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1. Court System in India

Sources report that the highest court in the judicial system in India is the Supreme Court and below it are the state High Courts (US 12 Jan. 2017; India n.d.a). Sources further report that under the High Courts, there are "a hierarchy" of Subordinate Courts (India n.d.a.; US Dec. 2004, 16) or District Courts and a Labour Court (US 12 Jan. 2017).

Indian Courts, a government website that "provides a single point access to information related to the Supreme Court and any High Court in India," notes that "the role of the Supreme Court of India is that of a federal court, guardian of the Constitution and the highest court of appeal" (India n.d.b). The Supreme Court of India reports that generally, its proceedings "arise out of the judgements or orders made by the Subordinate Courts including the High Courts", but that lately it has been entertaining "Public Interest Litigation" (PIL), whereby groups or individuals can file petitions with the Court on matters of public importance (India n.d.c).

Indian Courts reports that "the High Courts are the principal civil courts of original jurisdiction in the state, and can try all offences including those punishable by death. [The] work of most High Courts consists of Appeals from lower courts" (India n.d.b). The Supreme Court of India notes that there are 24 High Courts in India, 3 of which have jurisdiction in more than 1 state (India, n.d.c).

Indian Courts reports that the subordinate courts [district courts] "administer justice in India at the district level" and "are under administrative and judicial control of the High Court of the State to which the district concerned belongs" (India n.d.b). The Supreme Court of India’s website notes with regard to subordinate courts that

[e]ach State is divided into judicial districts presided over by a District and Sessions Judge, which is the principal civil court of original jurisdiction and can try all offences including those punishable with death. The Sessions Judge is the highest judicial authority in a district. Below him, there are Courts of civil jurisdiction, known in different States as Munsifs, Sub Judges, Civil Judges and the like. Similarly, the criminal judiciary comprises the Chief Judicial Magistrates and Judicial Magistrates of First and Second Class. (India n.d.a)

2. Independence of the Judiciary

reads "[t]he State shall take steps to separate the judiciary from the executive in the public services of the State" (India 1949).

Freedom House notes that "[t]he judiciary is independent of the executive branch" (Freedom House 2016). Bertelsmann Stiftung Transformation Index (BTI), "an international analytical collaboration of almost 300 experts in top academic institutions around the world and local reporters in most countries" (BTI n.d.), reports in its India report for 2016 that "[t]he horizontal separation of powers is guaranteed and implemented through a system of checks and balances... The Indian judiciary is institutionally differentiated and largely independent from the legislative and executive branches" (BTI 2016, 8). The US Library of Congress country profile for India notes that "all [high courts] are independent of state legislatures and executives" (US Dec. 2004, 16).

2.1 Judicial Appointments

The Indian Express, a national newspaper based in New Delhi, reports that Supreme Court and High Court judges are "appointed by the President under Articles 124(2) and 217 of the Constitution" (Indian Express 15 Nov. 2016). Article 124(2) of the Constitution states that

(2) every Judge of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal on the recommendation of the National Judicial Appointments Commission referred to in article 124A and shall hold office until he attains the age of sixty-five years:

Footnotes 3 and 4 for Article 124 provided in the Constitution state the following:

3Subs. by the Constitution (Ninety-ninth Amendment) Act, 2014, s. 2, for "after consultation with such of the Judges of the Supreme Court and of the High Court in the States as the President may deem necessary for the purpose" (w.e.f. 13-4-2015). This amendment has been struck down by the Supreme Court’s order dated 16th October, 2015 in the Supreme Court Advocates’ on Record Association Vs. Union of India.

4First proviso omitted by s. 2, ibid. (w.e.f. 13-4-2015). Before amendment, the first proviso was as under:- "Provided that in the case of appointment of a Judge other than the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice of India shall always be consulted." (India 1949)

Article 217(1) states that

(1) Every Judge of a High Court shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal on the recommendation of the National Judicial Appointments Commission referred to in article 124A, the Governor of the State, and, in the case of appointment of a Judge other than the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice of the High Court, and shall hold office, in the case of an additional or acting Judge, as provided in article 224, and in any other case, until he attains the age of sixtytwo years. (India 1949)

Footnotes 1, 2, and 3 for Article 217 in the Constitution state the following:

1Subs. by the Constitution (Ninety-ninth Amendment) Act, 2014, s. 7, for "after consultation with the Chief Justice of India" (w.e.f. 13-4-2015). This amendment has been struck down by the Supreme Court’s order dated 16th October, 2015 in the Supreme Court Advocates’ on Record Association Vs. Union of India.

2Subs. by the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956, s. 12, for "shall hold office until he attains the age of sixty years".

3Subs. by the Constitution (Fifteenth Amendment) Act, 1963, s. 4, for "sixty years." (India 1949)

With regard to appointments of judges to the subordinate courts, article 233(1) of the Constitution reads "[a]ppointments of persons to be, and the posting and promotion of, district judges in any State shall be made by the Governor of the State in consultation with the High Court exercising jurisdiction in relation to such State" (India 1949).

Sources report that the "collegium" system is used to select judges for appointment in the "highest courts" (The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015) or the Supreme Court and High Courts (Indian Express 15 Nov. 2016; Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015). Sources report that the collegium system is not specified in the Constitution, but instead evolved based on Supreme Court rulings in the "Three Judges Cases" (The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015; Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015). According to the Indian Express:

The Supreme Court collegium is headed by the Chief Justice of India and comprises four other seniormost judges of the court. A High Court collegium is led by its Chief Justice and four other seniormost judges of that court. Names recommended for appointment by a High Court collegium reaches the government only after
approval by the CJI [Chief Justice of India] and the Supreme Court collegium. Judges of the higher judiciary are appointed only through the collegium system — and the government has a role only after names have been decided by the collegium... [The government] can also raise objections and seek clarifications regarding the collegium's choices, but if the collegium reiterates the same names, the government is bound, under Constitution Bench judgments, to appoint them as judges. (Indian Express 15 Nov. 2016)

The Hindu, an English-language daily newspaper based in India, similarly reports that the collegium comprises "the Chief Justice of India and a forum of four senior-most judges of the Supreme Court" (The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015). However, the Hindustan Times, an English-language daily newspaper in India, notes that the collegium is comprised of "the three seniormost Supreme Court judges" (Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015).

Sources report that in 2014, the government passed the National Judicial Appointment Commission (NJAC) Act (BTI 2016, 8-9; The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015). Media sources further report that a constitutional amendment [99th constitutional amendment] was passed to facilitate the NJAC (The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015; Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015). According to The Hindu, the NJAC was intended to replace the current system of judicial appointments to the Supreme Court and high courts by collegium (The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015). Sources further note that the NJAC comprised six people: the Chief Justice, the Law Minister, two Supreme Court judges, and two "eminent" persons; the eminent persons were to be selected by a group comprising the Prime Minister, the Chief Justice, and the leader of the opposition in the Lok Sabha [lower house of parliament] (Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015; The Hindu 16 Oct. 2015). BTI notes that "[w]hile proponents of this system applaud its greater transparency, opponents highlight that the new NJAC gives the executive a greater say in the appointment of judges" (BTI 2016, 9). Media sources note that the Supreme Court struck down the NJAC in 2015 (Hindustan Times 16 Oct. 2015; Indian Express 15 Nov. 2016). According to the Hindu, the Court feared "being caught in a 'web of indebtedness' towards the government" (The Hindu 17 Oct. 2015).

The Indian Express further reports that the Supreme Court asked the government to draft a new Memorandum of Procedure to "guide future appointments," but that this has not been completed "owing to a lack of consensus on several fronts between the judiciary and the government" (Indian Express 15 Nov. 2016). Corroborating information could not be found among the sources consulted by the Research Directorate within the time constraints of this Response.

2.2 Removal of Court Judges

The Indian Express reports that "the Judges and Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of India and the state High Courts can be removed from service only through the process of impeachment under Article 124(4) of the Constitution on grounds of proven misbehaviour or incapacity" (Indian Express 29 Apr. 2010). Article 124(4) of the Constitution states that

(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. (India 1949)

The Constitution further states under Article 217(1)b) that in the case of a High Court judge, "a Judge may be removed from his office by the President in the manner provided in clause (4) of article 124 for the removal of a Judge of the Supreme Court" (India 1949).

The Indian Express further reports with regards to the impeachment process that

[as per the Judges Inquiry Act, 1968, a complaint against a Judge has to be made through a resolution either by 100 members of the Lok Sabha or 50 Rajya Sabha [Upper House of Parliament] members. After the MPs submit a duly signed motion to this effect to their respective presiding officers — Chairman of the Rajya Sabha or Speaker of the Lok Sabha — the presiding officer constitutes a three-member committee comprising two Judges — one from the Supreme Court and one Chief Justice of a High Court if the complaint is against a HC Judge; and two Supreme Court Judges if the complaint is against a sitting Judge of the apex court — and a jurist to probe the complaint and determine if it is a case fit for initiating the process of impeachment. ... After the debate ends and the Judge has been heard, if the House decides to put the motion to vote, the resolution has to be passed by two-thirds majority in both Houses in the same session. The resolution is then sent to the President, who orders removal of the Judge. (Indian Express 29 Apr. 2010)

The Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968 has been attached to this Response.

New Delhi Television (NDTV), an Indian news television network, reports that in December 2015, 58 members of the Rajya Sabha moved to seek impeachment of Gujarat High Court judge JB Pardiwala for "unconstitutional remarks" made while delivering a judgement in a case (NDTV 18 Dec. 2015). The Hindu reports that shortly after Rajya Sabha members sought to move an impeachment motion against him,
Pardiwala deleted the remarks from the judgement (The Hindu 19 Dec. 2015). Live Law, a "legal news portal" in India that seeks "to bring in more transparency in legal reporting without lowering the supremacy of law" (Live Law n.d.), reports that Justice Pardiwala was a High Court judge as of April 2017 and had recently delivered a verdict in the Gujarat Court (Live Law 12 Apr. 2017).

Media sources report that in December 2016, approximately 61 members of the Rajya Sabha moved to begin impeachment proceedings against C V Nagarjuna Reddy, a Telanagana and Andhra Pradesh High Court Justice, (Indian Express 6 Dec. 2016; New Indian Express 6 Dec. 2016) for "alleged victimisation of a Dalit district court judge and amassing assets disproportionate to his income" (Indian Express 6 Dec. 2016) or allegedly pressuring a principal junior civil judge in a criminal case (New Indian Express 6 Dec. 2016). The Hindu reports that 19 of the 61 members later withdrew their names from the impeachment petition, and thus it did not pass (The Hindu 17 Dec. 2016). The Times of India indicates that Nagarjuna Reddy was a Hyderabad High Court judge as of April 2017 (The Times of India 11 Apr. 2017).

The Business Standard, a daily business newspaper based in India, reports that three other judges have faced the "threat of impeachment" in India: former Supreme Court judge V Ramaswami, whose impeachment motion failed due to insufficient support in parliament; former Chief Justice of Sikkim High Court PD Dinakaran, who resigned before proceedings could be completed; and former Calcutta High Court judge Soumitra Sen, who was impeached in the Rajya Sabha, but resigned before the impeachment motion in the Lok Sabha could begin (Business Standard 7 Dec. 2016). Corroborating information could not be found among the sources consulted by the Research Directorate within the time constraints of this Response.

### 2.3 Judicial Salaries

Article 125 of the Constitution states that

1[(1) There shall be paid to the Judges of the Supreme Court such salaries as may be determined by Parliament by law and, until provision in that behalf is so made, such salaries as are specified in the Second Schedule.] (2) Every Judge shall be entitled to such privileges and allowances and to such rights in respect of leave of absence and pension as may from time to time be determined by or under law made by Parliament and, until so determined, to such privileges, allowances and rights as are specified in the Second Schedule:

Provided that neither the privileges nor the allowances of a Judge nor his rights in respect of leave of absence or pension shall be varied to his disadvantage after his appointment. (India 1949)

Footnote 1 for Article 125 of the Constitution provides the following: "1Subs. by the Constitution (Fifty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1986, s. 2, for cl. (1) (w.e.f. 1-4-1986)" (India 1949).

Article 221 states that

4[(1) There shall be paid to the Judges of each High Court such salaries as may be determined by Parliament by law and, until provision in that behalf is so made, such salaries as are specified in the Second Schedule.] (2) Every Judge shall be entitled to such allowances and to such rights in respect of leave of absence and pension as may from time to time be determined by or under law made by Parliament and, until so determined, to such allowances and rights as are specified in the Second Schedule: Provided that neither the allowances of a Judge nor his rights in respect to leave of absence or pension shall be varied to his disadvantage after his appointment. (India 1949)

Footnote 4 for Article 221 of the Constitution provides the following: "4Subs. by the Constitution (Fifty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1986, s. 3, for cl. (1) (w.e.f. 1-4-1986)" (India 1949).

The Times of India, a newspaper in India, reports that Supreme and High Court judges' salaries are revised every ten years (The Times of India 26 Mar. 2017). An article by Alok Prasanna Kumar, a research fellow at the Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, an independent think tank that "works with Ministries of the Government of India and State Governments, as well as other public institutions, providing research and drafting support at various stages of law-making" (Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy n.d.), published on Livemint, the online portal of India-based business newspaper Mint, indicates that "high court and Supreme Court judges' salaries have increased only thrice in 65 years" (Livemint 27 July 2015).

The Guardian notes that judges in India are underpaid in relation to lawyers, and this has decreased the quality of the judiciary (The Guardian 5 May 2016). Kumar writes that "[i]n effect, senior advocates make within the course of a hearing what judges make in a whole month, if not more," and that the pay discrepancy discourages lawyers from accepting judicial appointments in the first place (Livemint 27 July 2015). In March 2017, the Times of India reported that, the government accepted a Supreme Court’s proposal to raise salaries for Supreme and High Court judges by almost 200 percent (The Times of India 26 Mar. 2017). Further and corroborating information could not be found among the sources consulted by the Research Directorate within the time constraints of this Response.
3. Issues Facing the Judicial System

3.1 Staffing Shortages

BTI reports that the Indian judiciary's "limited functional operability, mainly due to understaffing, continues to pose a problem" (BTI 2016, 9). The Supreme Court of India reports that the country, as of 31 December 2015, has a judge-to-population ratio of 18 judges per million inhabitants, whereas the ratio in the United States is 107 per million (state level), 48 per million in Australia, and 57.4 million in England and Wales (India 2016a, 11). A 2016 article in the Guardian notes that "India has one of the world's lowest ratios of judges to population in the world, with only 13 judges for every million people, compared with 50 in developed nations" (The Guardian 5 May 2016).

According to the Department of Justice in India, via the National Mission of Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms [1],

As of 31st December, 2015, there were 4432 vacancies in the posts of [subordinate court] judicial officers, representing about 22 per cent of the sanctioned strength. In case of the High Courts, 458 of the 1079 posts, representing 42 per cent of the sanctioned strength, were vacant as of June, 2016. (India 2016b)

In May 2016, the Hindu cited Chief Justice of India (CJI) T.S. Thakur as stating that out of approximately 900 judge positions in the High Courts, over 450 were vacant, and over 170 recommended High Court appointments were still pending with the government (The Hindu 9 May 2016). A November 2016 article in the Hindustan Times, citing "official figures," reports that there are five vacant judicial positions in the Supreme Court, 464 in the High Courts, and 4,166 in the subordinate courts (Hindustan Times 15 Nov. 2016). Another article from the same source notes that "[n]early 40% of positions in the Supreme Court and high courts were vacant until mid-2016," however, following public debate around vacancies in the high courts and criticism from Thakur, the government increased judicial appointment approvals (Hindustan Times 29 Nov. 2016). The source further notes that up until November 2016, 121 judges had been appointed, including 25 who were scheduled to be appointed the following week (Hindustan Times 29 Nov. 2016).

In its "Report on Access to Justice 2016," the Supreme Court of India notes that as of 31 December 2015, the sanctioned strength of judges in the subordinate courts was 20,558 (India 2016a, 5). Data obtained from the National Judicial Data Grid (NJGD), an online portal which displays data on cases in district courts (The Hindu 19 Sept. 2015), indicates that as of 12 April 2017, there were 17,867 judges in the subordinate courts (India 12 Apr. 2017). The Supreme Court of India's "Report on Access to Justice 2016" further notes that 41,775, or 19.48 percent, of staff positions in the subordinate courts, including secretarial and support staff, are vacant (India 2016a, 5).

3.2 Case Backlogs

A 2015 BBC article reports that "more than 30 million cases are pending in [India's] courts and more than a quarter of them have been unresolved for at least five years" (BBC 13 May 2015). An April 2016 article by the same source reports that CJI Thakur stated at a conference in April 2016 that a Supreme Court judge handles 2,600 cases per year and questioned "how the country's current 21,000 judges could cope with tens of millions of cases pending" (BBC 24 Apr. 2016). A November 2016 article by the Hindustan Times notes that there is a backlog of approximately 27 million cases in India, of which 23 million are at the district and subordinate court level (Hindustan Times 17 Nov. 2016).

According to statistics provided by the National Judicial Data Grid, as of 12 April 2017, there are 24,186,566 pending cases in India's district courts, of which 2,317,448 (9.58 percent) have been pending for over ten years, and 3,975,717 (16.44 percent) have been pending for between five and ten years (India 12 Apr. 2017). Data provided by the Supreme Court of India shows 61,344 cases pending at the Supreme Court level as of 1 April 2017 (India 1 Apr. 2017).

BTI reports that "over two thirds of India's prisoners are awaiting trial" (BTI 2016, 9). Amnesty International's Report 2015/16: The State of the World's Human Rights states that "[a]s of January [2016], over 282,000 prisoners - 68 [percent] of the total prison population - were pre-trial detainees" (AI 24 Feb. 2016). Similarly, the Guardian reports that "more than 68 [percent]" of prisoners in India are pre-trial detainees (The Guardian 5 May 2016).

4. Corruption within the Judiciary and the Scale of Corruption at Different Levels

Without providing further information, US Country Reports for 2016 states that corruption in the judiciary is "widespread" (US 3 Mar. 2017, 12). In an opinion article published in the Indian Express, Upendra Baxi, a professor of law at the University of Warwick and the former vice-chancellor of the Universities of South Gujarat and Delhi (Indian Express n.d.), notes that "[s]everal chief justices of India (CJI), incumbent justices, and superannuated justices have lamented the fact that the widespread systematic governance corruptibility
has resulted in discrete acts of judicial corruption" (Indian Express 6 Mar. 2017). Markanday Katju, a retired Supreme Court judge who served from 2006 to 2011 (Indian Express 6 Jan. 2017), writes in an opinion article for the Kashmir Monitor, a Srinagar-based newspaper, that within the High Court at Allahabad,

[t]he list of most benches is hardly touched, and only fresh matters taken up. This means that if on the first hearing of a case it is adjourned for some reason (e.g. a counter affidavit is called for by the Court) the case will thereafter never come up for hearing unless a heavy bribe, often of thousands of rupees, is paid in the registry to the concerned official. (Kashmir Monitor 18 Oct. 2015)

In an article in SAIS Review, an academic journal published by the Foreign Policy Institute at the Johns Hopkins University Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Jason Miklian and Scott Carney [2] tie the judicial system into a wider system of corruption in India, noting that

[i]n India, obtaining the right paperwork to run a business means negotiating a maze of backdoor dealings for permits, payoffs to politicians and judges to ensure fast-tracked applications, and pleasing dozens of other bureaucratic vultures along the way. Operating by the letter of the law can, in fact, be a detriment; there are so many differing laws, jurisdictional squabbles, and overlapping regulations that entrepreneurial officials can target erstwhile compliant businesses for ‘fee collections,’ threatening unending court delays otherwise. (Miklian and Carney 2013, 38)

A 2015 BBC article on the link between the slow resolution of cases and corruption states that "[s]nail justice ends up benefitting the rich as witnesses can be intimidated and bought and political power can be used to influence and subdue prosecutors and sometimes judges" (BBC 13 May 2015). An article in the Guardian notes that "[t]he absence of speedy justice, vigilantism thrives. ... Corruption too, is endemic. People would rather bribe a police officer or a judge than go through the lengthy hassle of a trial" (The Guardian 5 May 2016).

Information on the scale of corruption at different levels of the judicial system in India was scarce among the sources consulted by the Research Directorate within the time constraints of this Response. Without providing further information, Freedom House’s Freedom in the World 2016 report for India states that "the lower levels of the judiciary in particular have been rife with corruption" (Freedom House 2016). The Indian Express quotes retired CJI V.N. Khare as claiming that "corruption in lower courts is no secret" (Indian Express 6 Mar. 2017). GAN Business Anti-Corruption Portal, a portal by GAN Integrity [3], which provides anti-corruption compliance resources and country risk profiles for businesses and is funded in part by the European Union European Commission's Prevention of and Fight against Crime Programme (GAN Integrity n.d.a), reports that in India, "[t]here is a high risk of corruption when dealing with India’s judiciary, especially at the lower court levels. Bribes and irregular payments are often exchanged in return for favorable court decisions" (GAN Integrity Mar. 2017).

4.1 Incidents of Alleged Corruption in the Judicial System

Media sources report the following incidents related to corruption:

- The Hindustan Times reports that in August 2015, two "lower court" judges, A D Acharya and P D Inamdar, were suspended over charges of accepting bribes in Gujarat (Hindustan Times 13 Sept. 2015).
- The Times of India reports in an April 2016 article that eight judges among the Tamil Nadu subordinate judiciary face "charges ranging from inefficiency to corruption and moral turpitude" and that actions had been taken against them by the Madras High Court (The Times of India 2 Apr. 2016).
- The Times of India reports that in June 2016, High Court justice K T Sankaran recused himself from hearings related to a gold smuggling case, citing an attempt to bribe him made on behalf of one of the accused (The Times of India 8 June 2016).
- The Indian Express reports that in July 2016, Chief Justice of Karnataka Subhro Kamal Mukherjee recused himself from a hearing involving a real estate firm after admitting that he had been offered a bribe to render a favourable judgement in the case (Indian Express 18 July 2016).
- Sources report that Chief Minister Kalikho Pul of Arunachal Pradesh alleged corruption by sitting and former Supreme Court Justices in his suicide note from August 2016 (Indian Express 23 Feb. 2017; IANS 11 Feb. 2017).
• Sources report that Tis [Tiz] Hazari District Court Senior Civil Judge Rachna Tiwari Lakhanpal was arrested in September 2016 for allegedly accepting a bribe to rule in favour of a complainant in a case (DNA 30 Sept. 2016; North India Press 30 Sept. 2016).

• The *Telegraph* (India) reports that the Supreme Court ordered an arrest warrant against Calcutta High Court Justice C.S. Karnan for contempt of court after the justice accused "several" Madras High Court judges and one Supreme Court judge of corruption (*The Telegraph* (India) 11 Mar. 2017).

This Response was prepared after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the Research Directorate within time constraints. This Response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim for refugee protection. Please find below the list of sources consulted in researching this Information Request.

**Notes**

[1] The National Mission of Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms was set up by the Ministry of Law and Justice in 2011 to "help in implementing the two major goals of increasing access by reducing delays and arrears in the system and enhancing accountability at all levels" (India n.d.d).


[3] GAN Integrity produces "compliance management software" and "[s]ince 2004, GAN has been helping companies around the world banish corporate risk and misconduct" (GAN Integrity n.d.b).

[4] The Lokayukta is state-level anti-corruption body in India that investigates corruption allegations against public servants (NDTV 12 July 2010).
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