

## Removal of Chief Justice of India (CJI)

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- Opposition parties in the 'Rajya Sabha' have moved a "motion to remove" CJI Deepak Mishra.

\n

- While there are multiple allegations against the CJI, some believe that the current motion could undermine the independence of the judiciary.

\n

\n\n

### What are the problems that have cropped up in the judiciary?

\n\n

\n

- Higher Judiciary in India has been going through a tumultuous time currently with multiple issues plaguing its work.

\n

- **The problems** - There is an ongoing strain between the government and the judiciary over judicial appointments.

\n

- 4 senior judges of the 'SC collegium' had publicly dissented against the CJI by voicing concerns over CJI's unilateral allocation of cases to benches.

\n

- Recently, as many as 6 major parties from the opposition benches had moved a motion for the removal of CJI - thereby accentuating the crisis.

\n

- **Removal** - Rajya Sabha rules prohibit the revelation of details about the motion before it is admitted and hence exact content is not known.

\n

- Their main charge against the CJI is speculated to be "the accusations regarding the selective assignment of cases to Benches of his choice".

\n

- The aggrieved parties have perceived that the CJI is misusing his discretionary power to distort judicial outcomes in multiple cases.

\n

- Significantly, even in the midst of all this, CJI had earlier asserted his

position as the 'master of the roster' - stressing his prerogative in allocation of cases.

\n

\n\n

### **How valid is the case against CJI's prerogative to allocate cases?**

\n\n

\n

- Collegium system was put in place by the Supreme Court to enable a plurality of consultation for judicial appointments (among senior-most judges).

\n

- Those arguing for a consultative approach for allocating cases have been drawing parallels from this established framework.

\n

- The counter argument is that, allocation of cases is a routine function and can't be equated with the process for new appointments.

\n

- Irrespective of the legal framework, the CJI could've averted the crisis by having held informal consultation with his collegium to ease tensions.

\n

\n\n

### **What could be the expected outcome of the removal motion?**

\n\n

\n

- The opposition parties do not have the numbers in the parliament to secure the removal of CJI, and the motion is merely a symbolic protest.

\n

- Additionally, it is also wholly within the power of the Rajya Sabha Chairman (Vice-President) to decide whether to admit it or not.

\n

- If the motion gets admitted, a parliamentary enquire would be constituted, and the report will then be discussed on the floor of the concerned house.

\n

- If there is any adverse finding, then the removal motion will have to be put to vote and be passes with a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the present and voting.

\n

- **Contrasting Views** - Some argue that commissioning a parliamentary enquiry would imperil the independence of the judiciary.

\n

- But others vouch that the constitution has ingrained such a procedure (with

sufficient checks) to ensure accountability.

\n

- If admitted, the motion will indeed be a black mark on judiciary's reputation, but if turned down, it would be a case of suppressing opposition's voices.

\n

- Hence, the Rajya Sabha Chairman will have to weigh both these options and take a nuanced stand on whether to admit or reject the motion.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n\n

\n\n

\n

