



J&K JUDICIAL ACADEMY e-NEWSLETTER



Official Newsletter of Jammu & Kashmir Judicial Academy

Volume 7

Monthly

January 2024



Patron-in-Chief
Hon'ble Mr Justice
N. Kotiswar Singh
Chief Justice

Governing Committee
Hon'ble Mr Justice
Sanjeev Kumar
Chairman

Hon'ble Mr Justice Javed Iqbal Wani
Hon'ble Mr Justice Rahul Bharti
Hon'ble Ms Justice Moksha Khajuria Kazmi

Members

Editor
Mr. Yash Paul Bourney
Director

Composed by
Ms. Vishali Razdan
Computer Operator

LEGAL JOTTINGS

"We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented."

... Elie Wiesel, Nobel laureate and survivor of a holocaust (September 30, 1928 – July 02, 2016)

CONTENTS

From Editor's Desk	2
Supreme Court Judgments.....	3
High Court Judgments.....	10
Activities during the month	11



From the Editor's Desk

Professor Andrzej Rzeplinski, President of the Constitutional Tribunal of Poland once observed:

“Being a judge is as equally beautiful and utterly absorbing, as being a doctor or being a scholar. The profession of being a judge is not a good career for persons who do not possess a sufficiently well-established sense of personal and professional dignity, the virtue of personal integrity, impeccable past, professional and practical knowledge, social and family maturity, and personal maturity to be able to assume full responsibility for every judgment passed in accordance with the law and with their own conscience.”

A judicial officer has to be possessed of excellence not only from within but he should also visibly display the functional excellence which is necessary to fulfil the constitutional promise of justice by the judiciary as a whole. Four qualities are needed in a judicial officer which are symptomatic of functional excellence. They are:

- i. Punctuality; ii. Probity;
- iii. Promptness; and iv. Patience.

When a judge sits on trial, he himself is on trial. Any action which may shake that foundation is not permitted. Once having assumed the judicial office, the judicial officer is a judge for 24 hours. It is a mistaken assumption for any holder of judicial office to say that I am a judge from 10.0 to 5.0 and from 5.0 to onwards it is his private life. A judge is constantly under public gaze. The trust and confidence of 'we the people' in judiciary stands on the bedrock of its ability to dispense justice fearlessly and impartially. Society is fully entitled to expect that a Judge must be a man of high integrity, honesty and has moral vigour, ethical firmness and is also impervious to corrupt or venial influences. The behavior and conduct of members of the judiciary inside as well as outside the court must re-affirm the faith of public in the impartiality and independence of the judiciary. Judges should be courteous to members of bar as well as to the litigant public not only that they deserve any special treatment but because it is for them only that courts which they preside over have been created. Besides, judges must avoid association with individual members of the Bar, particularly those who practice in their courts and should not permit any member of their own families and other close relatives, if a member of the Bar, to appear or even associate in any manner with a cause to be dealt with by them. Above all, every Judicial Officer need to prepare an action plan for the courts he presides over and start working on it right from the very beginning. Working towards realization of the ends of Justice to one and all particularly the deprived/marginalized sections of society is a solemn duty and fortunate are those who have been entrusted this heavenly task.

Citation: 2024 Livelaw (Sc) 7

Neeraj Sharma v. The State Of Chhattisgarh

Decided On: January 03, 2024

The Supreme Court in the context of Section 364-A (Kidnapping For Ransom) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, observed that apart from proving the act of abduction, the prosecution must also prove the demand of ransom along with the threat to the life of the abducted person.

“The necessary ingredients which the prosecution must prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, before the Court are not only an act of kidnapping or abduction but thereafter the demand of ransom, coupled with the threat to life of a person who has been kidnapped or abducted, must be there.,” observed Justices Sudhanshu Dhulia and Satish Chandra Sharma.

The case revolved around a horrific incident where an attempt was made by the accused to kill the victim, an 18-year-old boy, who was studying as a Class 12th student.

After perusing the relevant documents, the Court concluded that the prosecution had miserably failed to establish the ransom demand. The Court noted that, as per the prosecution, the complainant's father received a phone call from which a demand for ransom was made. The phone call was allegedly traced to one Ravi Kumar Dwivedi, the third accused, later acquitted by the Trial Court. However, the Court observed that no evidence was placed on record to establish the ransom demand.

“However, in order to come under the ambit of Section 364-A, something more than abduction is required, which is demand of ransom. We do not find that there was a demand of ransom as alleged by the prosecution. There is no worthwhile evidence placed by the prosecution in this regard.,” the Court opined.

Citation: 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 8

Perumal Raja @ Perumal v. State Rep. by The Inspector Of Police.

Decided on: January 04, 2024

The Supreme Court (on January 03), in a crucial judgment with respect to section 27 of the Evidence Act, reiterated the three conditions to invoke this provision. While doing so, the bench of Justices Sanjiv Khanna and S.V.N. Bhatti relied upon Mohmed Inayatullah v. State of Maharashtra., (1976) 1 SCC 828.

The first condition is the discovery of a fact. This fact should be relevant in consequence of information received from an accused person. The second condition is that the discovery of such a fact must be deposed to. The rationale is that a fact already known to the police would fall foul and not meet this condition. The third condition is that at the time of receipt of the information, the accused must be in police custody (regarding police custody, the Court clarified that it is not just custody after formal arrest and will include any sort of restraint or surveillance by the police). The last but the most important condition is that only "so much of the information" as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered is admissible. The rest of the information has to be excluded.

“The word 'distinctly' is used to limit and define the scope of the information and

means 'directly', 'indubitably', 'strictly' or 'unmistakably'. Only that part of the information which is clear, immediate and a proximate cause of discovery is admissible," the Court explained.

Additionally, it must be noted that, in the said case, Court clarified that discovery of fact also includes knowledge of the accused person. Thus, this fact discovery cannot be just equated to the object found. The see findings were supported by precedents like State (NCT of Delhi) v. Navjot Sandhu alias Afsan Guru., (2005) 11 SCC 600. Apart from this, the Court also delved into the interpretation of the expression 'custody' used in this Section. The Court held that 'custody' does not mean formal custody and includes any kind of restriction, restraint, or even surveillance by the police.

2024 LiveLaw (SC) 13

Darshan Singh v. The State of Punjab

Decided on: January 04, 2024

The Supreme Court while allowing the criminal appeal of the accused-appellant, observed that during a trial, the prosecution could not seek to prove a fact that the witness has not stated in his/her statement under Section 161 (Examination of witnesses by police) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

If witnesses had failed to mention in their statements, under Section 161 of the CrPC, about the involvement of an accused, their subsequent statement before the court during the trial regarding the involvement of that particular accused could not be relied upon.

The Court observed that there was no eye-witness to the incident, and the prosecution's case rested on circumstantial evidence. Thus, the Court observed that the circumstances from which an inference of guilt is sought to be drawn must be cogently and firmly established. The Court scrutinized the most important circumstance of the appellant.

Thereafter, the Court relied on Trimukh Maroti Kirkan v. State of Maharashtra wherein, the Court had pointed out two important consequences that play out when an offence is said to have taken place in the privacy of a house. First, was that in such cases, the burden would be of a comparatively lighter character. Secondly, the appellant would be under a duty to explain the circumstances that led to the death of the deceased. If he remains quiet or offers a false explanation, such a response would become an additional link in the chain of circumstances, the Court explained.

The accused has merely to create a doubt and it is for the prosecution then to establish beyond reasonable doubt that no benefit can flow from the same to the accused." Elaborating on the same, the Court said that when the conviction is based solely on circumstantial evidence, there should not be any snap in the chain of circumstances. "If there is a snap in the chain, the accused is entitled to benefit of doubt. If some of the circumstances in the chain can be explained by any other reasonable hypothesis, then also the accused is entitled to the benefit of doubt.

Criminal Appeal No. 1348 Of 2011

Jitendra Kumar Mishra @ Jittu v. State of Madhya Pradesh

Decided on: January 05, 2024

In this case, a division bench of Justices Abhay S Oka and Pankaj Mithal observed that an appellate court should give the benefit of doubt to the accused persons if the evidence indicates the prosecution has failed to prove guilt beyond reasonable doubt and if a view different from the one expressed by the courts below can be taken.

The Court was hearing the appeals filed by four persons who were convicted to life imprisonment for murder by a fast-track court in Jabalpur. The High Court affirmed the conviction and sentence. While the appeal was pending, one of the appellants passed away.

Reversing the concurrent findings of guilt entered by the trial court and the High Court against three persons in a 2007 murder case, the top court observed,

"We are conscious of the fact that the appellate court should be slow in interfering with the conviction recorded by the courts below but where the evidence on record indicates the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt and that a plausible view, different from the one expressed by the courts below can be taken, the appellate court should not shy away in giving the benefit of doubt to the accused persons."

Criminal Appeal No. of 2024**Perumal Raja v. State Rep by Inspector of Police****Decided on: January 07, 2024**

In this case, a division bench of Justices Sanjiv Khanna and SVN Bhatti ruled that facts sourced from a statement made by an accused is admissible as evidence during trial even if such accused is not in the "formal" custody of the police.

The Court stressed that the pre-requisite of police custody under Section 27 of the Evidence Act should be read pragmatically, rather than formalistically or euphemistically.

In doing so, the division bench appeared to disagree with a recent three-judge bench decision in Rajesh & Anr. v. State of Madhya Pradesh, wherein it was held that formal police custody is necessary to make facts obtained from confessions by an accused admissible.

However, the two-judge bench in the present case reasoned that there was a Constitution Bench decision in State of U.P. v. Deoman Upadhyaya reported in 1961 which supported the view that "formal" police custody was not necessary.

2024 LiveLaw (SC) 56**P. I. Babu v. C.B.I.****Decided on: January 18, 2024**

The Supreme Court opined that acquittal under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PC Act) cannot be based solely on invalid Sanction.

"The Sessions Court could not have acquitted the accused only on the ground of alleged invalid sanction, without recording its findings on all the issues involved," the Court said.

In a nutshell, the accused was the manager of Syndicate Bank. The allegation against him was that he abused his office by fraudulently forging the loan application

as well as an application for opening a Savings Bank A/c in the name of the fictitious person. Accordingly, the PC Act was invoked against the appellant, a public servant as defined under Section 2(c) of the Act.

The Trial Court acquitted the appellant solely on the ground that the sanction obtained by the prosecution was not valid. Challenging this, CBI approached the Kerala High Court. In its impugned order, the Court held the accused guilty and convicted him. Thus, the present appeal.

At the outset, the Court said that the Trial Court had erred in not recording specific findings merits and instead based the acquittal on the issue of sanction.

“...we are of the considered opinion that since the Special Court has failed to record any specific findings on the Point Nos.2 to 4 on merits and acquitted the appellant only on the ground that the sanction obtained by the prosecution was not valid, the Special Court has committed an error.”

“The High Court convicted the appellant- accused on merits without having the findings of the Sessions Court on record on the point nos. 2 to 4.”

In view of this, the Court had set aside the judgments of the below Courts while remanding the matter to the Trial Court. The Court directed that case be decided expeditiously and preferably within two months.

2024 LIVELAW (SC) 53

Mariam Fasihuddin and Anr v. State By Aduodi Police Station and Anr.

Decided on: January 22, 2024

The Supreme Court held that while prosecuting a person for the offence of cheating punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, it is to be seen whether the deceitful act of cheating was coupled with an inducement leading to the parting of any property by the complainant.

Reversing the concurring findings of the High Court and the Trial Court, the Bench of Justices Surya Kant and KV Viswanathan, observed that to constitute an offence of cheating, merely committing a deceitful act is not sufficient unless the deceitful act dishonestly induced a person to deliver any property or any part of a valuable security, thereby resulting in loss or damage to the person.

“It is thus paramount that in order to attract the provisions of Section 420 IPC, the prosecution has to not only prove that the accused has cheated someone but also that by doing so, he has dishonestly induced the person who is cheated to deliver property. There are, thus, three components of this offence, i.e., (i) the deception of any person, (ii) fraudulently or dishonestly inducing that person to deliver any property to any person, and (iii) mens rea or dishonest intention of the accused at the time of making the inducement.”

The court noted that the act of the wife to forge the sign of his husband to seek the passport for his minor child to travel abroad doesn't amount to cheating punishable under Section 420 IPC, due to the absence of a deceitful act that resulted in a loss or damage of property to a husband.

The court noted that no dishonest intention was made out against the appellants with the following observations:

“The offences of 'forgery' and 'cheating' intersect and converge, as the act of forgery is committed with the intent to deceive or cheat an individual. Having extensively addressed the aspect of dishonest intent in the context of 'cheating' under Section 420 IPC, it stands established that no dishonest intent can be made out against the Appellants.”

Additionally, the court observed that in the absence of dishonest intention on the part of the appellants, the act of forging the documents doesn't arise.

2024 LiveLaw (SC) 65

Krishna Sharma Alias Krishna Kumar Sharma v. The State Of West Bengal.,

Decided on: January 24, 2024

The Supreme Court recently observed that the non-appearance of the accused party is no ground for cancellation of bail. The three-judge Bench of Justices B. R. Gavai, Sanjay Karol, and Sandeep Mehta was hearing a criminal appeal arising out of the impugned order of the Calcutta High Court cancelling bail. Court, while cancelling the bail, had observed that neither the accused nor his lawyer was present. It recorded that this non-appearance 'exposes an insolent stance of opposite party No.2 to evade the process of law.' Against this backdrop, the matter came up before the Top Court. Therein, the appellant's counsel apprised the bench of the reason for such non-appearance. He submitted that there was a traffic jam due to VIP movements and therefore, the appellant could not attend the Court. Besides, the Counsel also averred that the appellant's lawyer was not present on the concerned date, as his Vakalatnama was withdrawn.

After recording the submissions, the Court observed that if bail has been granted, the same can be cancelled if any conditions are violated or liberty is misused.

“..we find that merely because the appellant did not appear personally could not have been a ground for cancellation of bail. The parameters for grant of bail and cancellation of bail are totally different. The bail already granted may be cancelled, if it is found that the person who has been granted the benefit of bail has violated any of the conditions or misused the liberty by influencing the witnesses or tampering with the evidence.”

Criminal Appeal No. 000778 / 2024

Prabhu v. The State Rep By The Inspector of Police & Anr.

Decided on: January 30, 2024

The Supreme Court observed that merely advising a partner to marry as per the advice of parents would not attract the penal provisions of abetment to suicide under Section 306 of the Indian Penal. Following victim's death, the police registered an FIR for abetment to suicide under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code against the boyfriend for suggesting his girlfriend to marry as per her parents' choice. The high court stated that Broken relationships and heartbreaks are part of everyday life. It could not be said that the appellant by breaking up the relationship and by advising her to marry in accordance with the advice of her parents, as he himself was doing, had intended to abet the suicide of. Hence the offence under Section 306 is not made out. "There must be direct or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Specifically, the accused's actions must align

CIVIL

Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.2341/2023

Gopal Krishnan MS & Anr. v. Ravindra Beleyur & Anr.

Decided on: January 02, 2024

A Special Leave Petition filed against an order passed by National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, Chennai was dismissed by a three-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court comprising Chief Justice DY Chandrachud, Justice JB Pardiwala and Justice Manoj Misra.

Pertinently, the Bench made an observation that a bar of limitation cannot be obviated or circumvented by taking recourse of proceedings under Article 136 of the Constitution when a statutory appeal is available.

Noting that the impugned order was amenable to the court's appellate jurisdiction under Section 62 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, the court declined to entertain the petition filed under Article 136 of the Constitution. The petition was dismissed both on the ground of delay, as well as on merits.

“We accordingly decline to entertain the Special Leave Petitions only on that ground leaving it open to the petitioner to adopt appropriate remedies in accordance with law,” said the order.

Civil Appeal No. 9695 Of 2013

Asma Latif and Another v. Shabbir Ahmed and Other

Decided on: January 12, 2024

In this case, a three-judge bench of Justices BR Gavai, Dipankar Datta and Aravind Kumar held that a Court cannot pronounce judgment in a suit merely on the default of the defendant to file a written statement if the plaintiff does not prove his case.

The Court observed that failure on the part of the defendant to file the written statement within the time permitted by the court would not be enough to pronounce the judgment against the defendant when it is incumbent upon the plaintiff to prove the case by adducing evidence.

It explained that Order 8 Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 provided two alternatives - either to pronounce judgment against the defendant defaulting to file the written statement or to pass such other order as deemed fit. The first alternative (passing judgment) is not always mandatory. The top court observed that the above rule is permissive, granting two options to the court, and if in every case a judgment is pronounced against a person in response to non-submission of the written statement then it would render the second part of Rule 10 otiose.

C.A. NO. 002286/2006

Aligarh Muslim University Through its Registrar Faizan Mustafa v. Naresh Agarwal and Other

Decided on: January 24, 2024

In this case, a Constitution Bench of Chief Justice of India (CJI) D. Y. Chandrachud and Justices Sanjiv Khanna, Surya Kant, J. B. Pardiwala, Dipankar Datta, Manoj Misra and Satish Chandra Sharma made it clear that right of minorities to establish and administer educational institutes under Article 30 of the Constitution is not meant to ghettoise any

religious community.

The Court noted that it is permissible for such institutes to admit students from other religious communities too.

Citation : 2024 LiveLaw (SC) 48

Raja Gounder and Others v. M. Sengodan and Others

Decided on: January 24, 2024

The Supreme Court held that children born out of a void and voidable marriage shall be considered as legitimate children and be treated as an extended family of the common ancestor for the purpose of deciding a valid share in the property of the common ancestor. Reversing the findings of the High Court, the Bench of Justices M. M. Sundresh and S. V. N. Bhatti noted that once the common ancestor has admittedly considered the children born of void and voidable marriage as his legitimate children, then such children would be entitled to the same share as the successors in the property of the common ancestor as that of children born out of a valid marriage.

The judgment authored by Justice Bhatti noted that the admission of the common ancestor to treat the children born out of a void marriage as his legitimate children would be also considered as an evidence against his legitimate child, who is claiming through the common ancestor.

“The Privy Council in Gopal Das and another v. Sri Thakurji and others, held that a statement made by a person is not only evidence against the person but is also evidence against those who claim through him.”

It is worthwhile to mention that Supreme Court in Revanasiddappa and another v. Mallikarjun and others, noted that the children born out of void or voidable marriage would possess rights in their parent's property but ancestral property. While relying on the aforesaid judgment, the court in the present case upheld the entitlement of the children born out of void and voidable marriage in the common ancestor property and passed the decree of partition accordingly.

Shama Sharma v. Kishan Kumar

Decided on: January 30, 2024

In pursuance of the directive issued by the Supreme Court, it is directed that, from henceforth caste/religion of a litigant will no longer be required to be mentioned in the memo of parties in any petition/suit/proceeding filed before the Gauhati High Court or the Courts under its jurisdiction. Coming into force with immediate effect, the Notification stated that existing Filing Forms in respect of the Principal Seat and the Outlying Benches of the Gauhati High Court will be modified accordingly and is to be used hereafter at the time of filing of fresh cases. It was further directed that the Presiding Officers of all other Courts/Tribunals under the jurisdiction of the Gauhati High Court must make the necessary modifications in the Filing Forms of their respective Courts/Tribunals and the modified Form be used thereafter at the time of filing of fresh cases.



2024 LiveLaw (JKL) 8

Mohammad Altaf Mir v. Firdous Ahmad Mir

Decided on: January 14, 2024

Shedding light on the principles governing the grant of leave to defend a summary suit, the Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh High Court has ruled that while the objective of summary suits is to expedite commercial disputes, this cannot come at the cost of denying the defendant a fair opportunity to defend himself.

Citing 'Sudin Dilip Talaulikar v. Polycap Wires Private Limited & Ors.' Justice M A Chowdhary expounded,

“..When the defence discloses facts of prima facie fair and reasonable defence, unconditional leave has to be granted and it relates to the subjective satisfaction of the Court on the basis of the material that may be placed before it and when the Court is satisfied that the defence is plausible or probable and is not sham or moonshine, but still it has some doubt over the defence, then conditional leave may be granted to the Defendant”.

After considering the rival contentions Justice Chowdhary ruled in the favour of the appellants and observed that if the defense discloses a triable issue that is plausible, leave should be granted. The Court held that if the defendant raises triable issues, even if not a positively good defence, he is ordinarily entitled to defend the suit.

Delineating between the intricacies of a conditional or unconditional leave to defend a summary suit, Justice Chowdhary clarified that an unconditional leave relates to the subjective satisfaction of the Court on the basis of the material that may be placed before it, whereas in conditional leave, element of discretion vests with the Court. Noting that the appellant's claims about repayment and the forced signing of the Hundi were plausible and raised triable issues the court held that the Trial Court had erred in categorizing the defence as 'moonshine' without properly considering the triable issues. Therefore the court allowed the appeal, setting aside the impugned judgment and decree. The case was remanded back to the Trial Court for a fresh trial, with the direction to grant conditional leave to the appellant.



ACTIVITIES DURING THE MONTH

One day Sensitization Programme for all Registrars/Sub-Registrars

The Jammu & Kashmir Judicial Academy organised a day-long sensitization programme for all Registrars/Sub-Registrars of Jammu Province in collaboration with the Registration Department, J&K Government on **6th January 2024** at Judicial Academy, Janipur Jammu. The program was aimed at honing the skills and knowledge of the officers to increase their efficiency in discharging their statutory duties more efficiently with a focus on citizen centricity.



The training programme was inaugurated by Hon'ble Mr Justice Sanjeev Kumar, Judge, High Court of J&K and Ladakh and Chairperson, Governing Committee for J&K Judicial Academy in the august presence of Hon'ble, Hon'ble Mr Justice Rahul Bharti, Judge, High Court of J&K, Ladakh Member, Governing Committee for J&K Judicial Academy, Mr Achal Sethi, Secretary to Govt. Dept. of Law Justice & Parliamentary Affairs, J&K and Mr Sheikh Arshad Ayub, IAS, Inspector General of Registration, Govt. of J&K. Besides, Mr Sajad Hussain Ganai, AIGR Kashmir and Mr Mansoor Aslam Choudhary, AIGR Jammu were also present.

Mr Pawan Dev Kotwal, (Former District & Sessions Judge) President, District Consumer Commission, Jammu and Mr M. S. Parihar (Former District & Sessions Judge) President, District Consumer Commission, Kathua were the resource persons for the training programme.

Delivering the inaugural address, Justice Sanjeev Kumar highlighted the need to train the Officers of the Government who have been vested with the powers of Registrars and Sub-Registrars under the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908, and also deliberated on the need to learn from the rich experiences of the Judicial Officers who were earlier discharging those duties, particularly the adjudicatory part of registration. He appreciated the Registration Department for the historic step of computerization of the registrations through technology-driven processes and procedures throughout the UT of J&K which in turn subsided the long wait for registration. He also added that the J&K Judicial Academy aims to enhance the knowledge and expertise of Registrars and Sub-Registrars through this sensitization programme, contributing to the efficient and effective implementation of registration processes across the UT of J&K.

In his address, Justice Rahul Bharti stated that the DNA of registration has been with the Judiciary since the pre-independence era. And it is a golden opportunity to transfer knowledge from the judiciary to the executive. He highlighted that registration is a time-bound process and needs to be accomplished within the shortest possible time period.

In his special remarks, Mr Achal Sethi highlighted that the abrupt change of laws in 2019 posed a challenge to officers with non-judicial backgrounds. He appreciated the Academy for organising the two training programmes on previous occasions held in December 2019 which went a long way in ensuring smooth and hassle-free transition of document registration from the judiciary to the executive.

In his introductory remarks, Mr Sheikh Arshad Ayub shared the history of developments in the field of registration since 2019 for a transparent document and registration regime. He exhorted the Registering Officers to work tirelessly to facilitate the general public in the matter of registration of documents with a citizen-centric attitude. He also gave an overview of document registration through the National Generic Document Registration System (NGDRS), and numerous initiatives implemented to streamline the registration of documents.

Mr Yash Paul Bourney, Director, J&K Judicial Academy in his introductory address emphasised the importance of organising such programmes. He said that by registering a document, it is placed in the public domain informing the public at large about the legal rights and obligations flowing therefrom. He also underlined the need for proper maintenance and preservation of the records in perpetuity so as to prevent fraud. He also emphasized the need to sensitize the Registering Officers at the time of the entrustment of powers to them as Registrars and Sub-Registrars.

Resource persons, after giving an overview and salient features of the Registration Act, Stamp Act and the incidental matters, elaborated on the powers of the Registering Officers and the procedure required to be followed by them in the registration of documents. The rules framed for practice and working were also discussed, as well as the precautions which are required to be taken by the Registering Officers. Special emphasis was given to the need to adopt a uniform approach by all Registering Officers to facilitate a smooth and hassle-free exercise of powers by Registering Officers. The incidental matters, as to payment of stamp duty, registration fee and the provisions regarding exemptions from payment of such duty and fee, were also elaborately discussed. Participants were engaged in a series of insightful sessions throughout the day, covering various aspects of the Registration Act and related matters.

In the interactive sessions, the queries of Registering Officers were responded to by the resource persons and doubts, were cleared. The participants expressed gratitude for organizing such a valuable and informative training programme.

