

# NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY

**P-1048:** National Judicial Conference for High Court Justices

22<sup>nd</sup> -24<sup>th</sup> September, 2017

**Programme Coordinator** : Dr. Amit Mehrotra, Assistant Professor, NJA, Bhopal

**No. of Participants** : 18

**No. of forms received** : 09

I. OVERALL				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The objective of the Program was clear to me	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	-	-
b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	<b>66.67</b>	<b>33.33</b>	-	-
c. Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	<b>100.00</b>	-	-	-
d. I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	-	-
e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	-	-
II. KNOWLEDGE				
PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
The program provided knowledge (or provided links / references to knowledge) which is:				
a. Useful to my work	<b>66.67</b>	<b>33.33</b>	-	-
b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	<b>75.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>	-	-
c. Up to date	<b>100.00</b>	-	-	-
d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	-	-

e. Related to International Legal Norms	<b>37.50</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>12.50</b>	-
<b>III. STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM</b>				
<b>PROPOSITIONS</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
a. The structure and sequence of the program was logical	<b>66.67</b>	<b>33.33</b>	-	-
b. The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz.				
(i) Group discussions cleared many doubts	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	-	-
(ii) Interactive sessions were fruitful	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	-	-
<i>(To be modified as per the sessions planned)</i>				
<b>IV SESSIONS WISE VETTING</b>				
<b>Parameters</b>				
<b>Session</b>	<b>Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized</b>		<b>The Session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons</b>	
	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory	Effective and useful	satisfactory
1	<b>100.00</b>	-	<b>100.00</b>	-
2	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>
3	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>
4	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>
5	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>
6	<b>77.78</b>	<b>22.22</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>
7	<b>100.00</b>	-	<b>100.00</b>	-
8	<b>100.00</b>	-	<b>100.00</b>	-
9	<b>100.00</b>	-	<b>100.00</b>	-
<b>V. PROGRAM MATERIALS</b>				
<b>PROPOSITIONS</b>	<b>To a great extent</b>	<b>To some extent</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
a. The Program material is useful and relevant	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	-	-
b. The content was updated. It	<b>100.00</b>	-	-	-

reflected recent case laws/ current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area				
c. The content was organized and easy to follow	<b>88.89</b>	<b>11.11</b>	-	-
<b>VIII. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS</b>				
a. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme	<p>1. It made may more confident that I was not done in many of my perceived implements in the discharge of my duties.</p> <p>2. Regarding PMLA, IPR &amp; Tribunals jurisdiction.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. 1. Comprehensive discussion; 2. Related discussion M.I.P.R.; 3. Detailed discussion on supervisory power of High Court.</p> <p>5. <i>Session 3: Supervisory power of High Courts over Subordinate Courts: Monitor and Mentor; Session 4: IPR in India: Emerging Trends and Session 7: Tribunalization of Justice in India: Boon or Bane.</i></p> <p>6. Come across different ideas.</p> <p>7. 1. Developments in constitutional laws; 2. Economic offences and laws to deal with them; 3. IPR- role of judiciary.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. Interaction and sharing experiences with judges of different High Courts broadens our perspective on issues discussed.</p>			
b. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why	<p>1. The practical aspects and the free and frank interactions/ discussion.</p> <p>2. IPR- was more lively and interactive.</p> <p>3. <i>Session 2: Evolution of economic crimes: Money Laundering, Bribery and Corruption; Session 4: IPR in India: Emerging Trends.</i></p> <p>4. All sessions were very useful.</p> <p>5. <i>Session 8: Effect of Tribunalization and Judicial Review Contours.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Session 2: Evolution of economic crimes: Money Laundering, Bribery and Corruption; Session 3: Supervisory power of High Courts over Subordinate Courts: Monitor and Mentor; Session 4: IPR in India: Emerging Trends; Session 5: Role of the Judiciary in IPR Evolution and Adjudication; Session 6: Jurisdictional Issues in Trademark, Copyright &amp; Patent Disputes: Law and Practice; Session 7:</i></p>			

	<p><i>Tribunalization of Justice in India: Boon or Bane and Session 8: Effect of Tribunalization and Judicial Review Contours.</i></p> <p>7. <b>Session 1:</b> <i>Developments in the Area of Constitutional Law</i>; <b>Session 3:</b> <i>Supervisory power of High Courts over Subordinate Courts: Monitor and Mentor</i>; <b>Session 4:</b> <i>IPR in India: Emerging Trends</i>; <b>Session 5:</b> <i>Role of the Judiciary in IPR Evolution and Adjudication</i>; <b>Session 6:</b> <i>Jurisdictional Issues in Trademark, Copyright &amp; Patent Disputes: Law and Practice</i>; <b>Session 7:</b> <i>Tribunalization of Justice in India: Boon or Bane</i> and <b>Session 8:</b> <i>Effect of Tribunalization and Judicial Review Contours.</i></p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. None.</p>
<p>c. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>	<p>1. The purely Academic i.e. the explaining of the written statutory provisions.</p> <p>2. <b>Session 1:</b> <i>Developments in the Area of Constitutional Law</i>- It could have been more elaborate &amp; subject respectful.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. None</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. <b>Session 6:</b> <i>Jurisdictional Issues in Trademark, Copyright &amp; Patent Disputes: Law and Practice.</i></p> <p>7. History behind development of constitutional permissions as those and only of academic importance now.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. The session in which we discussed IPR related issues because in High Court of Allahabad there are handily any such matters.</p>
<p>d. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p>	<p>1. The programmes have to have more practical facets of what actually the judges face while working.</p> <p>2. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. No suggestion required from my side as excellent arrangements were made.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. More programmes be agenzied on new laws particularly useful for commercial litigation.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. If a resume of the proceedings in each session in circulated amongst participants, it may serve NJA's purpose better.</p>