

SHRI GHANSHYAM OZA : The price is not controlled under any legislation ; because it is a State subject. It is for the States to make any enactment if they so choose to. The Centre has nothing to do with it.

श्री भान सिंह भौरा : मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से यह जानना चाहता हूँ, उन्होंने अभी कहा कि यह स्टेट सबजेक्ट है, आजकल पंजाब में ईटों का रेट 80 रुपये प्रति हजार हो गया है, तो क्या इसको आप कंट्रोल करने को तैयार है ? क्योंकि यह तो आपके ही मातहत है, वहाँ प्रेसीडेंट्स रूल है ।

SHRI GHANSHYAM OZA : He may draw the attention of the Punjab Government to this aspect. As I said, the price has risen from Rs. 6 to Rs. 10, according to our information. It is not a subject with which the Centre is directly concerned. We will pass on this information to the State Government.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्या मंत्री महोदय के ध्यान में यह बात है कि इस समय ईटों के दाम सारे देश के अंदर क्या चल रहे हैं ?…… (व्यवधान)…… यह बड़े महत्व का सवाल है । यह जो सारे देश में असमानता है उसके लिए मंत्री महोदय कौन से उपाय करने जा रहे हैं ?

Setting up of Benches of High Courts outside Headquarters

*946. **SHRI BALATHANDAYUTHIAM :** Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state :

(a) which of the High Courts in India have established Benches at places other than the Headquarter of such High Courts ;

(b) whether Governments of Tamil Nadu and Kerala have been pressing for permission to establish a Bench at Madurai and Trivandrum respectively ;

(c) if so, the action taken on their requests; and

(d) the principle involved in permitting certain High Courts alone in setting up Benches outside headquarters ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY) : (a) and (d). A statement giving the requisite information is laid on the Table of the House.

(b) and (c). There is no proposal either from the Government of Tamil Nadu or from the Government of Kerala for the establishment of a Bench of the High Court at a place other than the principal seat of the High Court.

Statement

(1) The following High Courts have Benches at places other than the principal seat of the High Court :-

| Name of High Court | Principal Seat | Benches |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1. Allahabad High Court | Allahabad | Lucknow |
| 2. Madhya Pradesh High Court | Jabalpur | Gwalior and Indore |
| 3. Bombay High Court | Bombay | Nagpur. |

(d) Formerly there was a Chief Court of Oudh at Lucknow serving the Oudh region of Uttar Pradesh and the High Court of Allahabad serving the rest of the Province. By the United Provinces High Court (Amalgamation) Order, 1948, the High Court in Allahabad and the Chief Court in Oudh in Lucknow were amalgamated into a single High Court by the name of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad. It was found necessary for the administration of justice to have a Bench at Lucknow to exercise jurisdiction in respect of cases arising in such areas in Oudh as the Chief Justice of the High Court may direct. Accordingly, the Lucknow Bench was set up in 1948.

Previously there was a High Court at Nagpur. After re-organisation of States when this area became part of the State of Maharashtra with Headquarters at Bombay, it was decided to continue one High Court for the whole State with its principal seat at Bombay and a Bench

at Nagpur. Section 41 of the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960 provided for a Bench of the Bombay High Court at Nagpur to exercise jurisdiction and power of the High Court in respect of cases arising in the Districts of Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Ycotal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara, Chanda and Rajura. The Bench at Nagpur was set up in pursuance of this provision.

Gwalior and Indore were important seats of administration of the former princely States. With the merger of the States, the territory of Madhya Bharat was created and later the State of Madhya Pradesh came into being. The Benches of the Madhya Pradesh High Court at Gwalior and Indore were set up under Section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 in order to maintain the continuity of the facilities earlier available to the people of the various areas.

In all these cases the decision to set up Benches was taken in the public interest, i. e. in the interest of administration of justice and for the convenience of the litigants, who had been used to these facilities at those places.

SHRI BALATHANDAYUTHAM : Is the Government aware that the poor peasants of Kanyakumari district of Tamil Nadu and Southern parts of Kerala have been persistently demanding a bench in Madurai for Tamil Nadu and a bench at Trivandrum for Kerala, because they have to travel hundreds of miles—it is nearly 400 miles from Kanyakumari to Madras since the reorganisation of States ?

SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY : No such request has come to the Government so far.

SHRI BALATHANDAYUTHAM : Will Government consider such a proposal if it comes from the Government of Tamil Nadu or from the people ?

SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY : It is for the State Government to take a decision and if the State Government approaches the Central Government, the matter would be considered here.

SHRI T. BALAKRISHNIAH : The principle is that justice has to be carried to the door of the people. If so, will the Government co-

sider the reorganisation of the judicial department and establish additional benches in places other than the State headquarters ? Will Government consider establishing an additional bench at Tirupathi in Andhra Pradesh ?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE) : This question was considered on more than one occasion. The Law Commission gave a definite opinion that constitutions of benches, whether of the High Courts or of the Supreme Court, at other places will lead to the efficiency of the courts being impaired. So, they were positively against any demand for constituting benches. The Chief Justice of India also took the view that unless it was imperative in public interest, such a demand should not be encouraged. As hon. members know, the High Courts of Allahabad, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay have benches in some other places where it was found necessary in public interest, therefore, if at a particular place in public interest it is thought necessary, the best authority to consider it in the first instance is the State Government in consultation with the Chief Justice of the High Court. If a proposal is made and if public interest requires it, certainly such a proposal will be considered.

Decrease in orders for wagons placed with Indian Standard Wagon Company Ltd., Burnpore

*948. **SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state :

(a) Whether orders placed with the Indian Standard Wagon Company Ltd., Burnpore for Railway wagons have decreased over the orders for previous years;

(b) if so, the reasons for the decrease ;

(c) whether he is aware that due to shortage of orders, Indian Standard Wagon management is laying off its workers and may retrench some of them; and

(d) whether orders for wagons will be increased in the near future ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI) : (a) Yes, Sir.