



The Arunachal Pradesh Gazette

EXTRAORDINARY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 128, Vol. XVIII, Naharlagun, Thursday, July 28, 2011 Sravana 6, 1933 (Saka)

GOVERNMENT OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND JUDICIAL
ITANAGAR

NOTIFICATION

The 25th July, 2011

No. JUD-55/2010. — Whereas the Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice, Department of Legal Affairs has framed National Litigation Policy, 2010 in accordance with the Resolution presented by the Union Minister for Law and Justice in the 'National Consultation for strengthening the Judiciary towards reducing pendency and delays held on the 24th and 25th October, 2009 as adopted by the conference unanimously;

Whereas the Government of India has called up on all the States to frame similar State Litigation Policy;

Whereas the object of framing the state litigation policy is to reduce government litigations in Courts so that valuable court-time would be spent in resolving other pending cases so as to achieve the goal to reduce average pendency time from 15 years to 3 years, in consonance with the National Legal Mission;

Now, therefore, the Governor of Arunachal Pradesh, after due consideration of the National Litigation Policy, 2010 and the position of pending Court-cases in the state and its resultant impact on the State as well as the people of the State, in exercise of his powers under Article 162 read with Article 21 of the Constitution is pleased to notify and launch the Arunachal Pradesh State Litigation Policy, 2011 as annexed hereto as ANNEXURE-I, with immediate effect.

C.P. Mansai,
Secretary to the
Law and Justice Department,
Government of Arunachal Pradesh,
Itanagar.

ANNEXURE-I

The Arunachal Pradesh State Litigation Policy, 2011

1. Introduction :

This Policy reflects the resolve of the State Government to bring about a visible and enduring qualitative and quantitative improvement in the manner in which litigation is perceived, managed and conducted in the state. It embodies the national concern that pendency and delays in our learned Courts should be reduced proactively by the Government.

It has been formulated by drawing upon the National Litigation Policy published by Ministry of Law, Government of India. A major part of its provisions applicable to the State have been incorporated mutatis mutandis.

2. The Vision :

2.1. The Arunachal Pradesh State Litigation Policy is based on the recognition that the State Government and its various agencies are the pre-dominant litigants in courts and Tribunals in the State. Its aim is to transform Government into an Efficient and Responsible litigant. This policy is also based on the recognition that it is the responsibility of the Government to protect the rights of citizens, to respect fundamental rights

and those in charge of the conduct of Government litigation should never forget this basic principle.

2.2 "Efficient Litigant" Means -

- 2.2.1 Focusing on the core issues involved in the litigation and addressing them squarely;
- 2.2.2 Managing and conducting litigation in a cohesive, coordinated and time-bound manner;
- 2.2.3 Ensuring that good cases are won and bad cases are not needlessly Persevered with; and
- 2.2.4 A litigant who is represented by competent and sensitive legal persons competent in their skills and sensitive to the facts that Government is not an ordinary litigant and that a litigation does not have to be won at any cost.

2.3 "Responsible Litigant" Means -

- 2.3.1 Not resorting to litigation only for the sake of litigating;
 - 2.3.2 Not resorting to pleas and technical points, and ordinarily discouraging the same;
 - 2.3.3 Ensuring that the correct facts and all relevant documents are placed before the court; and
 - 2.3.4 Suppressing nothing from the court and making no attempt to mislead any court or Tribunal.
- 2.4 The State Government must cease to be a compulsive litigant. The philosophy that matters should be left to the courts for ultimate decision has to be discarded. The easy approach, "Let the court decide," must be eschewed and condemned.

2.5. The purpose underlying this policy is also to reduce Government litigation in courts so that valuable court time would be spent in resolving other pending cases so as to achieve the Goal in the National Legal Mission to reduce average pendency time from 15 years to 3 years. Litigators on behalf of Government have to keep in mind the principles incorporated in the National mission for judicial reforms, which include identification of bottlenecks which the Government and its agencies may be concerned with and also reduction of or even weeding away unnecessary Government cases. Prioritization in litigation has to be achieved with particular emphasis on welfare legislation, social reforms, weaker sections and senior citizens and other categories requiring assistance must be given utmost priority.

3. Nature and Applicability of the Policy :

- 3.1 It shall be mandatory on all Government/State Public Sector Undertaking/Statutory Bodies personnel who directly or indirectly are associated with litigation, to follow provisions of the Policy.
 - 3.1.2 The Policy shall serve as the main authoritative reference point for all questions of procedure, norm and interpretation.
- 3.2 The Policy shall have the force of an administrative regulation.
- 3.3 The Policy shall bind all participants, stakeholders, and personnel to enforceable performance, which may be prescribed.

4. The Stakeholders :

In ensuring the success of this policy, all stake-holders will have to play their part - the Department of Law and Justice, Heads of various Departments, Law Officers and Government Counsels, and individual officers all connected with the concerned litigation. The success of this policy will depend on its strict implementation.

4.1 Nodal Officers

Nodal Officers are to be appointed by Heads of Departments, from time to time for regular monitoring and effective management of Government litigations in the Supreme Court, High Courts and Subordinate Courts.

Explanation :

"Head of Department" for the purposes of this policy means the administrative person ultimately responsible for the working of the Department or Agency, as the case may be.

4.1.2 The Nodal Officers have a crucial and important role to play in the overall and specific implementation of this Policy, including but not limited to the references made hereinafter. Every Department must be mindful of the responsibility to appoint proper Nodal Officers who have legal background in case there is, and if not, those who have an experience and expertise. They must be in a position to pro-actively manage litigation. Whilst making such appointments, care must be taken to see that there is continuity in the incumbents holding office. Frequent changes in persons holding the position must be avoided. Nodal Officers must also be subjected to training so that they are in a position to understand what is expected of them under the State Litigation Policy.

4.1.3 Accountability is the touch-stone of this Policy. Accountability will be at various levels; at the level of officers in charge of litigation, at the level of those responsible for defending cases, at the level of all the lawyers concerned and Nodal Officers. As part of accountability, there must be critical appreciation on the

Conduct of cases. For Good cases which have been lost must be reviewed and subjected to detailed scrutiny to ascertain responsibility and suitable action will have to be taken. Complacency must be eliminated and replaced by commitment.

4.2 State Level Empowered Committee :

There will be State Empowered Committee to monitor the implementation of this Policy and accountability. The Nodal Officers and the Heads of Department will ensure that all relevant data is sent to the Empowered Committee. The Empowered Committee shall be chaired by the Chief Secretary of the State and shall include a representative of Advocate General and such other members not exceeding six in number as may be nominated by the Law and Justice Department, with Secretary of the Law and Justice Department as the Member Secretary. The committee shall aim to streamline the litigation and grievance redressal system. The committee shall have full powers to take decisions in respect of Policy content and changes in procedures to be introduced and the decisions of the committee would be implemented directly by the departments without separate approval on file.

The Committee shall oversee the implementation of all aspects of this policy. It shall either on reference by a stakeholder or member of the Public or suo moto take notice of observations in implementation of the policy, including deviant or malafide behavior by any official and initiate corrective action. It shall enforce accountability of all stages of the litigation process and for this purpose introduce a comprehensive reporting and data flow system.

4.3 District Level Empowered Committee :

There will be District Empowered Committees to be chaired by the respective Deputy Commissioners/ District and Sessions Judge. It shall include such number of Government Lawyers of the Judicial District and such other members as may be decided by the Law and Justice Department not exceeding 10 (ten) and the Deputy Commissioners and the District and Sessions Judge of the District as the case may be shall be the Member Secretary. The District Committees shall submit monthly reports to the State Empowered Committee which shall in turn submit Comprehensive Reports to the Law and Justice Department. It shall be the responsibility of the Empowered Committee to receive and deal with suggestions and complaints including those from litigants and Government Departments and take appropriate measures in connection therewith.

Home Department in respect of Criminal and Law and Justice Department in respect of Administration of Justice will be the nodal agency to facilitate coordination and interaction between these Committees.

5. Government Representation :

5.1 While it is recognized that appointment as Government Lawyer(s) is broad-based opportunity for a cross section of lawyers, it cannot be vehicles for sustaining incompetent and inefficient persons. Persons who recommend names for inclusion on the Panel are to be careful in making such recommendations and to take care to check the credentials of those recommended with particular reference to legal knowledge and integrity.

5.2 Screening Committees for constitution of Panels will be introduced at every level to assess the skills and capabilities of people who are desirous of being Government Lawyer(s) before their inclusion on the Panel. The Law and Justice Department shall ensure that the constitution of Screening Committees will include representatives of the Departments concerned. The Screening Committees will make their recommendations to the Law and Justice Department. Emphasis will be on identifying areas of core competence, domain expertise and areas of specialization. It cannot be assumed that all lawyers are capable of conducting every form of litigation.

5.3 Government Lawyers must be well equipped and provided with adequate infrastructure. Efforts will be made to provide the agencies which conduct Government litigation with modern technology such as computers, internet links, etc. Common research facilities must be made available for Government lawyers as well as equipment for producing compilations of cases.

5.4 Training programs, seminars, workshops and refresher courses for Government Lawyers must be encouraged. There must be continuing legal education for Government lawyers with particular emphasis on identifying and improving areas of specialization. Institutions concerned will be associated in preparing special courses for training of Government lawyers with particular emphasis on identifying and improving areas of specialization. Most importantly, there must be an effort to cultivate and instill values required for effective Government representation.

5.5 Government Lawyers shall be deputed for National and Regional conferences of Government Lawyers as may be organized so that matters of mutual interest can be discussed and problems analyzed.

5.6 Government Lawyers who head the civil or criminal side must play a meaningful role in Government litigations. They cannot continue to be merely responsible for filing appearances in Court. A system of motivation has to be worked out for them under which initiative and hard work will be recognized and

extraordinary work will be rewarded. This could be in the form of financial benefits.

5.7 It will be the responsibility of the Law and Justice Department to train Government Lawyers and to explain to them what is expected of them in the discharge of their functions.

5.8 Subject to Sections 24-254 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Panels will be drawn up of from amongst willing, energetic and competent lawyers to develop special skills in drafting pleadings on behalf of Government. Such Panels shall be flexible. More and more advocates must be encouraged to get on to such Panels by demonstrating keenness, knowledge and interest.

5.9 Nodal Officers will be responsible for active case management. This will involve constant monitoring of cases particularly to examine whether cases have gone "off track" or have been unnecessarily delayed.

5.10 Incomplete briefs are frequently given to Government Lawyers. This must be discontinued. It is the responsibility of the person in charge of the Department/Agency concerned, to ensure that proper records are kept of cases filed and that copies retained by the Department/Agency are complete and tally with what has been filed in Court. If any Department or Agency has a complaint in this regard it can complain to the Empowered Committee concerned.

5.11 There should be equitable distribution of briefs so that there will be broad based representation of Government. Complaints that certain Government Lawyers are being preferred in the matter of briefing will be inquired into seriously by the Empowered Committee concerned.

5.12 Government lawyers are expected to discharge their obligations with a sense of responsibility towards the court as well as to the Government. If concessions are made on issues of fact or law, and it is found that such concessions were not justified, the matter will be reported to the Empowered Committee concerned and remedial action would follow.

5.13 While the Government cannot pay fees which private litigants are in a position to pay, the fees payable to Government lawyers will be suitably revised from time to time to make it remunerative. Optimum utilization of available resources and elimination of wastage will itself provide for adequate resources for revision of fees. It should be ensured that the fees stipulated as per the Schedule of Fees should be paid within a reasonable time. Malpractice in relation to claim and release of payments must be eliminated.

6. Adjournments :

6.1 Accepting that frequent adjournments are resorted to by Government lawyers, unnecessary and frequent adjournments and infractions will be dealt with seriously. Prevailing practice of seeking adjournment on first date of hearing despite the department concerned having been duly served notices months earlier, must be stopped and responsibility be fixed by taking suitable remedial action.

6.2 In fresh litigations where the Government is a Defendant or a Respondent in the first instance, a reasonable adjournment may be applied for, for obtaining instructions. However, it must be ensured that such instructions are made available and communicated before the next date of hearing. If instructions are not forthcoming, the matter must be reported to the Nodal Officer and, if necessary, to the Head of the Department concerned.

6.3 In Appellate Courts, if the paper books are complete, then adjournments must not be sought in routine course. The matter must be dealt with at the first hearing itself. In such cases, adjournments should be applied for only if a specific query from the court is required to be answered and for this, instructions have to be obtained.

6.4 One of the functions of the Nodal Officers will be to coordinate the conduct of litigation. It will also be their responsibility to monitor the progress of litigation, particularly to identify cases in which repeated adjournments are taken. It will be the responsibility of the Nodal Officer to report cases of repeated and unjustified adjournments to the Head of Department and it shall be open to him to call for reasons for the adjournment. The Head of Department or Agency shall ensure that the Records of the case reflect reasons for adjournment, if these are repeated adjournment. Serious note will be taken of cases of negligence or default and the matter will be dealt with appropriately by referring such cases to the Empowered Committee. If the advocates are at fault, action against them may entail suspension/removal of their names from their duties.

6.5 Cases in which costs are awarded against the Government as a condition of grant of adjournment will be viewed very seriously. In all such cases the Head of Department must give a report to the Empowered Committee of the reasons why such costs were awarded. The names of the persons responsible for the default entailing the imposition of costs will be identified. Suitable action must be taken against them.

7. Pleadings/Counters :

7.1 Suits or other proceedings initiated by or on behalf of Government have to be drafted with precision and clarity. There should be no repetition either in narration of facts or in the grounds.

7.2 Appeals will be drafted with particular attention to the Synopsis and List of Dates which will carefully crystallize the facts in dispute and the issues involved. Slipshod and loose drafting will be taken serious note of. Defaulting advocates may be suspended/removed.

34

7.3 Care must be taken to include all necessary and relevant documents in the appeal paper book. If it is found that any such documents are not annexed and this entails an adjournment or if the court adversely comments on this, the matter will be enquired into by the Nodal Officer and reported to the Head of Department for suitable action.

7.4 Effort will be made in time bound manner, to formulate and circulate Special formats for Civil Appeals, Special Leave Petitions, Counter Affidavits etc. by way of guidance and instruction as a Manual. This will include not only contents but also the format, design, font size, quality of paper, printing, binding and presentation. It is the joint responsibility of the Nodal Officer and the Advocate in Charge of either Civil or Criminal side to ensure compliance.

7.5 Counter Affidavits in important cases will not be filed unless the same are shown to and vetted by the Advocate General of the State. This should, however, not delay the filing of counters.

7.6 It shall be ensured by the Nodal Officer/Legal Officers of the Department that there is no contradiction in the replies or any submission filed by Government respondents who may be filing replies separately.

8. Litigation at High Court and Supreme Court :

8.1 While Advocate General is responsible for defense of cases in the High Court, the litigation at the national level should be directly under the control/advice and monitoring of the Advocate General. The Standing counsel in the Hon'ble Supreme Court and other authorities shall function under the guidance and administrative control of the Advocate General. In important cases, where senior private counsels have to be engaged, the terms and conditions of engagements shall be made in consultation with the Advocate General.

9. Filing of Appeals :

9.1 Appeals will not ordinarily be filed against ex-parte ad interim orders. Attempt must first be to have the order vacated. An appeal must be filed against an order only if the order is not vacated and the continuation of such order causes prejudice.

9.2 Appeals must be filed intra court in the first instance.

9.3 Given that Tribunalisation is meant to remove the loads from Courts, challenge to orders of Tribunals should be an exception and not a matter of routine.

9.4 In Service Matters, no appeal will be filed in cases where:

- (a) the matter pertains to an individual grievance without any major repercussion on the Government Policy;
- (b) the matter pertains to a case of pension or retirement benefits without involving any principle and without setting any precedent or financial implications.

9.5 Further, proceedings will not be filed in service matters merely because the order of the Administrative Tribunal affects a number of employees. Appeals will not be filed to espouse the cause of one section of employees against another.

9.6 Proceedings will be filed challenging orders of Administrative Tribunals only if :

- (a) There is a clear error of record and the finding has been entered against the Government.
- (b) The judgment of the Tribunal is contrary to a service rule or its interpretation by a High Court or the Supreme Court.
- (c) The judgment would impact the working of the administration in terms of morale of the service and the Government is compelled to file a petition; or
- (d) If the judgment will have recurring implications upon other cadres or if the judgment involves huge financial claims being made.

9.7 Appeals in Revenue matters will not be filed:

- (a) If the stakes are not high and are less than that amount to be fixed by the Revenue Authorities;
- (b) If the matter is covered by a series of judgments of the Tribunal or of the High Courts, which have held the field and which have not been challenged in the Supreme Court;
- (c) where the assessee has acted in accordance with long standing industry practice;
- (d) merely because of change of opinion on the part of jurisdictional officers.

9.8 Appeals will not be filed in the Supreme Court unless:

- (a) the case involves a question of law;
- (b) If it is a question of fact, the conclusion of the fact is so perverse that an honest judicial opinion could not have arrived at that conclusion;
- (c) Public finances are adversely affected;
- (d) There is substantial interference with public justice;
- (e) There is a question of law arising under the Constitution;

- (f) The High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction;
- (g) The High Court has struck down a statutory provision as *ultra vires*;
- (h) The interpretation of the High Court is plainly erroneous.

9.9 In each case, there will be a proper certification of the need to file an appeal to be issued by the Law Department and in important cases by the Advocate General. Such certification will contain brief but cogent reasons in support. At the same time, reasons will also be recorded as to why it was not considered fit or proper to file an appeal.

10. Limitation : Delayed Appeals :

10.1 It is recognized that good cases are being lost because appeals are filed well beyond the period of limitation and without any proper explanation for the delay or without a proper application for condonation of delay. It is recognized that such delays are not always bonafide particularly in cases where high revenue stakes are involved.

10.2 Each Head of Department will be required to call for details of cases filed on behalf of the Department and to maintain a record of cases which have been dismissed on the ground of delay. The Nodal Officers must submit a report in every individual case to the Head of Department explaining all the reasons for such delay and identifying the persons/causes responsible. Every such case will be investigated and if it is found that the delay was not bonafide, appropriate action must be taken. Action will be such that it operates as a deterrent for unsatisfactory work and malpractices in the conduct of Government litigation. For this purpose, obtaining of the data and fixing of responsibility will play a vital role. Data must be obtained on a regular basis annually, bi-monthly or quarterly.

10.3 Applications for condonation of delay are presently drafted in routine terms without application of mind and presentation of underlying facts. This practice must immediately stop. It is the responsibility of the Advocate in Charge to carefully draft an application for condonation of delay, identifying the areas of delay and identifying the causes with particularity. Drafting Advocates who fail to adhere to this may be suspended/ removed.

10.4 Every attempt must be made to reduce delays in filing appeals/applications. It shall be responsibility of each Head of Department to work out an appropriate system for elimination of delays and ensure its implementation.

10.5 The question of limitation and delay must be approached on the premise that every court will be strict with regard to condonation of delay.

11. Alternative Dispute Resolution :

11.1 More and more Government departments and PSUs are resorting to arbitration particularly in matters of drilling contracts, hire of ships, construction of highways, etc. Careful drafting of commercial contracts, including arbitration agreements must be given utmost priority. The Law and Judicial Department recognizes that it has a major role to play in this behalf, and that the Department needs to be strengthened on priority basis.

11.2 The resort to arbitration as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism must be encouraged at every level, but this entails the responsibility that such arbitration will be cost effective, efficacious, expeditious, and conducted with high rectitude. In most cases arbitration has become a mirror of court litigation. This must be stopped.

11.3 It is recognized that the conduct of arbitration at present leaves a lot to be desired. Arbitrations are needlessly dragged on for various reasons. One of them is by repeatedly seeking adjournments. This practice must be deplored and stopped.

11.4 The Head of Department will call for the data of pending arbitrations. Copies of record of proceedings etc. must be obtained to find out why arbitrations are delayed and ascertain who is responsible for adjournments. Advocates found to be conducting arbitrations lethargically and inefficiently must not only be removed from the conduct of such cases but also not briefed in future arbitrations. It shall be the responsibility of the Head of Department concerned to call for regular review meetings to assess the status of pending arbitration cases.

11.5 Lack of precision in drafting arbitration agreements is a major cause of delay in arbitration proceedings. This leads to disputes about appointment of arbitrators and arbitrability which results in prolonged litigation even before the start of arbitration. Care must be taken whilst drafting an arbitration agreement. It must correctly and clearly reflect the intention of the parties particularly if certain items are required to be left to the decision of named persons such as engineers, are not meant to be referred to arbitration.

11.6 Arbitration agreements are loosely and carelessly drafted when it comes to appointment of arbitrators. Arbitration agreements must reflect a well defined procedure for appointment of arbitrators. Sole arbitrator may be preferred over a Panel of three Arbitrators. In technical matters, reference may be made to trained technical persons instead of retired judicial persons.

11.7 It is also found that certain persons are "preferred" as arbitrators by certain departments or corporations. The arbitrator must be chosen solely on the basis of knowledge, skill and integrity and not for extraneous reasons. It must be ascertained whether the arbitrator will be in a position to devote time for expeditious disposal of the reference.

11.8 It is found that if an arbitration award goes against the Government, it is almost invariably challenged by way of objections filed in the arbitration. Very often these objections lack merit and the grounds do not fall within the purview of the scope of challenge before the courts. Routine challenge to arbitration awards must be discouraged. A clear formulation of the reasons to challenge Awards must precede the decision to file proceedings to challenge the Awards.

12. Settlement of dispute through Lok Adalat :

12.1 All pending disputes/cases litigation would be reviewed by the Department & District Level Empowered Committee with a view to settling them before the Lok Adalat/Special camps, in consultation with the Legal Aid Cell of Hon'ble High Court. This exercise shall be carried out periodically, preferably every three months.

12.2 Every department should authorize some officers with sufficient powers to take final decisions so that minor disputes pending in different courts can be settled through Lok Adalat by an officer deputed to do so.

13. Specialised Litigation :

13.1 Proceedings seeking judicial review including in the matter of award of contracts or tenders should be defended keeping in mind Constitutional imperatives and good governance. If the proceedings are founded on an allegation of the breach of natural justice and it is found that there is substance in the allegations, the case shall not be proceeded with and the order may be set aside to provide for a proper hearing in the matter. Cases where projects may be held up have to be defended vigorously keeping in mind public interest. They must be dealt with and disposed off as expeditiously as possible.

13.2 In all cases involving *vires*, or statutes or rules and regulations proper affidavits should be filed explaining the rationale between the statute or regulation and also making appropriate averments with regard to legislative competence.

13.3 Public Interest Litigations (PIL)

13.3.1 Public Interest Litigations must be approached in a balanced manner. On the one hand, PILs should not be taken as matters of convenience to let the courts do what Government finds inconvenient. It is recognized that the increase in PILs stems from a perception that there is governmental inaction. This perception must be changed. It must be recognized that several PILs are filed for collateral reasons including publicity and at the instance of third parties. Such litigation must be exposed as being not bonafide.

13.3.2 PILs challenging public contracts must be seriously defended. If interim orders are passed stopping such projects then appropriate conditions must be insisted upon for the Petitioners to pay compensation if the PIL is ultimately rejected.

13.4 Public Sector Undertaking Litigation :

Litigation between Public Sector Undertakings inter se between Government Public Sector Undertakings is causing great concern. Every effort must be made to prevent such litigation. Before initiating such litigation, the matter must be placed before the highest authority in the public sector such as the CMD or MD. It will be his responsibility to endeavor to see whether the litigation can be avoided. If litigation cannot be avoided, then alternative dispute resolution methods like mediation must be considered. Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure must be resorted to extensively.

14. Quick action on Legal Notices/Representation and covered matters : ✓

14.1 As soon as Legal notice is served upon any department asking for a relief the same should be decided expeditiously in accordance with the relevant rules/instructions and by passing a detailed speaking order.

14.2 Large number of cases comes before the Hon'ble High Court wherein grievances are that legal notice/representations are not being decided or are delayed by the Government. Generally Hon'ble High Court directs Government to decide the representation within a specific time. If Government disposes of the notice at the first instance, it would reduce the burden of the Court.

14.3 In disciplinary matters while passing the orders in original jurisdiction or in appeals a detailed speaking order should be passed. Also the inquiry officer should follow all the procedures for conducting the inquiry so that no lapse occurs in the procedural part and orders are not set aside on that ground.

14.4 While deciding the cases relating to seniority of the employees, the decision should be taken strictly in accordance with the rules and it should be taken promptly so that interest of no employee is jeopardized due to delayed decision.

14.5 In cases with similar issues, departments shall endeavor to settle the issue as per post-judicial proceedings formed in identical cases by different courts when attained finality to avoid multiplicity of same matters increasing rush of work in different courts.

15. Review of pending cases :

15.1 All pending cases involving Government will be reviewed. This Due diligence Process shall involve

drawing upon statistics of all pending matters which shall be provided for by all Government departments (including PSUs). The Office of the Advocate General and the Government Advocate as well as the Public Prosecutor of each district shall also be responsible for reviewing all pending cases and filtering frivolous and vexatious matters from the meritorious ones.

15.2 All Cases will be grouped and categorized. The practice of grouping should be introduced whereby cases should be assigned a particular number of identity according to the subject and statute involved. In fact, further sub-grouping will also be attempted. To facilitate this process, standard forms must be devised which lawyers have to fill up at the time of filing of cases. Panel will be set up to implement categorization, review such cases to identify cases which can be withdrawn. These include cases which are covered by decisions of courts and cases which are found without merit. This must be done in a time bound fashion.

16. Amendment to Policy :

The State Litigation Policy should be responsive to the changing requirements of the litigation system and its various constituents like Judiciary, Government and the Public. The State Level Empowered Committee shall consider reasonable suggestions/proposals for amendment to the policy as may be received from stakeholders in the litigation system at various levels with the goal of achieving of objectives of the policy more effectively. The committee may recommend modification in the policy as and when necessary on its own motion also.

C.P. Mansai,
Secretary to the
Government of Arunachal Pradesh,
Itanagar.