercial banks or Primary Dealers (PD).

- Retail investor: any person, it includes individuals, firms, companies, corporate bodies, institutions, provident funds, trusts, and any other entity as may be prescribed by RBI - submit bid indirectly through Aggregator or Facilitator.
45 RS members take oath
36 are first-timers to the Upper House

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT
NEW DELHI

Forty-five of the 61 newly elected members took oath on Wednesday, and for the first time, the ceremony was held inside the Rajya Sabha hall when Parliament is not in session. Rajya Sabha Chairman Venkaiah Naidu urged the new members “not to fall prey to the temptation of disrupting the proceedings of the House for short-term gains”.

The BJP now stands at 85 members, more than double of the Congress, which is down to 40. Hence, the Rajya Sabha is no longer a roadblock to any legislation proposed by the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government.

A little before the oath-taking ceremony commenced, BJP MP Jyotiraditya Scindia walked across the aisle to greet members from his former party, including Congress MP Digvijaya Singh.

Mr. Scindia won’t be the only former Congress MP to be sitting in treasury benches after joining the BJP. He will be accompanied by the former chief whip of the Congress in Rajya Sabha, Bhuvaneswar Kalita, who recently joined the BJP.

Out of the 45 who took oath, 36 members were first-timers to the Upper House, and 12 members have been re-elected, including NCP leader Sharad Pawar, Congress leader Digvijaya Singh, and Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha and Janata Dal-United leader Harihans Narayan Singh.

24% RS members face criminal cases
ADR analysis finds that 89% have declared assets estimated at over ₹1 crore

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT
NEW DELHI

About a quarter of the sitting Rajya Sabha members have declared criminal cases against themselves, according to an analysis of their self-sworn affidavits by the Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR) released on Wednesday.

With three seats vacant and Kerala MP K.K. Ragesh’s affidavit being unavailable, the ADR report said that an analysis of 229 of the 233 Rajya Sabha seats that represent the States and the Union Territories showed that 54 MPs or 24% had declared criminal cases. Out of the 229 MPs, which included the newly-elected representatives taking the oath on Wednesday, 28 or 12% had declared serious criminal cases.

The report stated that 14 of the 77 BJP MPs and eight of the 40 Congress MPs had declared serious criminal cases against themselves in their affidavits.

The ADR analysis found that 203 of the 229 MPs, or 89 of those analysed, had declared assets over ₹1 crore, including 90% of the BJP MPs, 93% of the Congress MPs, 100% of the AIADMK MPs and 69% of the Trinamool Congress MPs.

Highest declared assets
Janata Dal (United) MP from Bihar Mahendra Prasad had the highest declared assets at ₹4,078 crore, followed by YSRCP MP from Andhra Pradesh Alla Ayodhya Rami Reddy, with assets worth ₹2,777 crore, and Samajwadi Party MP from Uttar Pradesh Jaya Bachchan, actor-turned-politician, who declared assets over ₹1,001 crore.

The ADR report said BJP MP from Manipur Maharaja Sanajaoba Leishemba declared ₹5.48 lakh in assets, the lowest of the MPs analysed, followed by Aam Aadmi Party MP from Delhi Sanjay Singh, who declared ₹6.6 lakh in assets, and BJP MP from Jharkhand Samir Oraon, who declared ₹18.69 lakh.
News

• Newly elected member of Rajya Sabha (RS) took oath - first time, the oath taking ceremony was held inside the RS hall when Parliament is not in session.

• National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government will not face obstruction to any legislation proposed by it in RS, since it enjoys majority in RS.
Composition of RS

- Maximum strength - 250
- Present seats - 245 - as per the Fourth Schedule to Indian Constitution.
  - 12 seats nominated
  - 8 seats represent UTs (NCT Delhi, Puducherry, Jammu and Kashmir)
  - 225 seats represent the States.
- A member elected for a full term serves for a period of 6 years.

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

80. Composition of the Council of States.—

(1) The Council of States shall consist of—

(a) twelve members to be nominated by the President in accordance with the provisions of clause (3); and

(b) not more than two hundred and thirty-eight representatives of the States and of the Union territories.

(2) The allocation of seats in the Council of States to be filled by representatives of the States and of the Union territories shall be in accordance with the provisions in that behalf contained in the Fourth Schedule.

(3) The members to be nominated by the President under sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall consist of persons having special knowledge or practical experience in respect of such matters as the following, namely:—Literature, science, art and social service.
Election to RS

- Biennial Election - election held every second year to elect new members to replace the retiring members on the expiration of their term of office.

- Bye-election - election held to fill a vacancy arising due to reasons other than by retirement of a member.

- Method of indirect election - the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

- Representatives of each State - elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of the State.

- Representatives of two Union territories (National Capital Territory of Delhi and then Puducherry) in RS - elected by the members of the Electoral College for that territory.

Electoral College - elected members of the Legislative Assembly of Delhi, and Puducherry Legislative Assembly, respectively.

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

80. Composition of the Council of States.—

(4) The representatives of each State in the Council of States shall be elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of the State in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.
Qualification to be a member of RS

84. Qualification for membership of Parliament.—A person shall not be qualified to be chosen to fill a seat in Parliament unless he—

(a) is a citizen of India, and makes and subscribes before some person authorised in that behalf by the Election Commission an oath or affirmation according to the form set out for the purpose in the Third Schedule;

(b) is, in the case of a seat in the Council of States, not less than thirty years of age and, in the case of a seat in the House of the People, not less than twenty-five years of age; and

(c) possesses such other qualifications as may be prescribed in that behalf by or under any law made by Parliament.

Oath or Affirmation

• First act of a member after her election or nomination to the House.

99. Oath or affirmation by members.—Every member of either House of Parliament shall, before taking his seat, make and subscribe before the President, or some person appointed in that behalf by him, an oath or affirmation according to the form set out for the purpose in the Third Schedule.

104. Penalty for sitting and voting before making oath or affirmation under article 99 or when not qualified or when disqualified.—If a person sits or votes as a member of either House of Parliament before he has complied with the requirements of article 99, or when he knows that he is not qualified or that he is disqualified for membership thereof, or that he is prohibited from so doing by the provisions of any law made by Parliament, he shall be liable in respect of each day on which he so sits or votes to a penalty of five hundred rupees to be recovered as a debt due to the Union.
Comparison with Lok Sabha

- RS cannot make or unmake the Government (Article 75(3))

✓ It can exercise control over the Government, particularly when the Government does not enjoy majority in RS.

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

75. Other provisions as to Ministers.—

(3) The Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People.

- Deadlock between the two Houses in case of an ordinary legislation – to resolve, Constitution provides for the joint sitting of both Houses under Article 108 of Constitution.

- Powers, privileges and immunities of the Houses of Parliament, their members and committees – two Houses are placed absolutely on equal footing by the Constitution.

✓ Election and impeachment of the President

✓ Election of the Vice-President

✓ Approving the Proclamation of Emergency

✓ Proclamation regarding failure of constitutional machinery in States and financial emergency.
24% RS members face criminal cases

ADR analysis finds that 89% have declared assets estimated at over ₹1 crore

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT
NEW DELHI

About a quarter of the sitting Rajya Sabha members have declared criminal cases against themselves, according to an analysis of their self-sworn affidavits by the Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR) released on Wednesday.

With three seats vacant and Kerala MP K.K. Ragesh's affidavit being unavailable, the ADR report said that an analysis of 229 of the 233 Rajya Sabha seats that represent the States and the Union Territories showed that 54 MPs or 24% had declared criminal cases.

Out of the 229 MPs, which included the newly-elected representatives taking the oath on Wednesday, 28 or 12% had declared serious criminal cases.

The report stated that 14 of the 77 BJP MPs and eight of the 40 Congress MPs had declared criminal cases against themselves in their affidavits.

The ADR analysis found that 203 of the 229 MPs, or 89% of those analysed, had declared assets over ₹1 crore, including 90% of the BJP MPs, 93% of the Congress MPs, 100% of the AIADMK MPs and 69% of the Trinamool Congress MPs.

Highest declared assets
Janata Dal (United) MP from Bihar Mahendra Prasad had the highest declared assets at ₹4,078 crore, followed by YSRCP MP from Andhra Pradesh Alla Ayodhya Rami Reddy, with assets worth ₹2,577 crore, and Samajwadi Party MP from Uttar Pradesh Jaya Bachchan, actor-turned-politician, who declared assets over ₹1,001 crore.

The ADR report said BJP MP from Manipur Maharaja Sanajaoba Leishemba declared ₹5.48 lakh in assets, the lowest of the MPs analysed, followed by Aam Aadmi Party MP from Delhi Sanjay Singh, who declared ₹6.6 lakh in assets, and BJP MP from Jharkhand Samir Oraon, who declared ₹8.69 lakh.
Post-law, 82% fall in triple talaq cases: Naqvi

NEW DELHI

There has been about 82% decline in triple talaq cases since the law against the “social evil” was put in place, Minority Affairs Minister Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi said on Wednesday, terming August 1, when the legislation came into being, “Muslim women’s rights day.”
News

• There is about 82% decline in triple talaq cases after the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019 came into force.

Triple Talaq

• A form of an Instant and irreversible Islamic Divorce procedure.
• Muslim husband gives divorce to his wife by uttering the word talaq, 3 times at one go.
• It was applicable in both forms, oral and written.

• But nowadays, digital mediums like email, WhatsApp etc.
• Seen as a form of discrimination against women in Muslim community.
• So, the parliament came up with The Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019.
CHAPTER II

DECLARATION OF TALAQ TO BE VOID AND ILLEGAL

3. Any pronouncement of *talaq* by a Muslim husband upon his wife, by words, either spoken or written or in electronic form or in any other manner whatsoever, shall be *void* and illegal.

4. Any Muslim husband who pronounces *talaq* referred to in section 3 upon his wife shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Source: http://egazette.nic.in/WriteReadData/2019/209473.pdf
CHAPTER III

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF MARRIED MUSLIM WOMEN

5. Without prejudice to the generality of the provisions contained in any other law for the time being in force, a married Muslim woman upon whom talaq is pronounced shall be entitled to receive from her husband such amount of subsistence allowance, for her and dependent children, as may be determined by the Magistrate.

6. Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, a married Muslim woman shall be entitled to custody of her minor children in the event of pronouncement of talaq by her husband, in such manner as may be determined by the Magistrate.


(a) an offence punishable under this Act shall be cognizable, if information relating to the commission of the offence is given to an officer in charge of a police station by the married Muslim woman upon whom talaq is pronounced or any person related to her by blood or marriage;

(b) an offence punishable under this Act shall be compoundable, at the instance of the married Muslim woman upon whom talaq is pronounced with the permission of the Magistrate, on such terms and conditions as he may determine;

(c) no person accused of an offence punishable under this Act shall be released on bail unless the Magistrate, on an application filed by the accused and after hearing the married Muslim woman upon whom talaq is pronounced, is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for granting bail to such person.

Source: http://egazette.nic.in/WriteReadData/2019/209473.pdf
Court allows teen to terminate pregnancy

She was sexually assaulted by her father

B. TILAK CHANDAR
MADURAI

The Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court on Tuesday allowed a 15-year-old teenager, who was seven months pregnant, to terminate the fetus after taking cognisance of reports from medical experts who said it could be considered.

Justice R. Ponjapappan directed the Dean of Thanjavur Medical College and Hospital to immediately commence the process of termination of pregnancy, keeping the well-being of the girl in mind.

Case filed by aunt

The court was hearing a petition filed by the girl's aunt, who sought termination of pregnancy.

It was said that the girl was sexually assaulted by her father and grandfather, who had been arrested. The girl had lost her mother.

Earlier, a team of medical experts was constituted to examine the 15-year-old's condition as the gestation period was 25 weeks.

The medical team, after examining the girl, said that the termination of pregnancy could be considered.

The court relied upon Supreme Court judgments that allowed termination of pregnancy, exceeding the statutory limit, taking into account compelling reasons. If the pregnancy of the girl was continued, it would affect her well-being, the court said.
(2) Subject to the provisions of sub-section (4), a pregnancy may be terminated by a registered medical practitioner,—

(a) where the length of the pregnancy does not exceed twelve weeks if such medical practitioner is,

or

(b) where the length of the pregnancy exceeds twelve weeks but does not exceed twenty weeks, if not less than two registered medical practitioners are.

Of opinion, formed in good faith, that,—

(i) the continuance of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of the pregnant woman or of grave injury physical or mental health; or

(ii) there is a substantial risk that if the child were born, it would suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities as to be seriously handicapped.

Explanation 1.—Where any pregnancy is alleged by the pregnant woman to have been caused by rape, the anguish caused by such pregnancy shall be presumed to constitute a grave injury to the mental health of the pregnant woman.

Explanation 2.—Where any pregnancy occurs as a result of failure of any device or method used by any woman or her partner for the purpose of limiting the number of children or preventing pregnancy, the anguish caused by such unwanted pregnancy may be presumed to constitute a grave injury to the mental health of the pregnant woman.

Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971
Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Bill, 2020

• Objective:
  ✓ to expand the access of women to safe and legal abortion services.
  ✓ Aims to strengthen the access to comprehensive abortion care, under strict conditions, by not compromising the service and quality of safe abortion.
  ✓ Defines “termination of pregnancy” as a procedure to terminate a pregnancy by using medical or surgical methods.

• Proposes to extend the upper limit for permitting abortions from 20 weeks to 24 weeks of gestation period under special circumstances.
  ✓ Requirement of opinion of one registered medical practitioner (RMP) for termination of pregnancy up to 20 weeks of gestation.
  ✓ Requirement of opinion of two RMPs needed for termination of pregnancy of 20 to 24.

• Termination of pregnancies up to 24 weeks will only apply to special categories of women.
  ✓ It includes rape survivors, victims of incest, the differently-abled and minors, or as may be prescribed by the central government.
• Every state government/UT is required to constitute a Medical Board. These Medical Boards will consist of:

  ✓ A gynaecologist.
  ✓ A paediatrician.
  ✓ A radiologist/Sonologist.

  ✓ Any other number of members, as may be notified by the state government/UT.

• The bill also has provision for maintaining the privacy of the woman whose pregnancy has been terminated.
Set up a High Court for Puducherry

The administration must highlight the need to streamline expenses, the case volume and constitutional rights as factors

In 1962, when Puducherry was merged with India, the jurisdiction of the Madras High Court was extended to it. After several decades, in 2017, the Puducherry legislature unanimously resolved to have its own High Court, and the Madras High Court was in- formed on July 7, 2017. Prior to this, in April 2017, the Pondicherry Bar Association also passed a resolution seeking establishment of the High Court.

In August 2019, while addressing a State-level conference on legal services and Motor Accident Mediation Cells, Puducherry Chief Minister V. Narayanasamy said that “a Bench of the Madras High Court at Puducherry on the lines of the one set up in Madurai” was a felt need and sought the support of judges of the Supreme Court.

Sound reasons

So, why should there be the need for a High Court at Puducherry? The Puducherry government spends exorbitant sums of money towards expenses of the large High Court. With not much of a population, this amount can be reduced to less than a quarter of the amount spent with a much smaller High Court for Puducherry.

In fact, according to the Constitution, when a common High Court is established for more than one State, administrative expenses have to be paid only from the consolidated fund of the ‘State’ in which the principal seat of the High Court is situated. However, this provision is breached with respect to Puducherry which shares the disproportionately exorbitant expenses with Tamil Nadu. On the other hand, administrative expenses of a High Court at the Union Territory shall be drawn from the ‘Consolidated Fund of India’ under the Constitution.

A Puducherry High Court, with four to five judges, can ensure quick action on pending matters of the High Court matters. At least at Puducherry. In the All India Judges Association and Others vs Union Of India (2014) 1 & OA, the Supreme Court observed that the “time has now come for protecting one of the pillars of the Constitution, namely, the judicial system, by directing increase, in the first instance, in the judges strength from the existing ratio of 10.5 or 13 per 10 lakhs people to 50 Judges for 10 lakh people”. This was also discussed in the Law Commission of India Report entitled ‘Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (wo)manpower’, in 2014.

However, as of 2016, the ratio is only 12 judges for one million population. This ratio at Puducherry can be increased if a separate High Court with four to five judges is established.

A data comparison

The number of cases filed and disposed of at Puducherry in 2010 is four times higher than the numbers at Sikkim, Manipur and Goa (with High Courts) put together. Therefore, the size of population and territory is irrelevant. Bigger States have more judges and staff, smaller States have lesser numbers of these.

The data collected by this writer show that in terms of the number of cases filed in 2010, the figures are: Sikkim (1,117), Manipur (637), Goa (4,964) and Puducherry (24,159). In terms of the number of cases decided, the numbers are: Sikkim (1,174), Manipur (405), Goa (3,646) and Puducherry (24,336).

Similarly, the memorandum provided by the All India Bar Association to the Chief Minister in 2017 shows that the number of cases disposed from Puducherry (28,631 cases) is three times more than the number of cases (9,031 cases) disposed by four High Courts (Tripura, Manipur, Meghalaya and Sikkim) put together in 2016.

The presence of the Constitutional Court in the capital city acts as a check on the executive and legislature. Even the exercise of safeguarding fundamental rights involves travel, time and expenses. Several people often cite that litigants from western districts travel the long distance to Chennai. It defies logic why litigants from Puducherry need not be benefited merely because other litigants are not benefited, especially when the Constitution permits Puducherry to have its own High Court under Article 241.

Aiding Statehood demand

A High Court for Puducherry will also strengthen voices seeking Statehood. The Constitution enabled establishment of a legislature and Council of Ministers for certain Union Territories with the intent of providing them Statehood gradually. Out of the seven Union territories originally placed under Article 239A, all except Puducherry were granted Statehood by 1989. Most Union Territories under 239A at least had Benches of High Courts when they attained Statehood. Tripura, Manipur, Meghalaya had Benches of the Gauhati High Court before they got their own High Courts. Interestingly, the Delhi High Court was established in 1861 before Delhi got its legislature in 1992.

Even a Bench of the Madras High Court as against a separate High Court at Puducherry is unfavourable because: Puducherry will still have to share the expenses of such a large High Court; judges might not prefer shuttleting between Bench at Chennai, Puducherry and Madurai frequently; the protests against the setting up of the Madurai Bench a decade ago should be borne in mind. In fact, the presidential order establishing the Bench was challenged before Madras High Court in 2004, just before commissioning the work; demand for a Bench of the High Court has always been met with stiff resistance from the Bar practising in the Court having jurisdiction. For instance, on December 12, 2018, Meenatchi MP Rajendran said in the Lok Sabha that “the U.P. Government had recommended a bench in 1955 but the HC lawyers who always exert pressure not to allow the bench in Western UP”. Unlike Meenatchi, the advantage that Puducherry enjoys is that the Constitution enables Parliament to establish separate High Courts in Union Territories.

In March 2016, the Government of India had suggested to the writer that the establishment of a High Court will be taken up if the Puducherry government proposes the idea. However, the decision of the Puducherry legislature has still not been conveyed to the Central government.

Interestingly, though the 2017 resolution of the legislature seeks a High Court, authorities have on multiple occasions spoken of establishing a Bench of the Madras High Court. There is a popular notion that the establishment of a Bench of High Court is easier and economical as against the reality pointed out in this article. Therefore, the territorial administration should have clarity on this point.

The Puducherry government should now form a committee to prepare a comprehensive report and a draft Bill backing its proposal and forward it to the Central government. In this the nominated Lieutenant Governor and the elected Chief Minister must work in tandem.

-Nirmal Kumar Mohandoss is an advocate practising at the Madras High Court
Under Part – VI of the Constitution (The States)

214. High Courts for States.— There shall be a High Court for each State.

230. Extension of jurisdiction of High Courts to Union territories.— (1) Parliament may by law extend the jurisdiction of a High Court to, or exclude the jurisdiction of a High Court from, any Union territory.

231. Establishment of a common High Court for two or more States.— (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding provisions of this Chapter, Parliament may by law establish a common High Court for two or more States or for two or more States and a Union territory.

Under Part – VIII of the Constitution (the Union Territories)

241. High Courts for Union territories—(1) Parliament may by law constitute a High Court for a Union territory or declare any court in any Union territory to be a High Court for all or any of the purposes of this Constitution.
PRACTICE QUESTIONS
DISCUSSION
Practice Question - Prelims

Q1. Consider the following statements:

1. A Government Security (G-Sec) is a tradeable instrument issued by the Central Government or the State Governments.

2. G-Secs are issued through auctions conducted by RBI.

Which of the statements given above is/are incorrect?

(a) 1 only
(b) 2 only
(c) Both 1 and 2
(d) Neither 1 nor 2
Practice Question – Prelims

Q2. Consider the following statements with reference to The Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019.

1. The act makes pronouncement of talaq by a Muslim husband upon his wife, through any medium void and illegal.

2. According to the provisions of this act, a police officer can make an arrest only with a warrant issued by a magistrate.

3. It makes an offence under this act non-compoundable.

Which of the statements given above is/are correct?
(a) 1 only
(b) 1 and 2 only
(c) 1 and 3 only
(d) 1, 2 and 3
Practice Question – Prelims

Q3. Under which Schedule of the Constitution of India, the allocation of seats in the Council of States is prescribed?

(a) Twelfth Schedule
(b) Ninth Schedule
(c) Fourth Schedule
(d) Third Schedule
Q. Consider the following statements:

1. The Reserve Bank of India manages and services Government of India Securities but not any State Government Securities.

2. Treasury bills are issued by the Government of India and there are no treasury bills issued by the state Governments.

3. Treasury bills offer are issued at a discount from the par value.

Which of the statements given above is/are correct?

a) 1 and 2 only
b) 3 only
c) 2 and 3 only (Correct Answer)
d) 1, 2 and 3

Q. Which of the following special powers have been conferred on the Rajya Sabha by the Constitution of India?

(a) To change the existing territory of a State and to change the name of a State.

(b) To pass a resolution empowering the Parliament to make laws in the State List and to create one or more All India Services. (Correct Answer)

(c) To amend the election procedure of the President and to determine the pension of the President after his/her retirement.

(d) To determine the functions of the Election Commission and determine the number of Election Commissioners.
Q4. Which of the following is correct as per Article 241 of India Constitution?

a) There shall be a High Court for each State.

b) Every High Court shall consist of a Chief Justice and such other Judges as the President may from time to time deem it necessary to appoint.

c) The Supreme Court shall sit in Delhi or in such other place or places, as the Chief Justice of India may, with the approval of the President, from time to time, appoint.

d) Parliament may by law constitute a High Court for a Union territory.
Practice Question – Prelims

Q5. Consider the following statements with reference to Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971.

1. According to this act, the upper limit for permitting abortions is 24 weeks of gestation.
2. The act provided for the establishment of a Medical Board for each state to diagnose substantial foetal abnormalities.

Which of the statement(s) given above is/are incorrect?
(a) 1 only
(b) 2 only
(c) Both 1 and 2
(d) Neither 1 nor 2

Answers

1. Option ‘d’ – Neither 1 nor 2
2. Option ‘a’ – 1 only
3. Option ‘c’ – Fourth Schedule
4. Option ‘d’ – Parliament may by law constitute a High Court for a Union territory.
5. Option ‘c’ – Both 1 and 2