

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
EXTRA-ORDINARY ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO. 214 OF 2020 (PIL)
(Under Article 32 of the Constitution of India)
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION**

IN THE MATTER OF:

DR. SUBHASH VIJAYRAN ... PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. ... RESPONDENTS

WITH

I.A. NO. 73488 OF 2020

(Application for exemption from filing duly signed and attested/ notarized Affidavit)

AND

I.A. NO. 73489 OF 2020

(Application for permission to appear and argue the matter In-Person)

**PAPER- BOOK
FOR INDEX: KINDLY SEE INSIDE**

Drafted & E-filed on 27.07.2020 as Provisional Application No. 3948 of 2020

Entered on 28.07.2020 as Diary No. 15865 of 2020

Registered as W.P. (Cr.). 214 of 2020 on 06.08.2020

DRAFTED AND FILED BY:

**DR. SUBHASH VIJAYRAN (ADVOCATE)
(PETITIONER-IN-PERSON)**

I N D E X

S.No.	Particulars of Document	Page No. of part to which it belongs		Remarks
		Part I (Contents of Paper Book)	Part II (Contents of file alone)	
(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)
1.	Listing Proforma	A1 – A2	A1 – A2	
2.	Cover Page of Paper Book		A-3	
3.	Index of Record of Proceedings		A-4	
4.	Writ Proforma		A-5	
5.	Defect List		A-6	
6.	Note Sheet		NS1 –	
7.	Synopsis and List of Dates	B – D		
8.	Writ Petition (PIL) with Affidavit of Petitioner	1 – 11		
9.	<u>Annexure: P-1</u> True Copy of order dated 23.07.2020 of this Hon'ble Court passed in SLP(C) No. 8778 of 2020.	12 – 13		
10.	<u>Annexure: P-2</u> Screenshots of tweets dated 25.07.2020, posted by Mr. P. Chidambaram, Senior Advocate.	14		

11.	<u>Annexure: P-3</u> Some replies to the above tweet dated 25.07.2020.	15 – 19		
12.	<u>I.A. No. of 2020:</u> Application for exemption from filing duly signed and attested/ notarized Affidavit.	20 – 21		
13.	<u>I.A. No. of 2020:</u> Application for permission to appear and argue the matter In-Person.	22 – 23		
14.	Filing Memo		24	
15.	Memo of Appearance		25	
16.	Photo I-D proof		26	

SYNOPSIS

This Hon'ble Court, of lately, has become a *punching bag* of, inter-alia, some *learned Advocates*. They first approach this court, consume tens and hundreds of hours of the court's precious time, and if not satisfied with the outcome, go to the media criticizing and directly/ indirectly imputing motives on the Hon'ble Judges. Though these acts are *prima facie* criminal contempts; not all end up in contempt proceedings. Because if they would, this court would be taking up nothing but contempt matters.

The courts grant us, Advocates, extra leeway and liberty to freely speak our minds because we are men of law. But being a lawman – and not a layman – is a great responsibility. We have a duty towards society. We cannot go on cutting roots of the very system that nourishes us and misuse our liberty for our selfish ends.

Criticizing the judgments on points of law is healthy criticism – a sign of mature democracy – and helps develop the law. But criticizing the court/ judges in a way that either impute motives on the judges or project them as biased, is not healthy. The ill-effect is particularly exponential when a learned Advocate – more so one linked with a political party – does it.

In this petition, I am focusing on recent tweets by senior Advocate and Congress leader, Mr. P. Chidambaram, to show how *apparently innocuous* but *clever* tweets *in a pending matter* can impute motives and bias on the judges.

The million dollar question is: Till what time is this Hon'ble Court going to tolerate this unhealthy practice of maligning the courts and its Judges by the disgruntled and those with ulterior motives?

LIST OF DATES

21.07.2020	After a prolonged hearing spanning many days; on 21.07.2020, a division bench of Rajasthan High Court in CWP No. 7451 of 2020, directed the Speaker of Rajasthan Legislative assembly not to proceed with the Disqualification Notices under 10 th Schedule of the Constitution issued against the petitioners of the WPC, till next date of hearing i.e. 24.07.2020.
23.07.2020	Aggrieved, the Ld. Speaker preferred SLP(C) No. 8778 of 2020 before this Hon'ble Court, seeking stay of the order and proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court. On 23.07.2020, this Hon'ble Court, after a hearing spanning over an hour, ordered that the matter required prolonged hearing to decide the question of jurisdiction. Also this court refused to stay the proceedings before the High Court. True Copy of the 23.07.2020 order is annexed as <u>Annexure: P-1 (page- 12 to 13).</u>
24.07.2020	The Hon'ble High Court extended the status quo on Speaker's Disqualification Notices.
25.07.2020 & 26.07.2020	On 25.07.2020, Congress leader and Senior Advocate Mr. P. Chidambaram, posted the following <i>apparently innocuous</i> tweets: <i>"To the average citizen who is mystified by the orders of the HC and SC, the following passage in</i>

	<i>simple English should be easy to understand.</i> <i>In 1992, the SC ruled: “Having regard to the constitutional scheme in the Tenth Schedule, judicial review should not cover any stage prior to the making of a decision by the Speakers/Chairmen; and no quia timet actions are permissible”</i> <i>Those words are simple and clear enough. That statement of the law by 5 judges was binding on all courts, HC or SC.</i> <i>Now, dear average citizen, you be the judge.”</i> News regarding these tweets was widely carried by all leading Newspapers and media houses. Screenshots of the above tweets dated 25.07.2020 are annexed herewith as <u>Annexure: P-2 (page-14).</u> Since I am before a court of law, I would not go into politics. Suffice it is to say: to an average sane citizen who keeps himself updated with recent events – these <i>apparently innocuous</i> tweets impute that the judges of the Supreme Court and the High Court hearing the matter are puppets of the present Government at the Centre and pass orders that please the Central Government. This imputation can easily be appreciated by going through some of the replies dated 25/26.07.2020 to the above-mentioned tweets, annexed herewith as <u>Annexure: P-3 (page 15 to 19).</u>
27.07.2020	This PIL e-filed before this Hon'ble Court.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
EXTRA-ORDINARY ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO. _____ OF 2020 (PIL)

(Under Article 32 of the Constitution of India)

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION

IN THE MATTER OF:

DR. SUBHASH VIJAYRAN (ADVOCATE)

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. UNION OF INDIA,

Through its Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice,
Room No. 405-A, A Wing, 4th Floor,
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001
Ph: 011 – 23384617, 23387553;
E-mail: gn.raju@nic.in

... RESPONDENT NO-1

2. SUPREME COURT OF INDIA,

Through its Secretary General, Tilak Marg, New Delhi-110002
Ph: 011-23388922-24, 23388942; FAX: 011-23381508,
E-mail: supremecourt@nic.in

... RESPONDENT NO-2

.....
FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT VIOLATED:

ARTICLE-19 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA
.....

To

Hon'ble The Chief Justice of India and his Associate Justices of The Supreme Court of India. The Writ Petition of the Petitioner above-named **MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:**

1. This is a Writ Petition in Public Interest under Article 32 read with Article 19, 129 & 142 of the Constitution of India, seeking writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order:

A. Declaring that there is no freedom of speech and expression vis-à-vis pending matters before courts of law, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.

B. Declaring that there is no freedom of speech and expression vis-à-vis final judgments, orders or decrees of courts of law, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings, and healthy criticism of the law applied by the courts in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.

2. **Antecedents of the Petitioner:**

A. I am an Advocate by profession enrolled with Bar Council of Delhi. My details are:

- i. Bar Council of Delhi Enrollment No.:
- ii. PAN No:
- iii. Aadhar No:

iv. Voter I.D. Card No:

v. Driving License No:

vi. Passport No:

vii. Annual Income:

B. I am filing this petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of India as Public Interest Litigation [PIL] in the interest of general public and have no personal interest in the same.

C. I am filing this petition on my own and not at the instance of someone else. The litigation costs, including travelling expenses, are being borne by me. As of now, due to lockdown, there are no travelling expenses, as I am able to file it sitting at my home.

D. In the prevailing circumstances of COVID-19 pandemic, I seek exemption from filing duly signed, affirmed and attested/ notarized affidavits. I undertake that upon normal functioning of this court, I shall file the same at the earliest. I have also filed an appropriate application in this regard with this petition.

E. I give my consent for the matter to be taken up through video-conferencing mode. I shall prefer to link to the Hon'ble Bench by video-conferencing through my own desktop/ laptop/ mobile phone. In case of any technical glitch in Video-Conferencing, I consent for teleconferencing by WhatsApp Video call on any of my WhatsApp numbers i.e

3. FACTS CONSTITUTING THE CAUSE OF ACTION:

- A. This Hon'ble Court, of lately, has become a *punching bag* of, inter-alia, some *learned Advocates*. They first approach this court, consume tens and hundreds of hours of the court's precious time, and if not satisfied with the outcome, go to the media criticizing and directly/indirectly imputing motives on the Hon'ble Judges. Though these acts are *prima facie* criminal contempts; not all end up in contempt proceedings. Because if they would, this court would be taking up nothing but contempt matters.
- B. The courts grant us Advocates extra leeway and liberty to freely speak our minds because we are men of law. But being a lawman – and not a layman – is a great responsibility. We have a duty towards society. We cannot cut roots of the very system that nourishes us and misuse our liberty for our selfish ends.
- C. Criticizing the judgments on points of law is healthy criticism – a sign of mature democracy – and helps develop the law. But criticizing the court/ judges in a way that either impute motives on the judges or project them as biased, is not healthy. The ill-effect is particularly exponential when a learned Advocate – more so one linked with a political party – does it.
- D. In this petition, I am focusing on recent tweets by senior Advocate and Congress leader, Mr. P. Chidambaram, to show how *apparently innocuous* but *clever* tweets in a

pending matter can impute motives and bias on the judges.

**EVENTS LEADING TO THE 25.07.2020 TWEETS BY
LD. SENIOR ADVOCATE MR. P. CHIDAMBRAM:**

- E. After a prolonged hearing spanning many days; on 21.07.2020, a division bench of Rajasthan High Court in CWP No. 7451 of 2020, directed the Speaker of Rajasthan Legislative assembly not to proceed with the Disqualification Notices under 10th Schedule of the Constitution issued against the petitioners of the WPC, till the next date of hearing i.e. 24.07.2020.
- F. Aggrieved, the Ld. Speaker preferred SLP(C) No. 8778 of 2020 before this Hon'ble Court, seeking stay of the order and proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court.
- G. On 23.07.2020, this Hon'ble Court, after a hearing spanning over an hour, ordered that the matter required prolonged hearing to decide the question of jurisdiction. Also this court refused to stay the proceedings before the High Court.
- H. True Copy of the 23.07.2020 order is annexed herewith as **Annexure: P-1 (page-12 to 13)**.
- I. On 24.07.2020, the Hon'ble High Court extended the status quo on Speaker's Disqualification Notices.
- J. On 25.07.2020, Congress leader and Senior Advocate P. Chidambaram, posted the following *apparently innocuous* tweets:

“To the average citizen who is mystified by the orders of the HC and SC, the following passage in simple English should be easy to understand.

In 1992, the SC ruled: “Having regard to the constitutional scheme in the Tenth Schedule, judicial review should not cover any stage prior to the making of a decision by the Speakers/Chairmen; and no quia timet actions are permissible”

Those words are simple and clear enough. That statement of the law by 5 judges was binding on all courts, HC or SC. Now, dear average citizen, you be the judge.”

K. News regarding these tweets was widely carried by all leading Newspapers and media houses.

L. Screenshots of the above tweets are annexed herewith as **Annexure: P-2 (page-14).**

M. Since I am before a court of law, I would not go into politics. Suffice it is to say: to an average sane citizen who keeps himself updated with recent events – these *apparently innocuous* tweets impute that the judges of the Supreme Court and the High Court hearing the matter are puppets of the present Government at the Centre and pass orders that please the Central Government.

N. This imputation can easily be appreciated by going through some of the replies to the above-mentioned tweets, annexed as **Annexure: P-3 (page 15 to 19).**

O. **The million dollar question is:** Till what time is this Hon'ble Court going to tolerate this unhealthy practice of

maligning the courts and its Judges by the disgruntled and those with ulterior motives?

4. **Source of information:**

A. (1) News Reports (2) Twitter feeds. (3) Orders of this Hon'ble Court.

B. I have personally verified the information by cross-checking the information on the websites of respective courts and also cross-verified by the information from multiple independent sources.

5. **Details of remedies exhausted:** This matter pertains to administration of justice by this Hon'ble Court. As such there are no other statutory and/or other remedies left to be availed.

6. **Nature and extent of injury caused or likely to be caused to the public:** By imputing motives/bias to the judges/courts, the entire judicial system is brought to disrepute. This shakes the confidence of the public in the judiciary and is detrimental for our country and democracy.

7. **Nature and extent of personal interest, if any, of the petitioners:** I have no personal interest except than to uphold the rule of law.

8. **Details regarding any civil, criminal or revenue litigation, involving the petitioner or any of the petitioners, which has or could have a legal nexus with the issue(s) involved in the Public Interest Litigation:** No such litigation, past or present.

9. **Whether issue was raised earlier; if so, what result:**

A. I declare that the issues raised in this petition were neither dealt with nor decided by a Court of law either at my instance or, to the best of my knowledge, at the instance of any other person.

B. I declare that in no P.I.L., any cost has been ever been awarded to or imposed upon me, and no appreciation or stricture has ever been passed for/against me.

10. **Whether concerned Government Authority was moved for relief(s) sought in the petition and if so, with what result:**

This matter pertains to administration of justice by this Hon'ble Court. No representation is required to be sent to any government authority.

11. **GROUND:**

A. Article- 19(2) of the Constitution of India enumerates the reasonable restrictions on *Freedom of Speech and Expression*. "Contempt of Court" is one of the reasonable restrictions under Article- 19(2).

B. In a pending matter, where the court is seized of the dispute, there is no freedom of speech and expression, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.

C. Similarly, there is no freedom of speech and expression vis-à-vis final judgments, orders or decrees of courts of

law, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings, and healthy criticism of the law applied by the courts, in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.

D. Doing otherwise, directly or indirectly, would bring disrepute to the judiciary, and shake people's confidence in the system. If anyone has any grievance, he has the right to move the courts through appropriate proceedings. Ranting out in the media and imputing motives/bias on the judges is neither good for the system nor is the solution to the grievances of the aggrieved.

E. If there are shortcomings in our Judicial System, we should take appropriate steps under the law to fix it and make the system better. We don't throw the baby out with the bath water just because the water is dirty. We don't cut roots of the very system that nourishes us and help us survive and bloom.

12. **Grounds for interim relief:** No interim relief is prayed.

13. **MAIN PRAYER:** On the basis of the above premises, it is most humbly and respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order or direction as follows:

A. Declare that there is no freedom of speech and expression vis-à-vis pending matters before courts of law, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings, in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.

- B. Declare that there is no freedom of speech and expression vis-à-vis final judgments, orders or decrees of courts of law, except to the extent of fair and true reporting of court's proceedings, and healthy criticism of the law applied by the courts, in a manner that does not directly or indirectly impute motives/ bias to the judges/court.
- C. Pass any other or further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and to meet the ends of justice.

14. **Interim relief, if any:** No interim relief is prayed.

AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS, YOUR HUMBLE PETITIONER, AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY

Place: New Delhi

Drafted and e-filed on: 27.07.2020

DR. SUBHASH VIJAYRAN
(PETITIONER-IN-PERSON)

Annexure: P-1

1

MOST URGENT

ITEM NO.2 Court 2 (Video Conferencing) SECTION XV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 8778/2020

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-07-2020 in DBCWP No. 7451/2020 passed by the High Court Of Judicature For Rajasthan At Jaipur)

THE HON'BLE SPEAKER, RAJASTHAN LEGISLATIVE
ASSEMBLY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PRITHVIRAJ MEENA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.66836/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.66838/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.66842/2020-APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING ORIGINAL VAKALATNAMA/OTHER DOCUMENT)

Date : 23-07-2020 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARICounsel for the
partiesMr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vivek Tankha, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Kaushik, Adv.
Mr. Mohammad Nizam Pasha, Adv.
Ms. Nupur Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Muhammad Ali Khan, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Kasliwal, Adv.
Mr. Prastut Dalvi, Adv.
Mr. Omar Hooda, Adv.
Ms. Aishwarya Mohapatra, Adv.Mr. Harish Salve, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mukul Rohtgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. S. Hari Haran, Adv.
Ms. Jaikriti S. Jadeja, Adv.
(For Respondent Nos.1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 13)Mr. Devdatt Kamat, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Varun K. Chopra, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Inamdar, Adv.Signature valid
Digitally signed by
Munish Kumar
Date: 2023.07.23
17:17:00
Reason

2

Mr. Aditya, Adv.
Mr. Javedur Rehman, Adv.
Mr. Gurtejpal Singh, Adv.
For Ms. VKC Law Officers
(For Respondent No. 20)

Mr. Alok Gupta, Adv.
(Appearance slip not given)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

We have heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the parties at length.

The case requires prolonged hearing so as to decide the question of jurisdiction. However, prayer is made that the High Court should not pass an order on which it has heard the matter and reserved the order.

As the High Court has already heard the matter after prolonged arguments and reserved the order, we are not staying the passing of the order, however, whatever order is passed, shall be ultimately subject to the outcome of this petition.

List on Monday, the 27th of July, 2020 for further hearing.

(NARENDRA PRASAD)
AR-CUM-PS

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)
COURT MASTER

(JAGDISH CHANDER)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR



// TRUE COPY //

Annexure: P-2The Tweets

P. Chidambaram ✓
@PChidambaram_IN

To the average citizen who is mystified by the orders of the HC and SC, the following passage in simple English should be easy to understand.

3:00 PM · Jul 25, 2020 · [Twitter for iPhone](#)

936 Retweets and comments 3.7K Likes



P. Chidambaram ✓ @PChidambaram_IN · Jul 25
Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

In 1992, the SC ruled: "Having regard to the constitutional scheme in the Tenth Schedule, judicial review should not cover any stage prior to the making of a decision by the Speakers/Chairmen; and no quia timet actions are permissible"



22



546



1.6K



P. Chidambaram ✓ @PChidambaram_IN · Jul 25

Those words are simple and clear enough. That statement of the law by 5 judges was binding on all courts, HC or SC.

Now, dear average citizen, you be the judge.



46



494



1.5K



ENTU

// TRUE COPY //

Annexure: P-3Some replies to the above tweets

- 

John Davy @JohnDavy_ · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN and @karupasamy1

Obviously, the independence of the Judiciary is compromised. Where does one go? The consequences are dire indeed, when the last bastion of justice has fallen. Mass media is also compromised. Its a clarion call! Someone needs to step up soon or the nation as we knew it is history

1 18 58
-
- 

Hindustan @Hindust13806784 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Now the judiciary accept lucrative benefits just after retirement. They don't even think, what people, who are and were their masters, will say. The big change has happened after 2014, after Mr.Modi came to power. The four senior judges of SC had said, DEMOCRACY is in danger.

4
-
- 

Thakur Raj Kumar Singh @RajKuma47739261 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Justice Mishra has overruled precedent set by 5 judge bench as he is empowered by Modi-Shah

1
-
- 

Benga Pinto @bengapinto · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

BJPRSS+ Modi + Cronies + Compromised Constitutional Institutions (Compromise EVM's are a shame and curse upon India. #आपदा_में_भाजपाई_अवसर @INCIndia

22 54
-
- 

Hills @Hilalnazki · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

In a one man show, everyone else becomes a part of the choir.

1
-
- 

Exodus @Indian2001Shibu · Jul 25

well, is SC independent?

1 1 1



Sunand P @Sunand01 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

A smaller 3 judge bench literally overturns a larger 5 judge bench judgment? Unthinkable!



Selvakkumaran @Selvakkumaran5 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

We as ordinary people of India know it is blatant violation of the constitution of India, rule of law by Rajasthan HC and SC. We have to file contempt of law against these judges. And the judges of the bench should be learned former judges Madan Lokur, Chelameswar, kurian Joseph



Debasish Paul @ComradeDebasish · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

If Dissent is important according to the SC then what about the whip? Is not Whip against Dissent? SC is actually moving us round by round. RIP: Independence of SC.



4



21



77



john ekka @johnnekka11 · Jul 25

The HC deliberated over the matter for 3 days without a decision.



5



31



Surendra Nath kar @surendrakar3 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

5judges decision in Kihoto Hollohan V. Zachillu(1992)is a stare decisis&binding&accordingly quia timet orders or judicial review impermissible.But SC acted contrary&beyond&more unfotunate is remarks&orders of justice Arun Mishra indirectlysuggestingHC to orderfavouring Pilot



1



5



Surendra Nath kar @surendrakar3 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Now when a Bench of SCdisregards its earlier order&HC oversteps&no remedy is available against such degreded orders,one has to costrue that such attitude of some judges tends towards subordination of Judiciary to Executive/ruling party for reasons best known to those judges.



1





vijayan t.a @vijayanrd · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

If a party is anti India, this law won't act. People rejected SC uttarakand justice. People don't trust courts if it supports criminals. People are intelligent.



Idris Ahmad @IdrisAhmad_47 · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Should we trust the courts or not where to go now

@Asifrahmanmolla

@MalabarBiryani

@sardesairajdeep

@shenaz_irani

@Fayez_Indian

@osan_adil



1



3



Mohammed Faiz INC @Fayez_Indian · Jul 25

Trust and Courts???



2



4



Shenaz Irani @shenaz_irani · Jul 25

Really Really !!



1



5



Malcolm Lobo @msjlobo · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

At the rate the courts are giving judgements or shirking from it, it may be that citizens will have to be the 'judge'



2



4



INC Madantala @INCMadantala · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

HC bench of Rajasthan gave an order which isn't according to the law. Train judges again.



1



1



new_school @PVasanthibai · Jul 25

We can wake up people who are sleeping. We cannot wake up ppl. who are acting as sleeping.





Kovai_karan @KaranKovai · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Sir i just feel that our Judicial systems have become puppet of the ruling BJP and day by people of this country are loosing faith in it!!!!!!!



Kas @indosecular · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Sanghi Courts of India..



Rajeev Chhabra @AdvROChhabra · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

If they did not agree with the 5 judges decision, they could have said so and framed a question, constituted a larger bench of 7 or more judges and referred the question to it. But looks they are enjoying remaining in limelight



Deep Void @SethLalits · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

Sir, When there is RULE OF LAW then these words would have had any meaning....but now we are under no illusion. Unfortunately, misrule is the new normal.



Universal Solutions @UniversalSolu15 · Jul 25

Modi means no rules only fascism

Religious fascism

Cast fascism



rahul gakhhar @gakhharahul · Jul 26

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

This Old man @narendramodi will destroy future of our generations.

Historically whenever 1 man became extremely powerful in a nation. He had abused resources & ultimately everything end up in chaos.

All world wars leaders are heroes in their nation. We all know their futures now.



Rohankaviraj @rohankaviraj · Jul 25

Replying to @PChidambaram_IN

There is nothing to judge by us citizens in a dictatorship!



- 

Sushma Mishra @Sushmamish · Jul 25
Replying to @PChidambaram_IN
We know things are going wrong in this country.... But where do we go?
What do we do?

🗨️ ↻️ ❤️ 1 📤
-
- 

prafulla ratha @ratha_prafulla · Jul 25
Replying to @PChidambaram_IN
We the average Indians understand the game played out by this regime sir.

🗨️ ↻️ ❤️ 1 📤
-
- 

Milind Pusalkar @milind_pusalkar · Jul 25
Replying to @PChidambaram_IN and @INCIndia
Emergency from 1975 to 1977. Now you be the judge.

🗨️ 1 ↻️ ❤️ 1 📤
- 

Harish Kapoor @hckapoorccc · Jul 25
How old are you. I am 68. I fully support the emergency. It should have been extended further. The undeclared emergency nowadays is much more worse. That emergency was to save the country. This emergency is only to save moddy and shah.

🗨️ 3 ↻️ 3 ❤️ 13 📤
- 

wuntakal laxman @WuntakalL · Jul 25
I too support Indira's emergency.

🗨️ ↻️ 1 ❤️ 1 📤
-

ENTU
// TRUE COPY //

ORAL ARGUMENTS

1. Judges are not politicians. They can't respond or defend themselves against the various insinuations made against them in media. They have to focus on deciding cases. Disturbing the minds of judges by unnecessary insinuations hampers the ability of judges to think straight, and consequently hampers the administration of justice by them.
2. No system has ever been or will ever be perfect. But that doesn't mean that we destroy the entire system. In case we are not satisfied with an order of a court, we can take recourse according to law. To address the issue of misconduct by judges, we can bring a law on accountability of judges, prescribing various sanctions for various misconducts. We can have a National Judicial Accountability Commission to entertain complaints against judges. We can live telecast court proceedings to usher transparency. There are so many other methods that can be adopted within the bounds of law to improve our judicial system. But maligning the judges and judiciary is certainly not one of them.
3. We cannot allow any further damage to our judicial system by the disgruntled and those with habit of spewing venom in the garb of "Freedom of Speech and Expression". This court was not established to address the fancies of a handful of people who consume hundreds and hundreds of hours of this Court's precious time, arguing fanciful propositions, and then maligning the judiciary in the media. This Court was established for solving the real life problems of the billions of Indians who presently have to wait for 5 – 10 years to get a few minutes of hearing by this Hon'ble Court. It's time this court set things in order and define the bounds and manner within which one could report court proceedings and comment on the judiciary and the judges.