1. (a) Should the Supreme Court be replaced by a constitutional court dealing exclusively with constitutional matters?

(b) Should such a court invariably sit en banc (as against in Benches as is the present practice)?

(c) What should be the qualifications and modalities of appointment as a judge of that court?

2. Are you in favour of the establishment of a court of appeal as the final arbiter of disputes of law (other than constitutional law) leaving the Supreme Court to concentrate on only constitutional issues?

3. Should the Supreme Court only take up that much work which it can dispose of within three months?

4. Do you feel that the Supreme Court is acting as third chamber?

5. Have the judgments of the Supreme Court regarding compensations payable upon the abolition of feudal rights brought the process of social reform?

6. Are courts grasping at jurisdiction in matters which lie squarely within the competence of the executive branch of Government?

7. Should appointees to judgeships of the Supreme Court and high courts have a political background?

8. Is the criticism that persons of humble origin or low economic status are not likely to be appointed as high court judges in India justified?

---

*The Questionnaire was prepared by the 10th Law Commission to study the problem of evolving a methodology for speedier disposal of matters coming before the Supreme Court and High Courts.*
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9. Will it be correct to say that judges of the Supreme Court and high courts are not commanding that prestige which they used to command in the past only because their salaries are very much lower than the earnings of leading advocates?

10. Is much of the delay in the courts occasioned by lawyers seeking adjournments on flimsy grounds?

11. Should the Supreme Court evolve its own procedure in criminal cases?

12. Is not much of the time of the Supreme Court and high courts taken up by constitutional writs which ultimately are dismissed?

13. Presently the judicial system is based on the Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Should it be replaced by an Indian system of administration of justice?

14. Do you feel that the high courts grasp at jurisdictions in matters where the petitioner has not exhausted an equally efficacious remedy provided by the relevant statute?

15. Can the judicial process be scientized?

16. Do you feel that some leading advocates take up most of the court's working time arguing for interim relief in cases having no merits and thus upset the day's regular fixtures?

17. Has the practice of 'Bench fixation' by lawyers taken root in the Supreme Court and high courts?

18. Are certain advocates being related to sitting judges earning by way of 'negative practice' in as much as they are engaged only to ensure that the matter gets transferred from the court of a particular judge?

19. Are over-zealous government departments responsible for increasing the court's calendar?

20. Should the Supreme Court encourage public interest litigation?

21. Will it facilitate disposal of a greater number of cases if oral arguments are restricted to half an hour each side?
22. Will a procedural requirement making it obligatory on counsel to file written briefs out down the oral arguments?

23. Should some appeals be disposed of without hearing oral arguments?

24. Will it not make for better interpretation of statutes if the rule putting an embargo against citing of debates in Parliament as a legitimate aid to construction is abrogated?

25. Should the present practice of plurality and separate judgments be substituted by one of writing -

(a) Per curiam opinion;

(b) A single judgment representing the highest common denominator of the Bench;

(c) One majority and one minority opinion?

26. Will it not make for certainty in law if the higher courts write shorter judgments?

27. Should an appellate court necessarily write a reasoned judgment -

(a) in every case irrespective of its outcome?

(b) only when it reverse the verdict of the lower court?

28. Should not the statute provide for only one appeal?

29. Should matters involving a point of law of general public importance leap-frog directly to the Supreme Court?

30. Should judicial review, revision or appeal against interlocutory order be abolished?

31. To what extent is the criticism that the Supreme Court is reversing the high courts in matters failing within latter's discretion justified?
32. Should the statute provide for a compulsory attempt to arrive at a compromise at the appellate stage?

33. The above questions mainly cover the problems of fresh institutions. As regards the disposal of arrears, can you suggest any method other than appointment of retired judges?

34. Any other matter?