

Communique

NEWS LETTER FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION AMONG THE LEGAL FRATERNITY

Volume 8

October 1996

Part 7

Justice Venkatachalaiah to Head NHRC

Former Chief Justice of Supreme Court of India Justice M.N. Venkatachalaiah has been named as the New Chairman of the National Human Rights Commission of India. He takes over charge of office of the Chairman from Justice Ranganatha Mishra who retires on November 25, 1996. Justice Venkatachalaiah will remain in office till he turns 70.

Lahari Foundation

In response to the Foundation's Appeal the following donations have been received:

Prof M.S.Gopal Rs .5,000/-
S.Gangadhara Aithal Rs. 2,000/-,
N.S. Satyanarayana Gupta Rs. 1,000/-,
K.S. Ramanathan Rs .500/- and
H.Billappa Rs.500/-

During October 96 the Foundation provided financial assistance of Rs.1,000/- to Mr.H.R.Chandrashekara.

Subscription Revised

On account of increase in the publication cost of the news letter annual subscription of Communique is revised and fixed at Rs.15/- with effect from the new year.

Retired

On 5.10.1996 Justice R. Ramakrishna retired as a Judge of the Karnataka High Court. On the eve of his retirement AAB had organised a farewell function on 4.10.1996, at the High Court Unit.

Speakers' Meet call to stop interference by judiciary

The recent speakers meet held in New Delhi on October 12, 1996 came down heavily on the judiciary accusing it of taking over the functions of the Executive and held that this trend must stop. The conclusions reached by the symposium attended by the presiding officers of legislatures and parliamentarians to deliberate over the relationship between the Executive, the legislature and the judiciary are "The Judiciary has, off late, tended strongly to take over executive functions as reflected in a series of its decisions. The more disturbing aspect is in terms of identifying the investigating official who will report to it, thereby bringing the police investigation under the jurisdiction of the judiciary is playing the role of the prosecutor as well as the judge".

Loksabha speaker, P.A. Sangma who presided over the symposium said that, "this trend must stop". In his opening remarks Mr. Sangma complained, albeit indirectly, about the courts coming down harder on public personalities compared to the common people. He said that, "The judges are but men of flesh and blood" and on occasions, they had tended to be "impacted by media blitz on certain issues and there is a tendency on the part of judges to pronounce totally avoidable obiter dicta. This trend certainly smacks off judicial populism".

In an apparent reference to the courts' handling of VIP accused, Mr. Sangma said, "Nor should personalities who have been in high places be denied the remedies available to similarly placed people simply because the former held high position". The symposium felt that the judiciary while playing its rightful role should, "strongly discourage tendencies towards abuse of the facility of recourse to public interest litigation". Referring to PIL the speaker Mr. Sangma said that it was a vital weapon in the hands of common people to force rectitude on those who hold high offices. At the same time, the persons in high places were also vulnerable people as they were "not necessarily autonomous in decision making".

He urged the courts to take note of this fact and exercise restraint in admitting PIL. Elaborating the concept, Mr. Sangma remarked that "with great respect to our judicial system and with all the humility at my command, I would like to submit that courts of last resort should not become courts of first resort".

Mr. Sangma said the legislature had not been assertive, "in its own areas of competence". He was referring to the participant's unhappiness over the legislatures' failure to come to the aid of the Manipur Speaker who was arrested and handcuffed, or to impeach Justice M. Rama swamy, the former Judge of Supreme Court, even after the Judiciary itself had discredited him. Later, the speakers in the symposium admitted that the legislatures have failed in asserting their rightful role. The symposium called for a special session of parliament to enact Lok Pal Bill, bringing in its perview, the Prime Minister as well as the Judges, and to set up an Ethics Committee of Senior Parliamentarians and other legislators to secure probity in public life. While asserting the "Primacy" of legislatures, the symposium disapproved "interference" of the judiciary in the functioning of legislature and the Executive.

Around the Courts

★ Section 3 of the Muslim Women's (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986:

In a recent judgment dated 8.10.1996 the Ranchi Bench of Patna High Court has awarded maintenance cost of Rs.50,000/- to Rakeeba, directing her former husband to pay the same along with her maintenance for three months period of Iddat and also returning the Mehr. Rakeeba was married to her husband a Class III Employee in the State Government, on January 4, 1974. The couple has a son and a daughter. For the reason best known to him, the husband started ill-treating Rakeeba, as a result of which she had to take refuge in her parents' house. During this period the husband divorced Rakeeba by pronouncing Talaq three times.

Rakeeba moved a local court. By its judgment and decree of August 31, 1984, the trial court directed the husband to pay maintenance cost, maintenance for three months period of Iddat and return the Mehr amount. The husband challenged the trial court's order on the ground that Koran laid down only the payment of Mehr and maintenance for the period of Iddat and as such he is not liable to pay the maintenance cost for the divorced wife to maintain herself for the rest of her life. While dismissing the appeal, the High Court held that fair provision had to be made for a divorced Muslim Woman to maintain herself for the rest of her life.

★ Section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955: In a recent judgment, justice M.F. Saldanha, held that the marriages which have taken place in violation of Section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act can be still considered marriages with a view to do justice to both the parties the Lordship held that (continued on page 3)



Laws can never be enforced unless fear supports them

— Sophocles

Coverup Bureau of India

Statement of Objects in the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 declares that the Central Government decided to retain the then Special Police Establishment as the Central Bureau of Investigation for the avowed purpose of investigating offences of bribery and corruption connected with the Departments of the Central Government. Sec.5 of the Act provides for extension of jurisdiction of CBI to states and other areas with the constant of the concerned administration. Nobody would have dreamt that this premier investigating agency of the Government of India could be now to coverup the misdeeds of the persons accused of having committed offenses.

For the past couple of years the CBI is in the limelight not for its exemplary investigative skills but for its role of having been more or less a stumbling block in the proper pursuance of Criminal cases against the VIPs. No day passes without the media projecting the CBI in poor light based on the remarks of various courts. So much so the Delhi and the Patna High Courts have found it expedient to entrust the ongoing investigation to specified officers of the CBI with a direction to such offices not to take guidance and/or report to the highest offices of the Bureau. In a number of cases the apex court and High Courts have been monitoring the course of the investigations of the cases which has been pending adjudication before them.

The reasons for this sorry state of affairs are not difficult to be found. Firstly the Bureau has been under the administration control of Home Department and/or the Prime Minister. All and sundry issues will have to be cleared by the political bosses. Secondly the appointment of Director and other officers of CBI is not always done on the basis of merit. Often inconvenient

officers are transferred out of the Bureau and/or divested of the cases which have been entrusted to them for investigation purposes. In this background it is too much to expect that the Bureau could be purely professional and impartial. The situation is compounded particularly when the investigations against persons in high offices and/or persons who previously held high offices are taken up. Besides, unlike the Constitutional functionaries the tenure of office of the officers of the Bureau including that of the Director is not fixed. Always the democles' sword is hanging on their heads and the officers concerned know for certain as to what they should do to keep their bosses in good humour.

In the light of the role played by the premier investigation agency of the land in the immediate past the time has now come to review the status of the Bureau in its present form and to think of remedies to plug the loopholes so that the agency could discharge its legitimate functions without fear or favour. All though right thinking persons who are interested in the well being of the country should apply their minds on this vital question and suggest suitable remedies.

Needless to state that the CBI with present role has lost its purpose and utility. Public interest litigation has been the saving grace prompting for judicial activism resulting in the monitoring of various investigations by the courts and compelling the CBI to perform its job. As expected the politicians have already taken up cudgels against judiciary for "intrusion" into the legislative/Executive activities of the State. However the politicians are blind to the short comings of the Executive and the CBI since it suits their personal interests. Politicians being what they are, holding office or otherwise, cannot be expected to be the upholders of law particularly when it pinches them. Therefore it has become essential for the people and the judiciary to accept the challenge and to do the needful.

COPY RIGHT

A. R. Srinivasa Rao. Advocate.

(from last issue)

A license is different from assignment. In the case of license the licensee gets the right to exercise particular rights subject to the condition of the licence, but does not become the owner of the same; whereas the assignee becomes the owner. A license is personal and so not transferable. License cannot sue for infringement.

Compulsory Licensing: The Copyright Board is empowered to grant compulsory licence under certain circumstances on suitable terms and conditions in respect of an Indian work; (a) the work must have been published or performed in public (b) the author must have refused to re-publish or allow re-publication of the work, or refused to allow performance of the work in public (c) that by reason of the refusal, the work is withheld from public; or (d) the author must have refused to allow to broadcast the work on reasonable terms.

In the case of unpublished works, the author of which at the time of making the work was a citizen of India, when the author is dead, unknown or cannot be traced any person may apply to the Board for compulsory licence. The applicant is directed to deposit the amount of royalty in the public account so as to enable the author or his legal heir to claim such royalty amount.

Publishing Agreement: Publishing Agreement and Assignment are different. Where the author agrees to grant to the publisher the sole and exclusive license to print, publish and sell his work, but reserves to himself the copyright of such work, the agreement amounts to only publishing agreement and not an assignment of copyright.

An author may send the manuscript of a book to a publisher and the publisher agrees to publish it. In that case, law will imply the bare

minimum of terms to complete the contract. The publisher has a licence to publish an edition of the book, but that is all; the author of course keeps the ownership of the copyright. The publisher must pay the author a reasonable royalty.

If the publishing agreement contains a clause requiring the author to offer his next book (or next many books) to the same publisher, it is perfectly valid and enforceable. On the other hand an agreement to write a number of further books would not be enforceable by injunction. Injunctions are not given to compel the performance of personal services.

Suppose the author writes his next book on the subject and offers it to a second publisher, who publishes it and spoils the market for the first; or suppose the publisher puts out a second book on the same subject at the same time and spoils the first authors' sales—unless it is provided in the agreement as to what to do, it would be help less.

Copyright Society: Since it is practically impossible for the owner of a copyright in a dramatic or musical work to police and prevent performance of their work without licence, performing Rights Societies were formed under the 1984 Amendment Act for the collective enforcement of their rights by the authors of those works.

After coming into force of the Copyright (Amendment) Act 1994. Performing Rights Societies shall be deemed to be Copyright Society and shall get registered within one year. The amendment has extended the operation in respect of all rights relating to any class of work in which copyright subsisted under the Act. Organisation which was authorised to carry on such business is called Copyright Society.

(to be continued)

Rule of law essential to sustain Democracy

(from the last issue)

Referring to 1970 Tagore Memorial Lecture delivered by Justice P.B. Mukerjee where the speaker had mentioned that the judiciary is only carrying on the baton which was passed on to it by its forebears, Justice Verma said that judicial review is a continuous process. The learned speaker also hailed the dissenting opinion of Justice Mahmood of 1893 when he held that the principles of natural justice is also applicable to a criminal case and any sentence passed against the accused without hearing him was bad. He also referred to the 1949 judgement of Nagpur High Court delivered by justice Vivian Bose in which it was held that Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is not avoidable in respect of state's Vicarious Liability to pay compensation particularly when the state is involved in commercial activity.

Maintaining that the term judicial activism is a misnomer His Lordship felt that it is an ancient vintage of India and in any event it is not an imported concept. Refuting the apprehension that judicial activism has resulted in increased backlog of pending cases Justice Verma provided statistical data to show that infact between 1.1.1992 and 6.9.1996 the pendency has actually decreased. He maintained that 1,04,936 cases were pending before the Supreme Court as on 1.1.92 and whereas 26,673 cases 8,059 admission matters and 18,504 regular matters were pending as on 6.9.1996. He pointed out that this was possible mainly due to computerisation, clubbing of cases and categorisation of class action cases for the purpose of disposal of cases.

Paying rich tributes to late Mr.B.N.Datar, in whose memory the present endowment lecture is held Justice Verma pointed out that

(continued on page 4)

Around the Courts

(continued from page 1)

nothing could constitute greater traversity of justice, if such a technical plea of "Void marriage" is upheld in favour of the husband. Disagreeing with the traditional view taken by the Punjab and Haryana, Delhi, A P and Calcutta High Courts, the judge held that the marriage in question was valid and subsisting.

The husband filed a petition seeking a declaration that the marriage with his wife was void on the ground that he was just 20 years old when his marriage took place, and Section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act prescribes the minimum age of the male to be 21 years. It was also contended by the husband that the wife is not entitled to claim any maintenance since the marriage in question was void ab initio. The trial Court accepted this plea and decreed the husbands' petition. Aggrieved by the said judgment and decree the wife preferred an appeal to the High Court.

Justice Saldanha has recommended to the Union Government in this appeal that the penalty prescribed for conducting under-age marriages be drastically enhanced to discourage all such persons who abet and or take part in such marriages.

Lahari Foundation Appeal

Lahari Foundation, Bangalore, seeks donations for augmenting its financial base. This foundation is providing assistance to lawyers for health reasons. The donations you make now will be of immense help to some one who needs it.

— Trustee

Literary Union

○ On 29.9.1996 an excursion was arranged to Mekedatu, Muthathi and Talakadu.

○ On 3.10.1996 Dr. Rajkumar released the Souvenir 'Sougandhika'.

○ Pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Special General Body Meeting held on 7.10.1996 Mr.H.R. Shankara narayana took over as the interim President of the Literary Union with immediate effect.

○ The Annual General Body Meeting of the Union and election of Officer bearers is scheduled to be held on Sunday the 24.11.1996 at the City Unit of AAB.

Humour in Courts

Judge : Counsel, under what provision I can allow your prayer?

Counsel : Your Honour has "inherited" power under Sec.151 CPC to allow my prayer!

Letters to the Editor

This is with reference to the letter written by Sri.C.B. Srinivasan and published in Communique.

The Code of Civil Procedure makes a broad distinction between the right of an Advocate between pleading and acting. Order III Rule 4 provides that no Pleader so act for any person unless he has been appointed to do so in writing signed by such person. We learn that this what is called Vakalath. On the other hand Order III Rule 4(5) provides that it is permissible to a lawyer to plead on behalf of any party by merely filing into court a memorandum as prescribed. The proviso further states that one pleader can plead on behalf of another pleader even without such a memorandum.

It is therefore appropriate that the Bar Council of India do modify the Rules for Trainees. The enrolment may be completed, but every Advocate enrolled may be prohibited from acting for the period of one year. This facilitates the right of representation canvassed in the letter on behalf of the Tainee Advocates.

S.G.Harini & eleven others
Advocate Trainees.

➤ Death is a phenomenon of the life Cycle.
Rebirth does not carry memory Forward.
Every Life begins afresh with opportunities
either for Stagnation or Salvation
depending upon the previous birth.

Dharma is the mariner's compass in life, it
Binds man and man and the society at large.

➤ God is the greatest democrat known to the
world.
He gave liberty to man to choose the right
or the wrong.
The choice is his and he cannot blame the God
thereafter.

Collection : C.Srinivasa Iyengar

News Focus

☑ On 2-10-96, a special Lok Adalat was held at the Karnataka High Court on the occasion of Gandhi Jayanthi. Chief justice R.P.Sethi inaugurated the Lok Adalat. Information and Publicity Minister M.C.Nanaiah presided justice A.J.Sadashiva also participated in the function.

Foreign Tours

➔ Mr. RVS Naik & Mr K.P. Kumar, Advocates, returned to Bangalore on 28.10.96 after two weeks tour of Australia via Singapore.

Rule of Law essential to sustain democracy

(from page 3)

Lawyers from Karnataka has a daunting task of maintaining rich traditions of the Bar and continue to produce men of eminence.

Chief Justice.R.P.Sethi who presided over the function maintained in his presidential address that the courts in India have stood the test of time and have acted as promoters of social transformation. He pointed out that the Supreme Court of India has stood as the sentinel of Justice. He pointed out that people have complete faith in the system and look to it as the final arbiter even while other organs of the state have failed in discharging their obligations,. He commended the role played by the Bar in maintaining the independence of judiciary.

Barrister H.K.Vasudeva Reddy, Managing Trustee of the Advocates Foundation welcomed the guests. Treasurer of the Foundation Mr.Mohammed Ather read a report about the activities of the Foundation and the endowment. At the end Sri.K.N.Putte Gowda, General Secretary of AAB proposed vote of thanks. Mr.Harikishore, Advocate, compered the programme.

Miscellany

✱ On 12.9.1996 prof. M.S. Gopal, Advocate, completed the golden jubilee year of his professional career, Lahari wishes him all the best.

✱ On 11.10.1996 Mr.H.R. Shankaranarayana, Advocate, celebrated his 70th birthday at Bangalore Lahari wishes him all the best.

✱ On 14.10.1996 Mr.N.D. Onkarappa, Advocate, opened his law chamber at No. 122, I Floor, I'K'Block, Dr. Rajkumar Road, Rajajinagar Bangalore-560 010.

✱ As a part of Dasara Mahotsava Sri. Murugarajendra Swamiji of Sri.Brihanmata, Chitradurga, conferred the title of "Nyaya Bhushana" on Sri.H.S. Renukaprasad, Advocate & Notary from Bangalore, in a function held at Chitradurga on 17.10.1996. The function was presided over by the Karnataka Minister for Rural Development Sri.M.P.Prakash.

Obituary

☼ On 1-10-96 Former Civil Judge, P.S.Srinivas, expired at Bangalore.

☼ On 7-10-96 M.S. Bhujanya Rao [72], Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

☼ On 10-10-96 B.M. Natarajan, Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

☼ On 16-10-96 K.Ahmedulla khan [76], Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

☼ On 19-10-96 B.Muralidhar Singh, Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

Oppurtunity Available

Advocates interested in working with an Advocates Firm may apply with Bio-data to

M.R.Narayan & Co,
Advocates & Tax Consultant
768, 34th Cross,
9th Main, 4th Block,
Jayanagar,
Bangalore-560 011.
Phone: 6635669

ಸಮಾರಂಭ : ಸ್ಮರಣ ಸಂಚಿಕೆ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ



ನಾನು ಕಲಾವಿದ ನೀವು ಲಾ ವಿದರು.

ವರದಿ : ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಮಹದೇವ ಮೂರ್ತಿ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಲಿಟರರಿ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಆಶ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 3. 10. 1996 ರಂದು ಕಬ್ಬನ್ ಉದ್ಯಾನವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಘದ ಸಭಾಂಗಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಚಲನ ಚಿತ್ರರಂಗದ ಖ್ಯಾತನಟ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಿತ ದಾದಾಸಾಹೇಬ್ ಫಾಲ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತಿ ವಿಜೇತ ಡಾ|| ರಾಜ್‌ಕುಮಾರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸುಂದರ ಸಂಜೆಯ ಸರಳ ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸನ್ಮಾನಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಸನ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಿ ಭಾವ ಪರವಶರಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಅವರು ನನಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಇಲ್ಲ , ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ವಿನಯವಂತನಾಗಿರು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಜ್ಞಾಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ , ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ವಿನಯವಂತನಾಗಿರಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. " ನಾನು ಕಲಾವಿದ ನೀವು ಲಾ ವಿದರು " ಎಂದು ವಕೀಲರ ಕಾನೂನು ಜ್ಞಾನವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶಂಸಿಸಿದರು. ಯಾವುದೇ ರಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಲು ತಾನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ ತನ್ಮಯತೆಯಿಂದ ಅತ್ಯುತ್ತಮ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಏರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ವಕೀಲರಿಗೆ ಕಿವಿಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷತೆಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮೂರ್ತಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಎ.ಜಿ. ಸದಾಶಿವ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ " ಅಭಿನಯದ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಯುಧಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರ ಹೃದಯವನ್ನು ಗೆಲ್ಲಬಹುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಡಾ|| ರಾಜ್ ಕುಮಾರವರು ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ರಣಧೀರ ಕಂಠೀರವ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂ ಕೈಲಾಸ ಚಲನಚಿತ್ರಗಳ ಅಭಿನಯವನ್ನು ಮನಸಾರೆ ಹೊಗಳಿದರು. ರಾಜ್ ಕುಮಾರ್

ವಿನಯವಂತಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚಲನಚಿತ್ರರಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧಿಸಿರುವ ಯಶಸ್ಸಿಗೆ, ಕೇವಲ ಪಾತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ತನ್ಮಯರಾಗುವುದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹೃದಯ ಸಂಸ್ಕಾರವು ಕಾರಣ " ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು.

ಇದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ " ಸೌಗಂಧಿಕಾ " ಸ್ಮರಣಸಂಚಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಡಾ|| ರಾಜ್ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಅವರು ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಲಿಟರರಿ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಹಳೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರುಗಳ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಮರಿಸಿ ಸನ್ಮಾನಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

ಲಿಟರರಿಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮನಮೋಹನ್ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿದರು. ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸೋಮಶೇಖರ್ ವಂದನಾರ್ಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಸಾಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಸಹ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ವಿಶೇಷ ಸರ್ವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಭೆ

ದಿ|| 7. 10. 1996 ರಂದು ನಡೆದ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸರ್ವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಭೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ 1995-96ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಪದಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕೂಡಲೇ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ತತ್ಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಿಂದ ತೆಗೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿತು. ಈ ವಿಶೇಷ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಆಧಾರವೆಂದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಪದಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರ್ವಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸೂಚಿಸದೆ ಡಾ|| ರಾಜ್ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಸನ್ಮಾನಸಮಾರಂಭ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ಆಗಿತ್ತು.