## NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY



## National Conferences of High Court Judges on Criminal Law and Human Rights

(Development of Law)

April 18-19, 2015

READING MATERIAL

COMPILED AND EDITED BY

Mr. Rajesh Suman, Assistant Professor, National Judicial Academy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. No.	Cases & Materials	P.No
1. Con Justice	stitutional Protections Afforded in the Context of the Administration of Crimi	nal
1	Shreya Singhal v Union of India 2015 Indlaw SC 211	3
2	Arnesh Kumar v State of Bihar and another 2014(8) SCALE 250	9
3	Ashok Debbarma @ Achak Debbarma v State of Tripura (2014) 4 SCC 747	1.1
4	Atul Tripathi v State of Uttar Pradesh 2014(8) SCALE 663	1.4
5	Hema Mishra v State of Uttar Pradesh 2014(1) SCALE 342	1.5
6	Hardeep Singh and others v State of Punjab 2014(1) SCALE 241	1.7
7	Dharam Pal and others v State of Haryana 2013(9) SCALE 207	27
8	Lalita Kumari v Government of Uttar Pradesh 2013(13) SCALE 559	30
9	Sarah Mathew and others v Institute of Cardio Vascular Diseases by its Director, Dr. K. M. Cherian 2013(14) SCALE 404	38
10	Satyajit Ballulbhai Desai and others v State of Gujarat 2012 Indlaw SC 638	45
11	V.K. Sasikala v. State rep. by Superintendent of Police (2012)9SCC771	48
12	Mohammed Kasab @ Abu Mujahid v. State of Maharashtra MANU/SC/0681/2012	53
13;	Ranjan Dwivedi v. C.B.I., Through the Director General (2012) 8 SCC 495	54
14	Hardeep Singh vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2011 (13) SCALE	54

The Part of the Part	ulation of International Criminal Activities: Distinction between Role of the State ole of Judiciary	
15	Ram Jethmalani and Ors. [I] v. Union of India (2011) 8 SCC 1	57
16	Abu Salem Abdul Qayyum Ansari v Central Bureau of Investigation 2013(10) SCALE 31	59
17	Abu Salem Abdul Qayoom Ansari v State of Maharashtra 2010(9) SCALE 460	61
18	Jitendra Panchal v Intelligence Officer, NCB 2009(2) SCALE 202	63
19	Sarabjit Rick Singh v Union of India2007(14) SCALE 263	64
<b>国际公共</b> 2000年	neral Principles of International Human Rights Law Applicable to the Criminal dures of Individual Nations	
20	Sher Singh @ Partapa v State of Haryana2015(1) SCALE 250	73
21	Shatrughan Chauhan and another v Union of India 2014(1) SCALE 437	76
22	Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v State of Maharashtra: (2013) 6 SCC 770	82
23	Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra 2010 Indlaw SC 1026	85
24	Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali v State (Govt. Of Nct) Delhi (2012) 2 SCC 584	89
25	Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali v. State (Govt. of NCT) Delhi MANU/SC/0700/2012	90
26	Remdeo Chauhan @ Rajnath Chauhan v. Bani Kant Das 2010(12) SCALE 184	91
27	Rajesh Kumar v. State through Govt. of NCT of Delhi (2011) 13 SCC 706	94
28	Zahira Habibulla Sheikh andAnr. v. State of Gujarat-(2004) 4 SCC 158	95
29	Rudul Sah v. State of Bihar (1983) 4 SCC 141	95
30	Manju v. State of U.P. 2013 (83) ALLCC 563-Allahabad High Court	96

I. Con	viction vs. Acquittal Debate	
31	Tomaso Bruno and another v State of Uttar Pradesh 2015 Indlaw SC 37	99
32	Adambhai Sulemanbhai Ajmeri v State of Gujarat2014(7) SCALE 100	99
33	Jumni v. State of Haryana 2014(3)SCALE588	110
34	Mangat Ram v. State of Haryana 2014(4) SCALE153	114
35	Prakash v State of Karnataka 2014(5) SCALE 83	118
36	Selvaraj @ Chinnapaiyan v State of Tamil Nadu 2014(13) SCALE 655	126
37	State of Himachal Pradesh v Raj Kumar2014(5) SCALE 218	128
38	Muralidhar @ Gidda v State of Karnataka2014(4) SCALE 693	130
39	Vijay Ranglal Chourasia and others v State of Gujarat2014 Indlaw SC 483	133
40	State of Gujarat v. Kishanbhai MANU/SC/0004/2014	135
41	Perumal v. Janaki 2014(1)SCALE406	136
42	Ramesh Vithal Patil v. State of Karnataka 2014(4) SCALE 438	139
43	Javed Masood v. State of Rajasthan (2010)3SCC538	142
44	Vajresh Venkatray Anvekar v. State of Karnataka [MANU/SC/0004/2013]	143
45	Dr. Justice V.S. Malimath, Recommendations, Part – VI, P. 265- 298, Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System, Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Chairman, Dr. Justice V.S. Malimath, India, March 2003	145
46	Michael Naughton, Gabe Tan, The need for caution in the use of DNA evidence to avoid convicting the innocent, International Journal of Evidence & Proof, 2011	179
47	Stock Witnesses-Media Report	189

- 11.		
5. Judicial Control Over Transgressions to Limit the Violation of Rights by Law Enforcement Agencies		
48	People's Union for Civil Liberties v State of Maharashtra 2014(11) SCALE 119	193
49	Mohd. Haroon and others v Union of India 2014(4) SCALE 86	196
50	Dinubhai Boghabhai Solanki v. State of Gujarat (2014)4SCC626	199
51	In Re: Indian Woman says gang-raped on orders of Village Court published in Business and Financial News (2014)4SCC786	202
52	Mithilesh Kumar Singh v State of Rajasthan 2014(14) SCALE 25	205
53	Sudesh Dogra v Union of India (2014) 6 SCC 486	210
54	Baldev Singh and another v State of Punjab2013(11) SCALE 631	214
55	Extra Judicial Execution Victim Families Association (EEVFAM) v. Union of India (2013)2SCC493	217
56	Sister Mina Lalita Baruwa v State of Orissa 2013(14) SCALE 600	219
57	Urmila Devi v. Yudhvir Singh JT2013(14)SC262	221
58	Rohtash Kumar v State Of Haryana	225
59	Prithipal Singh etc. v. State of Punjab (2012)1SCC10	228
60	Narmada Bai v State Of Gujarat 2011(4) SCALE 469	230
61	National Human Rights Commission v State of Gujarat 2009(6) SCALE 509	236
6. The	Scope of Inherent Powers u/s 482, Cr.P.C.	
62	Narinder Singh and others v State of Punjab 2014(4) SCALE 195	243
63	State of Rajasthan v Shambhu Kewat 2013(14) SCALE 235	247

64	Ghanshyam Sharma v Surendra Kumar Sharma 2014(9) SCALE 777	249
65	Surya Baksh Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh2013(12) SCALE 492	251
66	Rajiv Thapar v Madan Lal Kapoor (2013) 3 SCC 330	253
67	Imtiyaz Ahmad v. State of Uttar Pradesh 2012 (2) Scale 81	258
68	D. Venkatasubramaniam v. M.K. Mohan Krishnamachari (2009) 10 SCC 488	260
69	M/s. Pricewaterhouse Coopers Pvt. Ltd. v. Mr.C. Anthony Louis  Bombay High Court, Criminal Application No.584 of 2010- Pronounced On: 22  March, 2012	263

## Note:

Judgments have been edited in order to accommodate them in the Reading Material. The emphasis on certain paragraphs or sentences in judgments has been made in the form of bold fonts to highlight issues for discussion in the programme.