

## Transparency in Judicial Appointments

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The central government has been pushing for reforming the collegium system and ensuring a bigger role for itself in judicial appointments and transfers.

\n

- While the judiciary has been actively thwarting these efforts, it needs to realise that more transparency is needed in judicial transfers and appointments.

\n

\n\n

### How are appointments made to the higher judiciary?

\n\n

\n

- The collegium system of judicial is in practice for appointments and transfers in the higher judiciary for more than 3 decades now.

\n

- Under this, the 5 senior most judges of the Supreme Court decide upon the appointment and transfer of judges in the higher judiciary.

\n

- The names decided are then forwarded to the government, which can either accept the suggestions or return them once but not the second time.

\n

- The closed door system has come under criticism as there is a lack of transparency and accountability in its functioning.

\n

- Lately, the central executive and the higher judiciary have openly disagreed over the manner in which senior judges should be appointed.

\n

\n\n

## **What are the recent developments in this regard?**

\n\n

- \n
- The government got the “National Judicial Appointments Commission” (NJAC) Act - 2014, passed as the 99<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment Act.
- \n
- NJAC sought to establish a body with representation from the higher judiciary, the government, and civil society to replace the current Collegium system.
- \n
- While the NJAC Bill was even passed and approved by more than 16 states (it is a federal subject), the Supreme Court pronounced it null and void.
- \n
- Nonetheless, government has time and again intervened in appointments, by delaying/opposing collegium recommendations on various grounds.
- \n
- In this regard, a recent report states that, of the multiple names recommended for appointment to the high courts across the country, 50% were ineligible.
- \n
- Further, many names reflected a clear cases of nepotism, failure to meet even the minimum criteria and lack of judicial competence.
- \n
- Moreover, collegium recommendations were also found to be skewed in favour of upper castes, with fewer SC, ST, OBCs and minority candidates.
- \n
- Further, only 27% of women were judges even in lower courts, which gets worse higher up with 11% in High Courts and 9% in Supreme Courts.
- \n

\n\n

## **What is the way ahead?**

\n\n

- \n
- Independence of the judiciary is one of the central pillars of any healthy democracy, which needs to be preserved.
- \n
- But the judiciary draws its power and influence from the fact that it is seen as an impartial arbiter, an image that it needs to protect.
- \n
- The current module for appointments and transfers has cast significant

doubt about the impartiality of the judiciary.

\n

- While the issues are clear and interference by the executive is undesirable, it is now upon the apex court itself to come up with an innovative solution.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Standard**

\n\n

\n\n

\n

