

Fourteenth Lok Sabha

**Session : 9**

**Date : 28-11-2006**

**Participants :** [Kumar Shri Shailendra](#), [Malhotra Prof. Vijay Kumar](#), [Bhardwaj Shri H.R.](#), [Bhardwaj Shri H.R.](#), [Manoj Dr. K.S.](#), [Reddy Shri Karunakara G.](#), [Yadav Shri Ram Kripal](#)

an>

Title: Shri G. Karunakara Reddy called the attention of the Minister of Law and Justice to the situation arising out of a large number of cases pending in various courts of the country for a long time and steps taken by the Government in this regard.

SHRI G. KARUNAKARA REDDY (BELLARY): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Law and Justice to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

“The situation arising out of a large number of cases pending in various courts of the country for a long time and steps taken by the Government in this regard.”

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): Sir, the Government is aware of the pendency of cases in the various courts in the country and its increasing trend. The matter of finding remedial measures to reduce the pendency of cases has been discussed with the judiciary and the State Governments in different Conferences of the Chief Ministers and Chief Justice of the High Courts, from time to time. The matter has also been looked into by the Law Commission and Committees constituted for this purpose. Though the speed of disposal of a case in the courts is primarily a judicial function, Government has taken a number of steps to facilitate reduction of pendency and backlog of cases in the courts. Important steps taken by the Government in this regard are:

(1) With a view to liquidating cases pending for long in the Sessions Courts, Government introduced a scheme of Fast Track Courts which has been extended upto 31.3.2010. These courts have disposed of 10.42 lakh cases out of 18.21 lakh cases transferred to them.[\[R10\]](#)

---

\* Placed in Library. See No. LT 5040/2006.

[\[r11\]](#)(2) Government reviews the strength of judges (in the High Courts)

triennially and ensures prompt filling up of vacancies so that administration of justice does not suffer from inadequate number of judges.

- (3) In respect of filling up of vacancies in the Subordinate Courts, a matter falling within the domain of the State Governments, the hon. Supreme Court has given directions to the States in the *Malik Mazhar Sultan* case. Government has reminded the State Governments in this regard.
- (4) Measures like encouraging alternative modes of disposal and setting up of special tribunals, etc. have been taken so that congestion in the courts is reduced.
- (5) Government provides infrastructural support for construction of court buildings and residential accommodation for judicial officers which go a long way in justice administration including criminal justice administration.
- (6) Government has initiated a scheme for application of Information and Communication Technology in the courts that would facilitate faster justice delivery including faster trials in criminal cases.

In addition, Government has, with a view to ensuring speedy disposal of cases, made appropriate changes in the Code of Criminal Procedure through Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2005. Separately, the Government has introduced the concept of 'plea bargaining' in the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005.

MR. SPEAKER: Except that, there is no reference about the pending cases.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: I will give the details.

SHRI G. KARUNAKARA REDDY : Sir, according to the information available, as on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2005, there are 27,87,979 Civil cases and 6,36,539 Criminal cases pending in various High Courts in the country. The number of pending Civil and Criminal cases in various Subordinate courts are running in crores, that is, nearly about 2.5 crore.

But, after establishment of Fast Track Courts, there is a very good disposal of cases throughout the country as the hon. Minister has referred to in his reply. But unfortunately, the vacancies in the Fast Track Courts are also not filled up timely. For example, the disposal of motor accident cases takes nearly four to six years, but I am given to understand that these cases are to be disposed of within six months. This type of delay causes great inconvenience to the victims and kins of victims in the accidents.

There is a rule that criminal cases should also be disposed of within six months from the date of charge-sheet, but in reality, this is running in years and it is not done so far. I would like to mention the famous proverb here: “Justice delayed is justice denied.

Sir, in *toto*, these delays are caused, among other reasons, mainly due to shortage of judges in various courts. According to my knowledge, in Europe, the ratio of judges is according to the population. Whereas in India, the ratio of judges with the population of India is very low, like one judge for lakhs of people whereas in Europe, one judge for some thousands of people.

The Statesman, published on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2006, states: “‘Empty Benches – Judiciary needs full financial autonomy’. The shortage of judges in law courts at all levels is the main cause for delay in disposal of cases and the huge arrears in proportion to its population, India has the lowest number of judges among the major democracies of the world. In its report of 1987 on Manpower planning, the Law Commission placed the judge population ratio at 10.05 judges per million people as against 50.09 in the United Kingdom, 57.07 in Australia, 75.02 in Canada and 107 in the United States. Against the requirement, in India in the lower courts, of 75,000 judicial officers, the sanctioned strength of judges remains just 13,000. Out of this, 1,871 courts are vacant and only 12,780 incumbents are working across the country.”

This causes delay in disposing of cases in various courts which creates lots of inconvenience like expenditure, time, etc. to the people and the people are suffering like anything with this delay in disposal of cases. If the vacancies of judges are filled in time, I think, there will be no delay in disposing of cases in various courts.

Sir, the Government should come forward seriously to see that these judiciary vacancies are filled in various courts in the country on war-footing basis.[\[r12\]](#)I also request the Union Government to create more number of posts of judges in Supreme Court and High Courts in the country and I also demand that *ad hoc* judges should also be appointed especially in Supreme Court for speedy disposal of cases.

Keeping in view of the facts above, I would like to know from the Minister whether the Union Government has taken any serious view on this matter. If so, what are the steps taken or being taken by the Union Government to fill up the vacancies of judges in various Courts in the country immediately? By what time these vacancies are likely to be filled up? Whether the Government is considering to create more posts of judges in various Courts as per the population like in Europe? If so, by what time final decision in this regard is likely to be taken?

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली): अध्यक्ष जी, अभी हमारे लॉ मिनिस्टर ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है, उसमें उन्होंने कितने केसेज़ पेंडिंग हैं, किस-किस कोर्ट में हैं, क्योंकि यह साफ तौर पर पूछा गया कि जो पेंडिंग केसेज़ हैं और जो इस समय भारत के न्यायालयों में केस पड़े हुए हैं, उनके बारे में क्या किया जा रहा है। अभी आपके सामने आंकड़े बताये हैं कि कुल मिलाकर जो देश

के 21 हाई कोर्ट्स हैं, इनके अन्दर 35.5 लाख केसेज़ पेंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं और जो सबऑर्डिनेट कोर्ट्स हैं, इनमें 2.5 करोड़ के करीब केसेज़ पेंडिंग हैं और सुप्रीम कोर्ट में 32 हजार केसेज़ पेंडिंग हैं।

अगर इतने केसेज़ पेंडिंग हैं तो इसकी प्रोब्लम है, उसकी भीणता यह जो स्टेटमेंट हैं, वह इसको रिफ्लैक्ट नहीं करती है। इनके हिसाब से जैसे आजकल केसेज़ किये जा रहे हैं, 360 साल या 400 साल लगेंगे, पिछले केसेज़ को ही निकालने में और उससे ज्यादा केसेज़ अगले आ जाएंगे तो यह जो सिस्टम है, जिसके माध्यम से हम फास्ट ट्रैक कोर्ट्स हों या दूसरी कोर्ट्स हों, उसमें सैटिस्फैक्शन व्यक्त किया है कि यह काम हो रहा है। यह भी ठीक है। जैसा अभी आपने बताया कि हाई कोर्ट्स में कितने जजेज़ की कमी है, सुप्रीम कोर्ट में कितने जजेज़ की कमी है। कुल मिलाकर 116 हाई कोर्ट्स के अन्दर जजेज़ की वेकेन्सीज़ हैं और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के अन्दर भी इस समय चार जजेज़ की वेकेन्सीज़ हैं, जितनी कि सैंक्शंड स्ट्रेंथ है। पहले तो सैंक्शंड स्ट्रेंथ बढ़ानी चाहिए, क्योंकि, कुल मिलाकर 10 लाख लोगों पर एक जज हमारे यहां पर होता है। अगर 10 लाख लोगों पर एक जज हैं तो कुल मिलाकर कितने जजेज़ की कितनी कमी है, इसका भी विचार करना चाहिए। जो सैंक्शंड स्ट्रेंथ है, वे पद भी भरे नहीं जा रहे हैं और उसके कारण यह स्थिति पैदा हो रही है।

दो बातों की ओर मैं उनका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। लोग रिटायर हो जाते हैं, मर जाते हैं, लेकिन केसेज़ पेंडिंग रहते हैं। लाखों आदमी हिन्दुस्तान की जेलों में बन्द हैं, जिनके केसेज़ 10-10 साल से चल रहे हैं। न उनका फैसला होता है और जितनी कुल सजा उनको मिलनी है, उससे ज्यादा उनको जेल में भुगतनी पड़ती है। उनकी बेल नहीं होती, कोई उनका केस लड़ने वाला नहीं है, यह भी मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह ठीक नहीं है कि आज जस्टिस सिवाय अमीर आदमी के लिए है, जो लाखों रुपये की फीस दे सकते हैं। वह फीस दिये बिना किसी गरीब आदमी को न्याय मिलना कठिन है। एक गरीब आदमी को अगर मौत की सजा हो जाती है तो वह कुछ नहीं कर सकता। एक अमीर आदमी है, वह अच्छा वकील कर सकता है, जिससे वह सजा से बरी हो जाता है। इसीलिए जो यह बात कही थी कि **Our system is lengthy, inefficient, full of uncertainty and expensive.** इतना ज्यादा यह मुश्किल है कि किसी गरीब आदमी के लिए कोर्ट में केस लड़ना असम्भव हो गया है, क्योंकि सालों लग जाते हैं, लाखों रुपये फीस के लग जाते हैं और इस प्रकार की स्थिति पैदा होती है। गरीब आदमी को न्याय मिले, इसके लिए हम क्या कर रहे हैं, इसके लिए विचार करना चाहिए।

1992 में मुम्बई बम ब्लास्ट का केस हुआ। ठीक सी समय 1992 में ही अमेरिका में ट्रेड सेंटर के ऊपर इसी प्रकार से बम ब्लास्ट हुआ था। वहां के ट्रेड सेंटर के केस का फैसला 1994 में आ गया, जबकि हमारे यहां 14 साल के बाद अब जाकर उसके बारे में फैसला आ रहा है। यहां पर प्रियदर्शिनी मट्टू के केस में फैसला आने में कितने साल लगे, इसको हम देखें। [\[R13\]](#) चाहे वे केस मजदूरों के हों, चाहे गरीब आदमी के केसेज हों, चाहे सब ऑर्डिनेट कोर्ट्स के केसेज हों, इन सभी के अंदर बहुत ही भीण स्थिति है। अगर इसमें कोई क्रांतिकारी कदम नहीं उठाए गए, ज्यादा जजेज अप्वाइंट नहीं किए गए, जजेज का टाइम नहीं बढ़ाया गया या उनकी छुट्टियों के बारे में विचार किया जाए, चाहे आप जजेज के नंबर बढ़ाए और उनका टाइम शेड्यूल तय करिए कि ये केसेज खत्म होने चाहिए। जिनका टाइम शेड्यूल आपने तय किया कि छः महीने में होंगे, उनमें भी दस-दस साल से ऊपर हो रहे हैं। यह बहुत जरूरी है कि यहां पर एक टाइम फ्रेम बना दिया जाए और उसके अंदर उनका फैसला किया जाए। जो छोटे पैटी केसेज हैं, इनके बारे में भी ऐसा विचार करना चाहिए। फास्ट ट्रैक में कुल मिलाकर अब तक दस लाख केसेज निकले हैं, अगर ढाई-तीन करोड़ केसेज हैं और उसमें से एक साल में दस लाख निकलते हैं, तो आप इसका अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं। उसके बाद बीस लाख केसेज और आ जाएंगे, इस तरह यह बैकलॉग बढ़ता ही जाएगा। माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट दिया है, मैं समझता हूं कि बहुत ही निराशाजनक है। इससे ऐसी स्वर्णिम लकीर नहीं दिखायी देती कि इस मामले में सचमुच कोई फैसला होगा और जनता को राहत मिलेगी। उनको इस बारे में कोई क्रांतिकारी कदम उठाना चाहिए।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, you know that we had two notices. Since then, some other hon. Members have given notices. As it is an important matter, I have got nine notices. Of course, I am not obliged to do it. I cannot call all of them. I will call serially as we have got it.

Now, Shri Shailendra Kumar. Please put questions only.

श्री शैलेन्द्र कुमार (चायल) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आपने बोलने का मौका दिया, उसके लिए मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ। ध्यानाकर्षण प्रश्न जो सम्मानित जी. करुणाकर रेड्डी जी और मल्होत्रा जी ने रखा है, यह देश के लिए चिंता का विषय है। जैसा कि अभी सम्माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने विचार रखे हैं और यह बात सही है कि आज समय पर सस्ता न्याय नहीं मिल पा रहा है। जिसकी अवधारणा के लिए सदन से हर जगह चर्चा होती रही है। मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि एक तो यह व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि चाहे वह निचली अदालत हो या हाई कोर्ट हो या सुप्रीम कोर्ट हो, उसमें जजों का भी आक्षण होना आप सुनिश्चित करें, तभी जाकर हमें न्याय मिल पाएगा।

दूसरी बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जजों की संख्या बढ़ायी जाए और उसको फिल-अप किया जाए। जिस प्रकार से मुकदमे लंबित पड़े हुए हैं, जो फास्ट ट्रैक आपने बनाए हैं, उस कोर्ट की संख्या में भी वृद्धि करें, तभी जाकर जो देश के अंदर लाखों मुकदमे लंबित पड़े हैं, उनका समय पर निपटारा किया जा सकेगा।

DR. K.S. MANOJ (ALLEPPEY): Thank you, Sir. I would straightaway put my questions. There is a longstanding demand from the Government of Kerala to establish a High Court Bench in Trivandrum. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India is contemplating to establish a High Court Bench in Trivandrum considering the long pendency of the cases.

Sir, some of the members have pointed out that the ratio in respect of population and judges is far low in our country. I would like to know whether the Government is contemplating to increase the number of Benches in the High Court and likewise in the District Courts also.

श्री राम कृपाल यादव (पटना) : महोदय, जो आंकड़े उपलब्ध हैं, खासतौर पर बिहार राज्य के बारे में, हाई कोर्ट में केसेज पेंडिंग हैं, उनकी संख्या 90 हजार से एक लाख है और जो निचली अदालत हैं, उसमें लगभग 12 लाख केसेज पेंडिंग हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत पुराने समय से ये केसेज पेंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं। निचली अदालत में बड़े पैमाने पर जजों की भी रिक्तियां हैं और हाई कोर्ट में भी कुछ रिक्तियां हैं। मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इतने लंबे समय से जो केसेज बिहार में पेंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं, उसके लिए आप अपने स्तर पर क्या कार्यवाही करने जा रहे हैं, ताकि जजों की नियुक्ति हो जाए और बारह लाख और एक लाख जो हाई कोर्ट और निचली अदालत में पेंडिंग पड़े हुए केसेज हैं, वे निपादित हो जाएं, ताकि आम लोगों को राहत मिल सके। [v14]

SHRI H.R.BHARDWAJ: Sir, I am very grateful to you and the hon. Members, who have drawn attention of the Government on this very important issue. I am reminded of the first Resolution brought by your esteemed father, Shri N.C. Chatterjee during Nehru's time, for giving a speedy and inexpensive justice to the country. Drawing inspiration from that Resolution, Nehru intervened in the debate and assured the establishment of the first Law Commission in the country, and since then a lot of efforts have been made. I am proud to say that this country has a wide network of courts in the country at all levels; and institution of cases, year after year, is on the increase.

Sir, firstly, I would like to give a brief account of the pendency of cases in the various courts because the hon. Members wanted it. Then, I would come to the responsibilities of various stakeholders in this.

With regard to the Judges, I would like to first make it very clear, and I need not quote the Constitution, that there are two kinds of courts in the country -- the superior courts, namely, the Supreme Court and the High Courts; and then the subordinate courts. The Supreme Court of India and the High Court of Delhi come in the administrative control of the Central Government and the Union Territory. Rest of the courts -- High Courts as well as the subordinate courts -- have to be funded by the States. But what has happened is that over the years, adequate finances have not been provided to the justice administration, namely, the funds required for increasing the judges ratio. And, we are aware that the Judiciary has been asking for this ratio. But the State Governments have not yet agreed to provide those funding... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): You offer subsidy... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, this is a very important matter; you should not interrupt him.

Hon. Minister, you please carry on.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, about the pendency, in the High Courts, the number of pendency is 42 lakhs. In the Supreme Court, it is about 38,000 cases pending. In the subordinate courts, the pendency is more; it is about 2.5 crore.

Sir, if you go into it, most of the cases, which are pending in the subordinate courts, are located in various States. The major pendency of these 2.5 crore cases is in the major States only. I would briefly touch upon it. Andhra Pradesh has got about nine lakh cases pending; Bihar has got more than 12 lakh cases pending; Gujarat has got more than 39 lakh cases pending; Karnataka has got more than 10 lakh cases pending; Maharashtra has got more than 40 lakh cases pending; Orissa has got more than nine lakh cases pending; Rajasthan has got about 10 lakh cases pending; Uttar Pradesh has got about 42 lakh cases pending; West Bengal has got about 19 lakh cases pending; Punjab has got about five lakh cases pending; and Haryana has got about five lakh cases pending in the subordinate courts. So, these cases are spread out in the country. So, this comes to about 2.5 crore cases pending in various States.

Sir, you will ask me: "What have you done to reduce this pendency?" I requested the hon. Prime Minister to convene a joint meeting of the Chief Ministers, Chief Justice of India and the Chief Justices of various High Courts to find a solution as to what should be done. I would simply quote from the Resolution that all the States agreed to the Resolution for financing the strength of the subordinate courts and the High Courts. All the parties expressed the concern on huge pendency in the subordinate courts and stressed the need to find ways and means. This is part of the Resolution. [\[r15\]](#)

So, thereafter, what the NDA Government provided was Rs.500 crore from the Finance Commission. This Government extended that allocation in the Budget for continuing the assistance in the Session Courts. Now, the session courts have been eased of the pendency by providing financial assistance. The State Governments have been approached by me time and again. It is not that I have not approached them. I asked them to improve the strength of the judges. Frankly, they said they have no money. This is where we are struck up. I would need the help of this august

House, cutting across the Party lines, to give strength to this issue so that the States as well as the Centre can sit together and find ways and means to get rid of this pendency. It is not beyond our capacity to finish the arrears.

Our courts have examined the trend of disposal of cases. A High Court judge decides about 2,300 cases every year. A single judge decides within a year 2,300 cases. That is a good ratio. In Uttar Pradesh, it is much more but yet the pendency is more because it is a vast State where the pendency and institution are there. But institution is more than the disposal. Disposal continues at the same rate. There is no decline in disposal of cases. As much as the cases are instituted, they are disposed. The pendency is not being wiped out because we are not adding to the strength of the judges. So, this is where the hon. Members should help so that the States should come forward to give more funds for the justice administration.

After all, there is a Law Minister in every State. I am prepared to share my responsibility with your help and grapple with this. We have demonstrated that we are willing to help. We are granting about Rs.1,000 crore for updating the judicial infrastructure during these three years and we are giving free facility of computerization to the States. We have provided Rs.500 crore again for fast track courts. But no facilities and financial support are forthcoming from the States. You cannot blame me for all this. Therefore, I want this House to emphasize that let all the concerned do their work in this direction so that the pendency in the trial courts to the tune of two crores are wiped out. Some States have been very forthcoming. We have done a lot of works in West Bengal. They have brought conciliation, ADR to wipe out the arrears. Some other States are also doing the same. Most of the cases, which are pending, are petty cases in criminal courts.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Some financial help is required.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you carry on

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: I want to clarify this that wherever the problem lies, if I had the powers to give you the finance, I would have readily agreed. But you know my constraints. Within my own Budget, I can provide you the money. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not take notice of any interruption. Otherwise, interruptions will go on mounting.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, now you will ask me about my job. Regarding the vacancy position, I inherited 350 vacancies in the High Courts. I have wiped out 271 out of them. Within these two years, I am going to zero in on the vacancy position in all the High Courts. This is the time for that.

I have reviewed the strength of the High Courts, and I am adding more judges in the High Courts. But, of course, you know I will have to get the concurrence of the States because it is they who would have to agree and most of the States have already been approached that they should add more judges. For instance, the State of Uttar Pradesh will require 50 more judges. The State Government may or may not agree to finance this. Once they agree, they will be immediately

appointed. Some States have done very well. Uttar Pradesh has disposed of more cases. As a matter of fact, their disposal rate is very good but yet their institution of cases is more.

In the Supreme Court, there were four vacancies. I have already received three proposals. So, these recommendations have to come there. The litigation of High Courts and Supreme Court is being co-ordinated very well but the problem is in the subordinate courts where there are petty cases under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. There are 15000 cases of one type. They can be disposed of by just one order if they just relax the norms. So, all these innovations we will have to do. But the main problem is, we will have to again call the Chief Ministers, Law Ministers of the States, Registrars and Law Secretaries to discuss that they should provide more funds and they should provide it from their side<sup>[MSOffice16]</sup>.

I have already approached the Union Government to give me more facilities in the magisterial courts. As a matter of fact, I have requested that this financial assistance which is being given for fast track courts in the Sessions courts, should also be extended to the Magistrates' Courts. Recently, I have examined it. The real problem lies in the village side. As you introduced the West Bengal Conciliation Mechanism, all States should use this ADR system so that small cases can be disposed of at the block level. Thereafter, we have requested again to set up Grameen Nyayalayas for the villages. Sir, I have already worked on another Bill of the Grameen Nyayalayas where the judges will go to the doorsteps of the poor people and resolve their disputes at the threshold. If this scheme is implemented, it will be better. I have written to the States. Some States have co-operated also. There also, the Centre will be willing to help the States to establish these Grameen Nyayalayas. I need only 7,000 judges to go to the block level and dispose of these cases. This revolution is possible.

We are doing so much in other matters, but justice administration is our least priority everywhere. I am fighting every inch of this ground for the benefit of the States, but you kindly give me strength within your respective States so that we get more money, more judges' strength. I have no dispute with Shri Reddy who has initiated this debate. All the points which he has mentioned are valid points. The judges' ratio in India is very poor. We can increase it. You will remember that when the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was there, the Chief Justice of India and the Prime Minister clashed on the stage about allocation of money for justice administration.

You cannot simply blame me. This is a matter which deserves utmost attention at all levels. All the stakeholders must come forward. Sir, I am very grateful to you. I am doing my best to introduce ADR, plea-bargaining, Grameen Nyayalayas, but we must jointly meet it. There is no partisanship into it. No single Law Minister of this country can do it for the whole country. We will have to co-operate and we will have to sit together as we do in National Development Council or National Integration Council. This is an issue where we will have to jointly fight the arrears so that we have the first-rate system in the country and the people of the country live freely.

Sir, I have worked on my brief very well. Within the Supreme Court, I have already worked on increasing the strength of judges. Every three years, we review it with the Chief Justice of India. We will appoint about 100 more judges within this year and increasing the strength, but I will have to take the permission of Chief Ministers of the States because unless they agree, I cannot sanction



this. Similarly, the vacancies which are still pending in the States, have to be filled by the High Court and the respective State Governments in the subordinate Judiciary, and they should agree to more judges' strength. I have written to them and I will write to them again.

Possibly, I will call another meeting of Chief Ministers, Chief Justices and Chief Justice of India to see how we can find mutually a system where money is provided. My difficulty is that when I ask for more money for States to be given in the matter of subordinate Judiciary, the constitutional hitch comes between. You know very well, Sir, that this funding of the subordinate courts is not within my domain. So, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have raised this issue. I promise, Sir, that I will push this issue again with the stakeholders and authorities which are involved, and the Central Government will be definitely willing to increase the strength of judges in the Supreme Court and the High Courts.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister ...

... (*Interruptions*)

श्री शैलेन्द्र कुमार : आपने आरक्षण के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा है।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कृपया आप बैठिए।

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: When the Speaker, when the Chair is speaking, you interrupt him also.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, from very high quarters, a suggestion has been made for more sittings or reducing the holidays. Is there any proposal on that?

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, I am very glad that you have raised this issue. This year this issue ... (*Interruptions*)

चौधरी विजेन्द्र सिंह (अलीगढ़) : महोदय, मुझे एक मिनट बोलने का मौका दे दीजिए।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कृपया आप बैठ जाइए।

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, I am very sorry that such a matter is being laughed at.

You just listen. Hon. Speaker has raised an issue and I have to reply to it. Please give me one minute.[\[s17\]](#)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, you can understand the agony of the Speaker also.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ : Yes. I am very much concerned, and I share your agony. I raised this issue. This issue was raised to the Chief Justice of India (CJI) directly by the highest quarters. This year, the Supreme Court (SC) held regular sittings during the vacations.

In Gujarat, an initiative has been taken by holding evening shifts. There are other States that are prepared to follow it. All States will have to do it. I recently went to Karnataka, and they have sat on Saturday. They have also said that they will sit on one more day in the week. Therefore, this initiative is being taken, but the Executive must share its responsibility by providing them funds for it, so that it is up-to-date. One cannot do it without money, and the required strength of the judges.

In England, they provided recorders and other things for two years, and disposed of their arrears. We will have to follow this. Therefore, I seek cooperation from various States that they should also follow it. I am in continuous dialogue with them on those traditions -- which the English left here -- that you go on furlough, and have more vacancies. They are willing to reduce their vacancies, and increase the working days.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

-----