

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT, JODHPUR

No. Gen/XV/107/2014/1291

Date : 06.06.2023

To : All the District & Sessions Judges.

Sub. : Regarding Miscellaneous Application No. 2034/2022 in
MA No. 1849 in SLP (Crl.) No. 5191/2021, Satender
Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr.

Ref. : This office letter no 993 dt. 06.04.2023

Sir,

With reference to the subject cited above, while enclosing herewith a copy of order dated 02.05.2023 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Miscellaneous Application No. 2034/2022 in MA No. 1849 in SLP (Crl.) No. 5191/2021, **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr.**, I am directed to request you to circulate the same amongst all the presiding officers (including officers on deputation) of your judgeship for making necessary compliance.

Encl.: As above.

Yours sincerely,


REGISTRAR (ADMN.)

All Communications Should be
Addressed to Registrar by
Designation and not by Name.
Pin Code - 110001

Delivery Mode: Speed Post

D. No. **37889/2022 /SEC-II**
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
NEW DELHI
10th May, 2023

From:

The Assistant Registrar,
Supreme Court of India, New Delhi.

To,

- 1 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT
AMRAVATI,
NELAPADU, ANDHRA PRADESH-522202
- 2 *THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF
TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD,
HYDERABAD, TELANGANA-500066
- 3 THE REGISTRAR,
GAUHATI HIGH COURT,
LATASIL, GUWAHATI, ASSAM-781001
- 4 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA,
PATNA, BIHAR-800028
- 5 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA-400032
- 6 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF CHHATISGARH AT
BILASPUR,
BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH-495220
- 7 *THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI,
NEW DELHI, DELHI-110003
- 8 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD,
AHMEDABAD, GUJARAT-380060
- 9 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT
SHIMLA,
SHIMLA, HIMACHAL PRADESH-171001
- 10 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND
LADAKH AT SRINAGAR,
SRINAGAR, JAMMU & KASHMIR-190009
- 11 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI,
RANCHI, JHARKHAND-834002
- 12 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT
BENGALURU,
BENGALURU, KARNATAKA-560001



- 13 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM,
ERNAKULAM, KERALA-682031
- 14 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT
JABALPUR,
JABALPUR, MADHYA PRADESH-482001
- 15 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK,
CUTTACK, ORISSA-753002
- 16 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH,
CHANDIGARH, PUNJAB-160001
- ✓ 17 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR
RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR,
JODHPUR, RAJASTHAN-342001
- 18 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF SIKKIM AT GANGTOK,
GANGTOK, SIKKIM-737101
- 19 *THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
AT CHENNAI,
CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU-600104
- 20 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD,
ALLAHABAD, UTTAR PRADESH-211017
- 21 *THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT
NAINITAL,
NAINITAL, UTTARAKHAND-263002
- 22 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA,
KOLKATA, WEST BENGAL-700001
- 23 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR AT IMPHAL,
IMPHAL, MANIPUR-795002
- 24 *THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA,
SHILLONG, MEGHALAYA-793001
- 25 THE REGISTRAR,
HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA AT AGARTHALA,
AGARTALA, TRIPURA-799010

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION No. 2034 OF 2022

IN

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 1849 OF 2021

IN

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (Cr.) NO. 5191 OF 2021

SATENDER KUMAR ANTIL

... Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)

VERSUS

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ~~CRS~~ *Amr*

... Respondent(s)

Sir,

In continuation of this Registry's letter dated 24.03.2022, please find enclosed herewith a certified copy of this Hon'ble Court's Record of Proceeding dated **02nd May, 2023**, passed in the matter above mentioned, for necessary action.

*You are requested to appear before the Hon'ble court's directions.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,

for petitioner 11/5/23
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

Copy to :-

1. Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma (adv.)
2. Mr. V.N. Raghupathy (adv.)
3. Mr. Tapesh Kumar Singh (adv.)
4. Mr. P.I. Jose (adv.)
5. Mr. Arjun Garg (adv.)
6. Mr. Amit Gupta (adv.)
7. Mr. Sanjai Kumar Pathak (adv.)
8. Mr. Sibho Sankar Mishra (adv.)
9. Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari (adv.)
10. Mr. Somanadri Gaud Katam (adv.)
11. Mr. Aaditya A. Pande (adv.)
12. Mr. Ankur Prakash (adv.)
13. M/s Arputham Aruna & Co. (adv.)
14. Mr. Apoorv Kurup (adv.)
15. Mr. Gaurav Agrawal (adv.)
16. Mr. Apoorv Shukla (adv.)
17. Dr. Joseph-Aristotle S. (adv.)
18. Mr. Kunal Chatterji (adv.)
19. Ms Manisha Ambawani (adv.)
20. Mr. S.N. Terdal (adv.)
21. Mr. Anupam Raina (adv.)
22. Mr. K. Enatoli sema (adv.)
23. Mr. Varinder K. Sharma (adv.)
24. Mr. Nikhil Goel (adv.)
25. Mr. Naresh K. Sharma (adv.)
26. Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Advocate

for petitioner 11/5/23
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR



ITEM NO.4

COURT NO.2

Certified to be true Copy
Assistant Registrar (Judl.)
Supreme Court of India
2023 SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Miscellaneous Application No.2034/2022 in MA 1849/2021 in SLP(Cr1)
No. 5191/2021

SATENDER KUMAR ANTIL

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

152780

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(Mr. V.N. Raghupathy, Advocate for High Court of Karnataka; Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh, Advocate for High Court of Jharkhand; Mr. P.I. Jose, Advocate for Gauhati High Court; Mr. Arjun Garg, Advocate for High Court of Madhya Pradesh; Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate for High Court of Delhi; Mr. Sanjai Kumar Pathak, Advocate for High Court of Meghalaya; Mr. Sibho Sankar Mishra, Advocate for High Court of Orissa, Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, Advocate for State of Arunachal Pradesh, Mr. Somanadri Gaud Katam, Advocate for High Court of Telengana; Mr. Aaditya A. Pande, Advocate for the State of Maharashtra; Mr. Ankur Prakash, Advocate for the State of Uttarakhand; M/s Arputham Aruna, Mr. Debojit Borkakati, Advocate for the State of Assam, Mr. S.N.Terdol, Advocate for the State of Ladakh, Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, Advocate for the State of Meghalaya, Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate for the State of Bihar, Mr. Mahfooz A.Nazki, Advocate for the State of Andhra Pradesh, Mr. Maibam N.Singh, Advocate for the High Court of Manipur, Mr. Prashant S.Kenjale, Advocate for the High Court of Bombay, Mr. Ajay Pal, Advocate for the State of Punjab, Mr. Gagan Gupta, Advocate for High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, Advocate for the State of Kerala, Mr. Suwendu Suvasis Dash, Advocate for the State of Orissa, Mr. Pradeep Mishra, Advocate for the State of Uttar Pradesh, Mrs. Swati Ghildiyal, Advocate for the State of Gujarat, Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Advocate for the Government of Manipur, Mr. Abhay Anil Anturkar, Advocate for the State of Goa, Mr. Anupam Raina, Advocate for the High Court of Jammu, Mr. Sunny Choudhary, Advocate for State of Madhya Pradesh, Mr. Varinder Kumar Sharma, Advocate for High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Ms. K.Enatoli Sem, Advocate for State of Nagalanad, Mr. R.Ayyam Perumal, Advocate for State of Madras, Ms. Pallavi Langar, Advocate Govt. of Himachal Pradesh, Mr. Sameer Abhayankar, Advocate for State of Sikkim, Mr. Aravindh S. Advocate of U.T. Pudducherry, Ms. D.Bharthi Reddy, Advocate for High Court of Uttrakhand, Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh, Advocate for High Court of Jharkhand, Mr. Gaurav Agarwal, Advocate for High Court of Patna, Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Advocate for High Court of Chhatisgarh, Mr. Nikhil Goel, Advocate for High Court of Gujarat, Mr. Naresh K.Sharma, Advocate for High Court of Tripura,, Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, Advocate for State of Rajasthan,, Mr. Shailesh Madiyal, Advocate for U.T. J and K, Ms. Surbhi Kapoor, Advocate for state of Goa, Dr. Monika Gusain, Advocate for State of

Haryana, Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, Advocate for State of Tripura, Jharkhand
 Manisha Ambwani, Advocate for High Court of Rajasthan, Mr. Arakhand
 Chatterjee, Advocate for High Court of Calcutta, Mr. Rahul C
 Advocate for High Court of Punjab and Haryana, Mr. Apoorv S
 Advocate for High Court of Allahabad, Mr. Nirnimesh Dubey, Adv
 for state of Mizoram, Mr. Joseph Aristotle S. Advocate for Sta
 Tamil Nadu, Mr. Vishal Prasad, Advocate for State of Chhattis
 Ms. Astha Sharma, Advocate for State of West Bengal.

(I.A. Nos. 35729, 36585, 54736, 54707, 52666, 52662, 52655, 5
 55689, 55890, 56135, 56839, 56842, 59555, 59556, 69359, 69362, 69366, 72
 72282, 71867, 72515, 72521, 79289, 81454, 81462, 82753 and 864
 2023) Applications for Directions and Intervention and applica
 for exemption from personal appearance)

WITH

Diary No(s). 15241/2023 (II)
 FOR INTERVENTION APPLICATION ON IA 74325/2023

MA 2035/2022 in SLP(CrI) No. 5191/2021 (II)
 IA No. 166259/2022 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION

Date : 02-05-2023 These applications were called on for h
 today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN KAUL
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH

Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. [AC]
 Mr. Akbar Siddique, AOR [AC]

By Courts Motion, AOR

FOR PARTIES:-

Mr. Sourabh Kirpal, Sr. Adv.

Delhi HC

Mr. Amit Gupta, AOR
 Mr. Harishankar Mahapatra, Adv.
 Mr. Shiv Verma, Adv.
 Mr. Ravinder Dudeja, Registrar General,
 Delhi High Court

Mr. Ehboklang Kharumnuid, Registrar General
 Meghalaya HC

Mr. Anil Kumar Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Arvind Kumar Mishra, Adv.
 Mrs. Shashi Pathak, Adv.
 Mr. Sanjai Kumar Pathak, Adv.

Jharkhand

Ms. Pragya Baghel, Adv.
 Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR
 Ms. Sonal Singh, Adv.

Uttarakhand

Mrs. D. Bharathi Reddy, AOR with Registrar,
Judicial, Uttarakhand High Court

Mr. Adviteeya Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Hrithik Manchanda, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Vikram Choudhary, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Ankur Saigal, Adv.

Mr. Anshuman Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. Shashwat Singh, Adv.

Mr. Pranjal Krishna, Adv.

Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

Ms. Pooja Dhar, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tyagi, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Malak Manish Bhatt, AOR

Ms. Neeha Nagpal, Adv.

Mr. Vishvendra Tomar, Adv.

Ms. Sowjhanya Shankaran, Adv.

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, Ld. ASG

Mr. Jayant K. Sud, ASG

Mr. Piyush Beniwal, Adv.

Mr. S.N. Terdal, AOR

Mr. Rajneesh Chuni, Adv.

Mr. Pankaj Singhal, Adv.

Mr. Ayush Anand, Adv.

Mr. Shakti Singh, Adv.

Mr. Ayush Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Animesh Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Parv. K. Garg, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Singh, Adv.

Mr. Malik Javed Ansari, Adv.

Mr. V.N. Raghupathy, AOR

Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. P.I. Jose, AOR

Mr. Jenis Francis, Adv.

Mr. Ravi Sagar, Adv.

Mr. Arjun Garg, Adv.

Mr. Jayant K. Sug, ASG

Mr. Kartik Jasra, Adv.

Ms. Ishika Farsaiya, Adv.

Mr. Plannit Steffano, Adv.

Mr. S.N. Terdal, AOR

Mr. Sib0 Sankar Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Abhimanyu Tewari, Adv.
 Mr. Somanadri Gaud Katam, Adv.

Maharashtra
 Mr. Bharat Bagla, Adv.
 Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
 Mr. Aaditya A. Pande, Adv.
 Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.

Uttarakhand
 Mr. Ankur Prakash, Adv.
 Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Sikkim
 Mr. Avneesh Arputham, Adv.
 Ms. Anuradha Arputham, Adv.
 M/s Arputham Aruna, AOR
 Mr. Debojit Borkakati, Adv.
 Mr. S.N.Terdol, Adv.

Himachal Pradesh
 Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, AOR

Meghalaya
 Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, Adv.
 Mr. T.K. Nayak, Adv.
 Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Mahfooz A. Nazki, Adv.
 Mr. Maibam N. Singh, Adv.

Bombay HC
 Mr. Prashant S. Kenjale, AOR

Punjab
 Mr. Vinod Ghai, AG, Punjab
 Mr. Ajay Pal, Adv.
 Mr. Prashant Manchanda, AAG
 Mr. Mayank Dahiya, Adv.

Andhra Pradesh
 Mr. Gagan Gupta, AOR

Kerala
 Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, AOR
 Mrs. Anu K. Joy, Adv.
 Mr. Alim Anvar, Adv.
 Mr. Suwendu Suvasis Dash, Adv.
 Mr. Pradeep Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, Adv.
 Mrs. Swati Ghildiyal, AOR
 Ms. Devyani Bhatt, Adv.
 Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Anupam Raina, Adv.
 Mr. Sunny Choudhary, Adv.
 Mr. Varinder Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Madra

Puducherry

Goa

Maryana

Cutta HC

H HC

ttisgarh

Bengal

Madras HC

Ms. K.Enatoli Sema, Adv.

Mr. R. Ayyam Perumal, AOR
Mr. A. Renganath, Adv.

Ms. Pallavi Langar, Adv.

Mr. Sameer Abhayankar, AOR
Ms. Vani Vandana Chhetri, Adv.
Ms. Nishi Sangtani, Adv.
Ms. S. Rathore, Adv.

Puducherry

Mr. Aravindh S. AOR
Ms. Uma Bhuvaneshwari L., Adv.

Ms. D. Bharthi Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Aproop Kurup, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goel, Adv.
Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, Adv.
Mr. Shailesh Madiyal, Adv.

Goa

Mr. Abhay Anil Anturkar, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Tank, Adv.
Ms. Surbhi Kapoor, Adv.

Haryana

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Sr. AAG
Mr. Nikunj Gupta, Adv.
Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR

Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, Adv.
Ms. Manish Ambwani, Adv.

Calcutta HC

Mr. Kunal Chatterjee, AOR
Ms. Maitrayee Banerjee, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Bansal, Adv.
Ms. Kshitij Singh, Adv.

P & H HC

Mr. Rahul Gupta, AOR
Mr. Aproov Shukla, Adv.
Mr. Nirnimesh Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Joseph Aristotle S. Adv.

Chhattisgarh

Mr. Vishal Prasad, AOR
Ms. Ritika Sethi, Adv.

West Bengal

Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
Ms. Manika Haryani, Adv.
Mr. Dewrat Singh, Adv.
Ms. Muskan Surana, Adv.

Allahabad HC

Mr. Yashvardhan, Adv.
 Ms. Smita Kant, Adv.
 Mr. Apoorv Shukla, AOR
 Mr. Prabhleen A. Shukla, Adv.

Mr. Ravi Shanker Jha, Adv.
 Ms. Pooja, Adv.
 Mr. Munakala Venkata Ramana, Adv.
 Mr. Penumala Vidyadhar, Adv.
 Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
 Ms. Ashima Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR

Mr. S. Nagamuthu, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Pandey Neeraj Rai, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Goyal, Adv.
 Mr. Kaushik Choudhury, AOR
 Mr. Saksham Garg, Adv.

Mr. Somesh Chandra Jha, AOR

Mr. Ashish Batra, AOR

Ms. Rooh-e-hina Dua, AOR

Mr. Aditya Jain, AOR

Mr. Malak Bhatt, AOR
 Mr. Gaurav Mehrotra, Adv.
 Mr. Nadeem Murtaza, Adv.
 Mr. Sheeran Mohiuddin Alavi, Adv.
 Mr. Paawan Awasthi, Adv.
 Mr. Prashast Puri, Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Jain, AOR

Ms. Anzu. K. Varkey, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
 O R D E R

I.A. NOS.59555/2023-FOR INTERVENTION, 59556/2023- FOR
DIRECTIONS, 69359/2023-INTERVENTION, 69362/2023 - FOR
DIRECTION, 72515/2023 -INTERVENTION, 72521/2023-DIRECTIONS,
56135/2023-INTERVENTION, 51653/2023-INTERVENTION,
72281/2023-INTERVENTION 72282/2023-DIRECTIONS, 81454/2023-
INTERVENTION, 81462/2023-DIRECTIONS, 82753/2023-

INTERVENTION, 74225/2023-INTERVENTION IN MA No.2034/2022

We are not inclined to entertain these applications in individual cases where it has been stated that the judgment in the present case is not being followed.

The remedy really lies in pointing out the judgment of this Court and inviting an order from the Court concerned and if still it is perceived that the judgment is being followed in breach, to agitate their rights in independent proceedings.

We also make it clear that henceforth we will not entertain any such application and the Registry should not list any such application as the purpose of keeping this matter alive is only to see that the implementation takes place in the larger perspective.

Mr. Saurabh Kirpal, learned senior counsel submits that if at least an observation is made that the judgment in *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr.*- (2022) 10 SCC 51 should be taken into account by the trial Court, it may facilitate the parties.

The judgment of this Court including the one in *Satender Kumar Antil's* case (supra) is the law of the land. There is no question of anyone violating the principles laid down. Suffice for us to say that wherever this judgment is applicable, its principles must be followed.

We may note that apparently there are large number of cases arising especially in Uttar Pradesh and other States where the grievance made is that the judgment is not being followed. We consider appropriate that this order should be placed before the Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court to ensure there is sufficient dissemination of information about this judgment.

All the applications stand dismissed with liberty to avail of the appropriate remedy.

COMPLIANCES BY HIGH COURTS

(i) The High Courts have now filed the compliance affidavits. Mr. Sidharth Luthra, submits that on perusal of the compliance report what emerges is that there is non-compliance of certain directions in certain districts. Suffice for us to say that it is for the High Courts to ensure that whenever in certain districts there is non-compliance, necessary steps are taken to ensure compliance.

We consider appropriate to direct that the High Courts after ensuring compliance may inform this Court accordingly that all directions have been so complied with.

(ii) The Registrar of the Allahabad High Court appears not to have even filed the affidavit setting out what steps have been taken in pursuance to the

directions passed by us on 21.03.2023 and it is now stated before us that it will be filed. We find this completely unacceptable. A date is fixed where considerable time is spent in this matter to ensure that the law is followed. The least we expect is that the affidavits will be filed well in time with advance copies to the Amicus so that he can assist the Court. This is more so of a State where it has been found that there are large number of examples of orders being passed by judicial officers, not in conformity with the judgment passed in the present matter.

We call upon the Allahabad High Court to file appropriate affidavit within four weeks with advance copy to the learned Amicus setting out the steps taken in this regard and as to whether it has been identified if some judicial officers have been still frequently passing orders not in conformity with the judgment and whether any of the officers have been sent to the judicial academies for further upgradation of their skills.

We may also note that as per some orders handed over to the learned Amicus, even after the last order, such orders as have been illustratively passed by the Lucknow and Ghaziabad Courts are not following the judgment of this Court. We would like to emphasize that if counsels want to bring to the notice of the

Court that such orders are being passed, the least which is expected is that the Amicus would have been handed over advance copies of such orders to facilitate him in assisting the Court.

One of the orders pointed out is of Sessions Judge, Lucknow in Bail Application [Under Section 438 Cr.P.C.] No.3704/2023 dated 26.04.2023 i.e. even after the order passed by us on 21.03.2023. The order rejects an anticipatory bail application in a matter of a matrimonial dispute where it was alleged that there was an assault on the complainant and various family members were sought to be roped in which included the husband, brother in law, mother in law and father in law. It was stated before the Court that the accused applicants were not arrested during the investigation and now charge sheet has been filed. The statement of the Public Prosecutor is also recorded that the offences levelled are punishable with less than seven years of imprisonment. Thereafter the order notes the 2021 judgment of this Court. Despite this the anticipatory bail application is rejected qua all the applicants while recording *"since ample safeguards in given situation is already available to the accused-applicant, therefore, no ground exists for grant of anticipatory bail"*.

We have thus, specifically brought this order to the notice of learned counsel for the Allahabad High

Court as an illustration where despite all directions, much leaves to be desired.

Certainly, the learned Judge concerned meets the parameters for upgradation of his skills in a Judicial Academy and the needful be done by the High Court.

The fact that the directions in the case would apply to anticipatory bail cases was enunciated in the order dated 21.03.2023 and thus, there could not have been any confusion on this aspect.

Another illustrative order, we may note is in the case of a Second Anticipatory Bail Application No.1287/2023 in the Court of the Special Judge, Anti-Corruption CBI Court No.1, Ghaziabad dated 18.04.2023 which also the High Court needs to look into.

(iii) Mr. Sidharth Luthra, learned Amicus Curiae submits that no material has been given to him to assist the Court *qua* the aspect of directions to prosecutors contained in this behalf in the order dated 21.03.2023 by CBI or the States/UTs. We direct the needful to be done within the maximum period of four weeks with advance copy to Mr. Luthra failing which the concerned Secretaries of the State Government or the Head of the prosecuting agencies or the persons looking to this aspect of the prosecuting agencies should remain present in Court. The circulation in this behalf should be made through the

Director of Prosecution and training programmes organized to keep on updating the Prosecutors in this behalf.

(iv) In pursuance to the details of UTs given to NALSA, by Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, learned Amicus Curiae for NALSA submits that steps are being taken and some more time may be given for the follow up action in this behalf by NALSA and the State Legal Services Authorities.

(v) A chart has been placed before us which shows that some of the States/UTs are yet to file the compliance report (para [73(d)]). We cannot appreciate the non-compliance by the States i.e. Karnataka, Telangana, Haryana Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu and Lakshdweep. Not only is it to be filed but copies have to be supplied so that the counsels assisting us are able to carry out their task.

(vi) Another issue flagged by Mr. Luthra is there are States which have filed affidavits but not supplied /filed standing orders i.e. Tamil Nadu, Assam, UT of Puducherry, Kerala and Odisha.

We direct the States to supply copy of standing orders within two weeks from today failing which their Home Secretaries will remain present in Court as nothing seems to work except the peremptory orders of this nature.

(vii) The third category is of States which have passed standing orders but not in not in conformity with the directions i.e. Manipur, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and West Bengal. Mr. Luthra states that he will inform these States within a week of the deficiencies and the corrected standing orders will be issued within two weeks thereafter, failing which Home Secretaries will remain present in Court. The following is the status of compliance:

**CHART B: STATUS OF Hcs/STATES IN COMPLIANCE OF ORDER
DT.03.02.2023 & 21.03.2023 TILL 30.04.2023**

Sr. No.	States/UTs yet to file the compliance report [73(d)]	States which filed affidavit but not supplied /filed standing orders	Standing orders not in terms of direction of this Court
1.	Karnataka	Tamil Nadu (Pg.545;Vol.I)	Manipur -filed draft of standing order (Pg.337; Vol.I)
2.	Telangana	Assam (Pg.161;Vol.II)	Andaman and Nicobar Islands- Standing order not comprehensive (Pg.140;Vol.II)
3.	Haryana	UT of Puducherry (Pg.1; Vol.I)	West Bengal - general direction- no standing order (Pg.112, Vol.II)
4.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli Daman and Diu	Kerala(Pg.53;Vol.II)	
5.	Lakshadweep	Orissa (Pg.244;Vol.II)	

(viii) When we had proceeded with the matter further, Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned ASG joined the proceedings and has taken note of what is pointed out by Mr. Luthra i.e. the affidavit of CBI is not in

compliance. She requests that the said affidavit may be ignored and she will file correct affidavit within four weeks.

IA NOS.35729/2023 IA NO.36585/2023

No reply has been filed.

Interim order dated 21.03.2023 is made absolute and the applications stand disposed of.

IA NOS.52666/2023-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS
IA NO.52662/2023-INTERVENTION
IA NO.52655/2023-INTERVENTION
IA NO.52669/2023-DIRECTIONS

No reply has been filed.

Interim order dated 21.03.2023 is made absolute and the applications stand disposed of.

IA NOS.54736/2023-DIRECTIONS, 54707/2023-INTERVENTION

No reply has been filed.

Interim order dated 21.03.2023 is made absolute and the applications stand disposed of.

IA NO.55890/2023-DIRECTIONS

No reply has been filed.

Interim order dated 21.03.2023 is made absolute and the applications stand disposed of.

IA NOS.56839/2023-INTERVENTION, 56842/2023- DIRECTION

No reply has been filed.

Interim order dated 21.03.2023 is made absolute and the applications stand disposed of.

(AS
AST

IA NO.56846/2023- INTERVENTION
IA NO.56848/2023-DIRECTION

The applicant(s) has already been enlarged on bail in separate proceedings by this Court.

These applications do not survive for consideration and are disposed of.

XXX XXX

List on 08.08.2023.

(ASHA SUNDRIYAL)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
COURT MASTER (NSH)