

**IN THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
(CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION**

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____ OF 2021

IN THE MATTER OF: -

Vishal Tiwari

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

.....Respondents

With

I.A. NO.....OF 2021

An Application for permission to Appear and Argue in Person

With

I.A. NO.....OF 2021

An Application for exemption from filing duly Affirmed Affidavit

PAPER BOOK

(FOR KINDLY SEE INSIDE)

PETITIONER IN PERSON – VISHAL TIWARI (ADVOCATE)

SYNOPSIS AND LIST OF DATES

The need for judicial immunity has been extremely instrumental in today's society in this democratic country. The incident of mysterious Death/murder of Justice Uttam Anand of Dhanbad area has paved the way to the issue that is the judiciary of our country threat less and non-interfered. Along with this there are various incidents which conclusively proves the fact that the judicial officers of the country as well as the advocates aren't independent in respect to their professional functioning. The question of interference and threat to the institution of justice is always prevailing. The notion of independent judiciary that shapes the philosophy of Indian legal system which tries to eradicate interference, threat to the institution of justice, harm to the judicial officers/Legal Fraternity etc. . The lawyers play important role in the maintenance of peace and order in the society. The peace and order, no doubt, are necessary for the very existence of the society. Learned C.L. Anand has rightly stated that the advocates share with the judges the responsibility for maintaining order in the community.

The reason that in every litigation there would be one losing party and a winning party. The losing party is always likely to blame the judge concerned and the controversy is bound to embarrass the judge. Such

C

repercussion leads to potential criminal threats, grievous hurt and death in various cases. Besides, such a persistent onslaught on the decisions and the judge would shake the will and independence of the judge, ultimately resulting in jeopardizing public confidence in the system.

In the recent Dhanbad Death/Murder case the Supreme Court of India took suo motu cognizance of the 'sad demise' of a judge who was allegedly mowed down in Dhanbad and sought a status report within a week from Jharkhand's Chief Secretary and the DGP on the investigation into the incident. A bench headed by Chief Justice N V Ramana said the Jharkhand High Court would keep monitoring the probe. The apex court said it has been taking suo motu cognizance of attacks on judicial officers and legal fraternity across the country.

History is replete with instances where political clout or death threats have been used to prevent the judiciary from discharging its functions. Keeping the judges exposed not only allows the disgruntled to retaliate, but also allows external forces to interfere, pressure and alter the course of judicial proceedings. The concept of independence of the judiciary is not limited to

freedom from executive pressure or influence, but also from undue pressures and influence from other quarters such as business leaders, the police, under trials and convicts.

D

The advocates of the legal fraternity are also under the same wrath i.e. whenever any advocate is dealing with any controversial, high stake, politicized matter, the fate has been worse in such situation. The recent incident in July, 2021, a lawyer who was dealing a property issue concerning high stake and such matter was sub judice before the competent court, 15-20 people attacked the lawyer with sharp weapons like swords, knives and tried to kill the advocate. The advocate Satyadev Joshi on whom the attack occurred along with his associate Ankit Tandon went for the survey of the property along with the client and during such visit this wrath took place and left a scar on the judiciary of our country forever.

The February, 2021 incident concerning the disastrous event of Hyderabad based Advocate couple murder named G Vaman Rao and his wife G Nagamani, practitioners at the Telengana High Court, were brutally murdered by unidentified individuals in the Pedapalli District of Telengana.

This incident conclusively proves the fact that the independence of the Indian judiciary is under high vulnerability wherein the notion of non-

interference, no criminal threats, harms are increasing at a greater alarming stage are at a steep rise with no course of remedy left for the judicial officers and the Advocates Practising this noble profession.

E

- 25-9-1989 - The chief judicial magistrate of Nadiad, Gujarat was molested , beaten, compelled to consume liquor, handcuffed and was arrested by implicating him in a false case.
- 11-9-1991 - Honourable Supreme court of India in the case of DELHI JUDICIAL SERVICE ASSOCIATION TIS HAZARI COURT, DELHI Vs. STATE OF GUJARAT AND ORS. ETC. *1991 AIR 2176, 1991 SCR (3) 936* punished the erring police officials in Nadiad case under contempt of courts Act.
- 28 – 7-2021 Additional District Judge Uttam Anand was Killed at Dhanbad Bihar.

Hence this present Writ Petition Civil (PIL)

1

**IN THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
(CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION**

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____ OF 2020

(A Petition in the nature of Public Interest Litigation filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writs seeking issuance of specific Directions, policies and regulations initiate guidelines and directions for the protection of the judicial officers, Advocates and legal fraternity as a whole.to enforce the Right to life and Safety enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.)

IN THE MATTER OF:

1. Vishal Tiwari

... Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Union of India
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Through secretary
North Block, Central Secretariat,

2

New Delhi,
Delhi 110001.

2. State of Uttar Pradesh

Through The Chief Secretary,
101, Lok Bhawan, Vidhan Sabha Marg
Lucknow-226001.

3. State of National Capital Territory of Delhi,

Through its Chief Secretary,
Players Building, I. P. Estate,
Delhi – 110002

4. State of Haryana,

Through the Chief Secretary,
Room No. 4, 4th Floor,
Haryana Civil Secretariat, Sector-1
Chandigarh-160019

5. State of Gujarat,

Through the Chief Secretary,
Block No. 1, 3rd Floor New Sachivalaya,

Gandhi Nagar–382010.

6. State of Jharkhand,

Through the Chief Secretary,

3

Project Bhawan, I Floor, Dhurwa,

Ranchi–834004,

7. State of Rajasthan,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Government Secretariat,

Jaipur–302005.

8. State of Jammu and Kashmir,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Room No. 2/7, 2nd Floor, Main Building,

Civil Secretariat, Jammu-180001

And Room No. 307, 3rd Floor,

Civil Secretariat, Srinagar-190001.

9. State of Karnataka,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Secretariat, M. S. Building,

Vidana Soudha,

Bangalore–560001.

10. State of Madhya Pradesh,

Through the Chief Secretary,
Mantralaya,
Bhopal-462003.

4

11. State of Maharashtra,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Room No. 518, 5th Floor,
Madame Cama Road,
Mumbai-400032.

12. State of Punjab,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Room No 28, 6th Floor, Punjab Civil Secretariat,
Pin-160019.

13. State of Assam,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Assam Secretariat, C Block, 3rd Floor,
Dispur, Guwahati-781006.

14. State of West Bengal,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Nabanna, 13th Floor, 325,
Sarat Chatterjee Road,
Mandirtala Shibpur,

Howrah-711102.

15. State of Kerela,

Through the Chief Secretary,

5

Govt. Secretariat,

Thiruvananthapuram-695001

16. State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Secretariat, Chennai-600009

17. State of Chhattisgarh,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya

Raipur-492002, India.

18. State of Telangana,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Tank Bund, Basheer Bagh, Near NTR Gardens,

Opposite Lumbini Park, Central Secretariat,

Khairatabad, Hyderabad, Telangana 500022.

19. State of Bihar,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Main Secretariat, Patna-800015.

20. Union Territory of Ladakh

Through the Commissioner Secretary

UT Secretariat, Leh- Ladakh.

21. U.T. Administration of Lakshwadeep

6

Through Administrator

Office of Lakshwadeep Administrator

Secretariat Building, Kavaratti, Lakshwadeep.

22. U.T. Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu

Through the Chief Secretary

Ground Floor, Secretariat, Fort Area,

Moti Daman, Daman (U.T.) - 396220

23. State of Arunachal Pradesh,

Through the Secretary

Block No-1, First Floor Room No-107

Civil Secretariat, Itanagar- 79111

Arunachal Pradesh.

24. Andaman & Nicobar Administration

Through Chief Secretary

Andaman & Nicobar Administration,

Secretariat, Port Blair – 744101.

25. State of Uttarakhand,

Through the Chief Secretary,

4 Subhash Road, Uttarakhand Secretariat,
Fourth Floor New Building, Dehradun,
Uttarakhand 248001.

7

26. State of Goa,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Government of Goa, Secretariat,
Porvorim, Bardez-40352,

27. State of Tripura,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Government of Tripura, New Secretariat Complex,
PO: Secretariat-799010,
Agartala, West Tripura, India.\

28. State of Sikkim,
Through the Chief Secretary,
Government of Sikkim,
New Secretariat,
Gangtok-737101, India.

29. State of Odisha,
Through the Chief Secretary,
3rd Floor, State Secretariat, Sachivalaya Marg,
Bhubaneswar, Odisha 751001, India.

30. State of Nagaland,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Civil Secretariat,

8

Kohima-797004, Nagaland.

31. State of Himachal Pradesh,

Through the Chief Secretary,

H. P. Secretariat,

Shimla-171002.

32. State of Manipur,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Manipur Secretariat,

South Blockmphal-795001.

33. State of Andhra Pradesh,

Through the Chief Secretary,

Building 1, 1st Floor, Interim Government Complex,

A.p. Secretariat, Velagapudi 522503All Contesting Respondents

(A PETITION IN THE NATURE OF PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRITS SEEKING ISSUANCE OF SPECIFIC DIRECTIONS, POLICIES AND

REGULATIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE JUDICIAL OFFICERS, ADVOCATES AND THE LEGAL FRATERNITY AS A WHOLE TO UPHELD THE NOTION OF INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY AND NON INTERFERED LEGAL SYSTEM TO ENFORCE THE

9

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF LIFE, LIBERTY ENSHRINED UNDER ARTICLE 21 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.)

To,

The Hon'ble Chief Justice of India

And His Companion Justices

Of the Supreme Court of India.

The Writ Petition of the

Petitioner above named

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH

1. The present Writ Petition civil in the nature of Public Interest Litigation is filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India by the Petitioner to enforce the fundamental rights, particularly the Right to life, liberty and Dignity which is enshrined under Article 21 to immediately enforce and initiate policies and directions to protect the judicial officers, advocates and

the legal fraternity as a whole to uphold the notion of independent judiciary and non-interfered legal system.

10

ARRAY OF PARTIES

2. The Petitioner is a citizen of India, who is a practising Advocate in Supreme Court of India and a regular member of Supreme Court Bar Association (SCBA). Petitioner is always vigilant about the Supreme Court of India's Judgements and guidelines issued from time to time for the protection and safeguard of the Fundamental rights of the citizens.

3. The Petitioner does not have any personal interest or any persona gain or private motive or any other oblique reason in filing this Writ Petition in Public Interest. The Petitioner has not been involved in any other civil or criminal or revenue litigation, which could have legal nexus with the issues involved in the present Petition. No similar petition has been filed before this court and any High court.

4. The Respondent No. 1 is the Union of India, represented by Ministry of Finance, which is the appropriate ministry dealing with safeguarding the financial policies of our country.

11

5. The Respondent No.2, is the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

6. The Respondent No.3, is the National Capital of Territory of Delhi, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

7. The Respondent No.4, is the State of Haryana, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

8. The Respondent No.5, is the State of Gujarat, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

9. The Respondent No.6, is the State of Jharkhand, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

10. The Respondent No.7, is the State of Rajasthan, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate

12

authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

11. The Respondent No.8, is the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

12. The Respondent No.9, is the State of Karnataka, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

13. The Respondent No.10, is the State of Madhya Pradesh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

14. The Respondent No.11, is the State of Maharashtra, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

15. The Respondent No.12, is the State of Punjab, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

13

16. The Respondent No.13, is the State of Assam, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

17. The Respondent No.14, is the State of West Bengal, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

18. The Respondent No.15, is the State of Kerala, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

19. The Respondent No.16, is the State of Tamil Nadu, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

20. The Respondent No.17, is the State of Chhattisgarh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

21. The Respondent No.18, is the State of Telengana, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate

14

authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

22. The Respondent No.19, is the State of Bihar, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

23. The Respondent No.20, is the Union Territory of Ladakh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

24. The Respondent No.21, is the State of U.T. Administration of Ladakh, Represented by its Commissioner Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

25. The Respondent No.22, is the U.T. Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

26. The Respondent No.23, is the State of Arunachal Pradesh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

15

27. The Respondent No.24, is the Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

28. The Respondent No.25, is the State of Uttarakhand, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

29. The Respondent No.26, is the State of Goa, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

30. The Respondent No.27 is the State of Tripura, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

31. The Respondent No.28, is the State of Sikkim Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

32. The Respondent No.29, is the State of Odhisha, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

16

33. The Respondent No.30, is the State of Nagaland, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

34. The Respondent No.31, is the State of Himachal Pradesh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

35. The Respondent No.32, is the State of Manipur, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate

authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

36. The Respondent No.33, is the State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Chief Secretary, which is appropriate authority for the appropriate authority concerned with safeguarding the fundamental rights of its citizens.

FACTS OF THE CASE

37. That it can be stated with greater misfortune that the recent killing of the Justice Uttam Anand of Dhanbad has once again showed this democratic country that the notion of independent judiciary with non-interference, no threats to the institution of justice to judicial officers and

17

advocates facilitating the court of law to reach at justice. India, in recent years has witnessed a lot of violence on the judicial officers, advocates for their functioning under the legal industry.

38. A litigation in many instances provides one party with the relief in accordance to the law, provides justice to the aggrieved. This litigation also denies relief to various litigants depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, such denial of relief becomes one of the ill will motive in various instances which paves the way for the atrocities and violence to creep in. Such situation therefore shows the fact that the legal machinery has failed to provide justice and it's the citizens who are taking the law in

their hand and tries to scandalise the name and functioning of the machinery.

38. That although the mysterious murder of Justice Uttam Anand was promptly taken into consideration by the concerned Jharkhand High Court and this Hon'ble Courts which stands as a welcoming and much needed step, however the bigger picture right now lies to the fact that such incident of attack on the judicial officers and advocates are in a rise. Such alarming rise of brutalities requires the immediate judicial intervention of the Court.

40. Such incidents stands as the obstruction of justice because threat on the judicial officers, advocates tend to hinder the functioning and the process of justice. The advocates and judicial officers associated with high profile,

18

high stake and publicised and politicised matters has had to face the wrath in past leading to a mockery of the system of justice of India.

41. That a shocking and disastrous incident took place in the month of Fenruary, 2021 when the Hyderabad based couple named G Vaman Rao and Nagamani both practising law at the Telengana High Court were brutally murdered on the roads of Pedapalli district.

42. That a similar incident also took place in July, 2021 in the city of Mumbai wherein the advocate Satyadev Joshi who was dealing a high stake property matter along with his Associate Ankit Tandon went to visit the property and therein confronted with 15-20 goons of the area and

thereafter the advocate was rushed to the hospital after grievous hurt was done on him with the attempt to murder the individual.

43. That such horrific incidents shaken the legal system from its core as there remains no protection or immunity for such judicial officers and advocates. Such threat to the institution of justice paves the way for the anarchy to creep in with no realisation for constitutional and democratic values which can be preached.

44. That such incidents tends to shake the confidence of the citizens towards the legal machinery which exists to provide due course of justice.

19

45

GROUND

A. Because the Present Writ Petition filed in the form of Public Interest Litigation by the Petitioner in this present case stands firmly maintainable as there has been a immense violation of fundamental rights of the Judicial Officers and legal fraternities including the advocates as a whole. Significant incidents of threats, wilful harms and oppression on the judicial officers, advocates and the legal fraternity as a whole has not only violated the Right to Life, liberty and dignity enshrined under Article 21 but such also makes the judiciary and the legal fraternity non independent and

suppressed which is a direct and blatant attack on the philosophy of democracy and rule of law.

B. Because this Court in the case of *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978 AIR 597) gave a new dimension to Art. 21 and held that “*right to life is not merely a physical right but includes within its ambit the right to live with human dignity and liberty*” However in this present situation, with various incidents of suppression, criminal threats and harms, interference on the judicial officers, advocates and the legal fraternity as a whole leading to the violation of right to live with human dignity, life and liberty of the has made the country vulnerable to anarchy. A notion of independent judiciary evolves the thought of thought of non-suppression,

20

non-interference, no external criminal threats and independence, hence such is absolutely necessary for a free society and a constitutional democracy. It ensures the rule of law and realization of human rights and also the prosperity and stability of a society.

C. Because the Supreme Court in the case of *Krishna Prasad Verma (D) THR. LRS v. State of Bihar & Ors* (Civil Appeal No 8950 OF 2011) profoundly observed that:

“1...In a country, which follows the Rule of Law, independence of the judiciary is sacrosanct. There can be no Rule of Law, there can be no

democracy unless there is a strong, fearless and independent judiciary. This independence and fearlessness is not only expected at the level of the Superior Courts but also from the District judiciary.

2....Most litigants only come in contact with the District judiciary. They cannot afford to come to the High Court or the Supreme Court. For them the last word is the word of the Magistrate or at best the Sessions Judge. Therefore, it is equally important, if not more important, that the judiciary at the District Level and at the Taluka level is absolutely honest, fearless and free from any pressure and is able to decide cases only on the basis of the facts on file, uninfluenced by any pressure from any quarters whatsoever.”

21

C. Because this Hon'ble Court also in the case of Somesh Chaurasia vs State Of M.P.(Criminal Appeal Nos 590-591 of 2021) held in a matter pertaining to the order threatening the learned Additional Sessions Judge to prevent the arrest of a murder convict. The Court in that regard prominently affirmed the fact that *“This court has had to step in to ensure that the rule of law is preserved.*

41.... The functioning of the judiciary as an independent institution is rooted in the concept of separation of powers. Individual judges must be able to adjudicate disputes in accordance with the law, unhindered by any

other factors. Thus, “for that reason independence of judiciary is the independence of each and every judge”. The independence of individual judges also encompasses that they are independent of their judicial superiors and colleagues.

D. Because this Court also in the case of *Madras Bar Association v Union Of India & Anr* (Transferred Case (C) NO. 150 OF 2006) observed on this philosophy that “29. *Impartiality, independence, fairness and reasonableness in decision-making are the hallmarks of the judiciary. If “impartiality” is the soul of the judiciary, “independence” is the lifeblood of the judiciary. Without independence, impartiality cannot thrive. Independence is not the freedom for Judges to do what they like. It is the*

22

independence of judicial thought. It is the freedom from interference and pressures which provides the judicial atmosphere where he can work with absolute commitment to the cause of justice and constitutional values. It is also the discipline in life, habits and outlook that enables a Judge to be impartial. Its existence depends however not only on philosophical, ethical or moral aspects but also upon several mundane things—security in tenure, freedom from ordinary monetary worries, freedom from influences and pressures”

E. Because the above observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India pertaining to the independence of judiciary from interference, threats and harms is still a far-fetched dream for this democratic country. This situation requires the immediate judicial intervention of this Hon'ble Court to enforce guidelines and policies so as to protect the philosophy of independent judiciary with non-interference and independence to the legal fraternity.

F. Because there have been History of cases regarding the manhandling of Judicial officers by the Police, one of the case was of Nadiad Gujarat where a Chief judicial Magistrate was Manhandled, beaten and paraded in handcuffs by the police officials of the Police station. There are many

23

similar incidents. Lawyers has to Approach police stations for their clients as their legal Counsel under Article 22(1).

G. Because the lawyers also act like Activists who raise the cause in Public Interest against the Government and Police Agency. They are like whistle blowers who initiates Action against Corruption, Fake Encounters Etc. And Sometimes they are targeted for their public Interest services. These lawyers are to be protected because they operate check on the unconstitutional activities done by the public officials/Departments and Agencies. The lawyers play important role in the maintenance of peace

and order in the society. The peace and order, no doubt, are necessary for the very existence of the society. Learned C.L. Anand has rightly stated that the advocates share with the judges the responsibility for maintaining order in the community. They do not prompt stripes but settle them. They stand for legal order which is one of the noblest functions in the society. Order which Advocate seeks is not order of grave. It is order based on justice. Justice is the highest thing desired by men on earth. It is the function of advocates to plead for legal justice for their clients or decision of disputes according to the law. He has stated further that rights and liberties are the creation of law and are subject to limitations imposed by the law. Advocates are everyday defending rights and liberties of citizens against all violators of the law. police has got no authority and power to

24

cause physical bodily injury to any citizen and give humiliating punishments. Citizens have got Right to life as their fundamental Right under Article 21 of Indian constitution and the Right to meet an Advocate of his choice during interrogation in case he gets arrested for any offence. Section 41D of CR.P.C.

46. That no other Similar petition has been filed before this Court or any other High Court.

PRAYER

In the said premises it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:

i. Issue writ of mandamus or any other Appropriate Writ/directions to the Respondents to immediately Enforce and initiate guidelines and directions for the protection of the judicial officers, Advocates and legal fraternity as a whole.

ii. Issue writ of mandamus or any other Appropriate Writ/directions to the Respondents to Grant 'X' Category Security to the Judicial Officers In their Respective States of Posting;

Pass such other appropriate relief which this Hon'ble Court may deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.

25

FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT
HEREIN AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY.

DRAWN ON- 02.08.2021

FILED ON – 02.08.2021

DRAWN BY

FILED BY

Vishal Tiwari (Advocate Supreme court of India)