

Cases pending in Courts

416 SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI · Will the Minister of LAW JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state ·

(a) the number of cases disposed of by the Supreme Court, High Courts, Central Administrative Tribunal and Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission etc. during the last three years,

(b) the number of cases pending in which the judgements have not yet been announced though arguments have been completed a number of times, and

(c) the steps taken by the Government for the expeditious disposal of the pending cases ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMFNTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM)

A Supreme Court and the High Courts

(a) The available information in respect of the Supreme Court and the High Courts is furnished in the Statement attached.

(b) In the Supreme Court, the total number of cases in respect of which arguments have been completed but judgments have not yet been delivered is 359. However, some of these are group matters and if a group matter is to be treated as one case the number of cases in which the judgments are yet to be delivered will be only 121.

Similar information in respect of High Courts is being collected and will be furnished

(c) Various steps have been taken to expedite disposal of pending cases in the Courts. The judge strength has been increased from time to time. Procedural improvements and modifications to speed up disposal of cases have been made. The various Courts are taking suitable steps such as grouping of cases involving common questions of law giving priority to cases requiring quick disposal, constitution of specialised benches etc. The various recommendations contained in the report of the Arrears' Committee (Malimath Committee) which went into the problem of arrears in the High Courts, have been forwarded to all concerned such as State Governments, Central Ministries and all the High Courts for similar follow up action.

The Benches are being so constituted in the Supreme Court that they function for a longer period and work so allocated that similar matters are posted before the same Bench.

B Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT) and the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (MRTPC)

(a) to (c) It may be pointed out that the CAT and MRTPC are not courts of law but specialised tribunals that have been set up for adjudicating disputes that may arise in the course of administration of specific regulatory Acts of Parliament. The desired information in respect of these two bodies is being collected and will be furnished.

STATEMENT

Name of the Court	Number of Cases Disposed of during the Year		
	1988	1989	1990
Supreme Court	44,252	48,118	56,343
<i>High Courts</i>			
1. Allahabad	60,356	51,258	26,730*
2. Andhra Pradesh	98,675	92,846	75,605
3. Bombay	64,749	53,188	54,877
4. Calcutta	37,468	44,672	21,104*
5. Delhi	30,169	37,089	32,749
6. Guwahati	7,246	9,642	8,655
7. Gujarat	20,235	19,403	9,855*
8. Himachal Pradesh	23,327	10,915(a)	Not available
9. Jammu & Kashmir	17,915	15,689	Not available
10. Karnataka	41,468	31,949	Not available
11. Kerala	70,223	1,04,595	68,014
12. Madhya Pradesh	42,397	47,003	41,747
13. Madras	64,352	99,743	1,03,023
14. Orissa	15,878	28,364	27,560
15. Patna	37,421	43,408	Not available
16. Punjab & Haryana	56,327	69,555	66,622
17. Rajasthan	26,626	26,974	28,686
18. Sikkim	96	81	57

(a) Information is for the half year ending 30-6-89

*Information is for the year ending 30-6-90

Accident of HS-748 AVRO Aircraft

417. SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any investigation has been made into the accident on 25 March, 1991 at Yelahanka air base involving a HS-748 Avro in which 28 young officers of the Indian Air Force lost their lives;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the steps taken by the Government to prevent the recurrence of such accidents in future?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Court of Inquiry which investigated the accident found that it was caused due to loss of power in the right engine of the aircraft at a critical stage soon after take off.

(c) Efforts to minimise accidents is an ongoing process. Every accident is investigated by a Court of Inquiry comprising specialists. Based on the recommendations of the Court of Inquiry, follow up action is taken to prevent recurrence of similar accidents. Whenever any adverse trend or weak area is observed, special joint studies are carried out with the help of specialists from the manufacturers and the users to look into the problem and take suitable remedial measures.