

Communique

NEWS LETTER FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION AMONG THE LEGAL FRATERNITY

VOL 4

NOVEMBER 1992

PART 8

Adv. Genl. Faces Contempt Proceedings

In an unprecedented situation a Division Bench of the Karnataka High Court ordered initiation of the Contempt of Court proceedings against the Advocate-General Mr. P.P. Muthanna for insinuating motives against the single judge of the Court who stayed the Government orders granting permission to start nine private capitation feebased Engineering colleges in the state. The Court in its order dated 30-10-92 observed that "we are constrained to take this painful decision resulting in our taking suo motu cognizance of contempt of Court, prima facie, committed by the Advocate - General. Consequently we direct the registration of Contempt of Court case against the Advocate General. An appropriate notice shall be issued to Mr. Muthanna as to why further proceedings shall not be taken under the provisions of the Contempt of Court Act, 1971."

The Division Bench rejected the contention of Mr. R. K. Garg, the counsel for Mr. Muthanna that "the remarks of the single judge were nothing but an impression gained by the judge." The Bench in its order pointed out that not once had Mr. Muthanna denied the correctness of the events recorded by the single judge on 25-9-92. Neither had he averred that it was incorrectly stated.

The Bench noted that when Justice G. P. Shivaprakash was not a party to any litigation either alongwith or

against the State Government in the SLP public interest litigation pending before the Supreme Court there was nothing to indicate that the judge could have developed any bias or prejudice against the State Government. As such the remarks of Mr. Muthanna of the learned single judge that he was disabled to hear the writ petitions were unfair.

Resolution Stayed

In a public interest litigation filed by C.H. Hanumantharaya, Advocate, the High Court of Karnataka stayed the operation of a recent resolution of the AAB directing that none of its members should represent the accused in Advocate journalist Gangadhara Murthy's case.

Writ Appeal Admitted

A Public interest writ petition filed by Sri.K.N.Subbarreddy, President, AAB, challenging the spending of state contingency funds and abuse of the Government machinery for the function organised on 17-10-92 to mark the completion of two years by Sri S. Bangarappa as the Chief Minister of Karnataka was dismissed by Justice S. Rajendra Babu on 15-10-92.

However, on 2-11-92 the writ Appeal filed against the order of the dismissal of the writ petition was admitted and the Respondents were granted three weeks time to file their statement.

Courts Urged to Keep Govt. Policy in Mind

Mr. S. Bangarappa, the Chief Minister of Karnataka, called upon the Courts to interpret law with due deference to the social philosophy of the Government in power rather than having commitment to the law of precedents. In his address to the All India Law Ministers conference inaugurated in Bangalore on 17-10-92 Mr. Bangarappa said that the Courts are not seeing eye to eye with the Government. He pointed out that "the programmes and policies of the Government in power should be taken note of by the law Courts in their interpretation of law rather than the perverse sense of commitment to precedents." Mr. Bangarappa said that there has to be change in the outlook of the Courts "from the imperative to the utilitarian" if the law is to be considered as an essential instrument of social change.

Mr. S. Bangarappa also announced on the occasion that the State Government is contemplating to set up Revenue Appellate Tribunals in every district as part of its plan to deliver justice to people at their doorsteps and make the process of administration of justice inexpensive and efficient. However, the observations of Mr. Bangarappa about the Courts following the social philosophy of the Government Justice K. N. Singh, Chairman, Law Commission and Justice V.S. Malimath, Chairman, CAT, expressed their reservations and said that the judges are committed only to the Constitution.

As a prelude to the Law Ministers' conference the All India Law Secretaries conference was convened at Bangalore on 16-10-92 and the same was inaugurated by the Union Law Secretary Dr. P. C. Rao.

After Successful Publication of Karnataka Acts and Rules upto 16 Volumes, now LLB proudly presents

THE COMPLETE DIGEST OF KARNATAKA CASES 1956-1992

(in 5 Volumes)

By

K. V. Shivaprasad

Edition : 1992

Rs. 395/- Per Volume

Place your orders with

Lawyers' Law Book,
848, 1st stage, 2nd phase,
9th Cross, Gokul, Yeshwanthpur,
BANGALORE-560 022.

B. M. Taneja,
Law Book Seller,
Civil Court Complex
BANGALORE-9

*A lawyer must first get on, then get honour
and then get honest —Anon*

COSTLY FAUX PAS

Under the scheme of our Constitutional setup the post of Advocate-General is an important office. He does not merely represent the State but discharges an array of functions commensurate with the importance of his position in the judicial system of our Country. The Advocates-General in the past were reportedly invited by the State to be in the office and effectively assist the High Court in its task of adjudication besides advising the State on all important legal aspects. But one cannot definitely say now that persons with outstanding merit, skill and erudition are invited by the State to occupy the exalted post of the Advocate-General. Considerations being otherwise the appointment of a person to hold the post of Advocate-General it is not always possible to expect him to be a person of outstanding legal acumen. This does not mean that the importance attached to this office is reduced in any manner in the present day context.

Prior to the enactment of the Advocates Act the Advocate-General was even considered to represent the Bar though the same is not the position now. Considering the outstanding personalities who have previously functioned as Advocates-General, the precedents they have laid in the past and the exemplary qualities they exhibited in the due discharge of their responsibilities one would have expected that irrespective of other aspects any Advocate-General would have maintained the dignity, decorum and equanimity at all times particularly in the Courts of law. But unfortunately this does not appear to be happening and serious introspection is required in the matter to set right any deficiencies in this regard. Politeness and cour-

tesy does not cost anyone anything but it may help in resolving many ticklish issues apart from enhancing the reputations of the persons concerned. This universal truth equally applies to the Advocate-General.

The recent episode concerning making of serious allegations by the Advocate-General against Justice G. P. Shivaprakash has taken all right thinking lawyers by surprise and it has evoked instantaneous response. As having been pointed out by Justice S. A. Hakeem the Advocate-General has caused irreparable damage to the institution of High Court by his remarks against one of its judges. It was not surprising that many of the lawyers who were present in the Court room on the day of the unfortunate happenings not only disagreed with the views of the Advocate-General but rightly lodged their protest describing the remarks as not having been made in good taste.

The ostensible ground for the Advocate-General to make such caustic remarks against Justice G. P. Shivaprakash was that the latter is a party to a special leave petition pending before the Supreme Court concerning the allotment of official quarters to Justices in High Court of Karnataka. While it is true that Justice G. P. Shivaprakash is yet to get a official quarters, to which he is entitled to, it is factually incorrect to state that he is a party to the SLP. As such the premises on which the Advocate-General made remarks against the learned judge does not stand to reason.

Subsequent remarks of the Advocate-General during recently held Bar Council function that the English judges

(continued on page 4)

Winding up of Companies

Udaya Holla, Advocate

For long men were carrying on business individually or in groups. However, the same was risky in view of the unlimited liability fastened on to the individual or to all the persons in the group as the case may be. Therefore, the man's ingenuity provided an answer in the form of "incorporated companies" with limited liability which permitted limiting of the members liability. Incorporation of a company facilities men with limited resources to come together to carry on business without being personally liable to the creditors in case the enterprise fails.

Pennington in his illustrious book Pennington's Company Law has stated that: "The Companies Act and the decisions of the Courts which have laid down the principles of company law are undoubtedly the greatest contribution made by lawyers to the industrial and commercial revolution of the last one hundred and fifty years".

Companies Act provides that upon incorporation a company becomes a separate legal entity different from its members having a corporate existence and a personality of its own and having perpetual succession and capable of owning property.

A company when once incorporated will continue to exist perpetually till wound up and eventually dissolved. Winding up is the process by which the corporate existence of a company can put an end to. Pennington states that "winding up or liquidation is a process by which the management of a company's affairs is taken out of its directors hands, its assets realised by a liquidator and its debts and liabilities discharged out of the proceeds of realisation and any surplus assets remaining returned to

its members/shareholders. At the end of the winding up the company will have no assets or liabilities and will therefore be simply a formal step for it to be dissolved that is for its personality as a corporation to be brought to an end".

Law of company liquidation is closely bound with the gradual evolution of limited liability and the extension of the corporate personality to trading concerns. Prior to 1844 there were no distinct statutes, enactments or legal principles which could be regarded as the law of company liquidation. All companies were treated as enlarge partnerships and the law of partnership applied to the winding up of such corporations. The liabilities of the members of a company like partners were unlimited. During the year 1844 an act called Winding - up Act came to be passed by the British Parliament which provided for winding up of a company. However, the said Act did not limit the liability of the shareholders. The corporate assets constituted the primary sources from which the liabilities were to be satisfied. The deficiency could still be made good by reaching out on to the private assets of the members. This was an unhappy situation as in cases of larger corporations the liabilities of the members were unlimited. Winding-up Act of 1844 was exclusively concerned with the rights of creditors and only creditors could precipitate the liquidation of a company. This Act specified that a member of a company could inter alia seek dissolution of a company if:

- i) the company committed an act of bankruptcy or
- ii) failed after notice in writing to indemnify a member

(to be continued)

ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಶತಮಾನೋತ್ಸವ ವರದಿ

ಮಹಂತೇಶ ಹೊಸಮಠ

ನಿರ್ಗಮಿಸಿರುವಂತೆಯೇ ಹಸಿರು ಮಡಿಲಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತ ರಸಿಕ ಕಣ್ಣಿನುದ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ರಾಜ ವೈಭೋಗ. ರಾಜ ಬೀದಿಗಳ ಮಾರ್ಗದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸಾಗಿದರೆ, ಅಂದದರ- ಮನೆಯ ಅಂಗಳದ ಅದ್ದೂರಿಯ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ. ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಶತಮಾನೋತ್ಸವ. ಪುರಾತನ ಕಾಲದ ರಾಜರಾಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲೇ ಹೈ-ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಮಖಂಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿತ್ತೆಂದರೆ ನಿಚ್ಚಿರಗಾಗುವಿರಲ್ಲವೆ? ಈಗಿನಂತೆ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಪ್ರೀಮ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನೇರ ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಪೀಲು ಇತ್ತು. ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಖ್ಯಾತಿಯ ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಶತಮಾನೋತ್ಸವ, ನೂತನ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭೋತ್ಸವ ಹಾಗೂ ಬಿಜಾವುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ನಕೀಲರ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 10 ಮತ್ತು 11 ರಂದು ನಡೆಯಿತು.

ರಾಜನನೆತನದ ಇತಿಹಾಸವುಳ್ಳ ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ನಗರ ರಾಜಾಂಗಣದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗಣದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಜೃಂಭಿಸುವ ವಿಶಾಲ ಪ್ರಾಂಗಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಶುಂಬಿದ್ದ ಜನಸ್ತೋಮ, ಪುರಾತನ ರಾಜನಿಷ್ಠೆ, ನ್ಯಾಯನಿಷ್ಠೆ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಅವರ ಅಭಿವಾನ್ಮದ ಜಯಕಾರ, ಗತಯುಗದ ರಾಜ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯ ನೋಡಲು ಬಯಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಜಮಖಂಡಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಿತ್ತು. ಇದೊಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಗೆ ಬಿಮ್ಮು ನೀಡಿದ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನವೇ ಸೈ.

ರಾಜ್ಯ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬಿಜಾವುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯವರೂ, ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರುಗಳೂ ಆದ ಕೆ.ಬಿ. ನಾವಡಗಿ, ಮಿರ್ಚಿ, ಮುರಗೋಡ್. ಎನ್.ವೈ. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ನವರು, ಶಂಜಾಬ್ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಮುಖ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಾದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಮಾಜೋಯ್ಯರು, ಸಚಿವರುಗಳಾದ ಬ್ಲೈಸಿಯಸ್ ಡಿಸೋಜಾ ಹಾಗೂ ನಾಡಗೌಡರು ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಜ್ಞಾನದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ, ನೆರವು, ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯ. ಕಿರಿಯ ವಕೀಲರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆ, ಜ್ಞಾನ ಹಾಗೂ ಪ್ರಶಾಂತತ್ವ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಮಾನ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರುಗಳು ನೀಡಿದ ಸಲಹೆ, ದೃಷ್ಟಾಂತಗಳು ಮಾರ್ಮಿಕವಾಗಿದ್ದವು.

ಚಲನಚಿತ್ರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಗಾಯಕಿ ಬಿ.ಕೆ. ಸುಮತ್ರ ಅವರು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಜನಸ್ತೋಮದ ಒತ್ತಡ ತಡೆಯದೇ ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರೂ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ನಗರದ ಜನತೆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ

ನೋಡಲು ದೂರ ದರ್ಶನ ನೇರ ಪ್ರಸಾರದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯ. ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಜ್ಞಾನ ದಾಸೋಹ ಜವತಿಯ ಮನಮುಟ್ಟುವಂತೆ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ನಡೆಸಿದ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ವಕೀಲರ ಸಂಘಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿದರೆ, ವಕೀಲರ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಕ್ಕೆ ನಗರವೇ ನಿಂತು ಸ್ವಾಗತದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ವಕೀಲರುಗಳಿಗಿರುವ ಜನತೆಯ ಅಭಿಮಾನ, ಪ್ರೀತಿಗೆ ದ್ಯೋತಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದೊಂದು ಕಾನೂನಿನಂಗಳದ ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಜ್ಞಾನದಂಬಾರಿಯ ಜಂಬೂಸವಾರಿಯೆಂದರೆ ಅತಿಶಯೋಕ್ತಿಯಾಗಲಾರದು.

News Spectrum

□ In a judgment delivered during September 92 a Crown Court in Britain after a retrial, accepting the contention that Ms. Kiran Ahluwalia had caused the death of her husband under provocation reduced the sentence on her from life imprisonment to imprisonment for three years. In this landmark judgment the court did not accept the contention of the prosecution that the accused is entitled for lenient punishment only in a case where the reaction was immediate response to the provocation. The Court ruled that in such cases the provocation may be continuous and the reaction of the accused might be delayed.

□ During October - 92 a Scottish Court granted divorce to Ms. Nasreen Akmal who was married according to Islamic rites at the age of fourteen years in Pakistan. The Court rejected the contention that it cannot adjudicate the case on the ground that the spouses were Muslims and the divorce can only be obtained by the parties as per the tenets of shariat law.

□ During the second week of October-92 the US Supreme Court finally rejected the libel suit filed by Sri Morarji Desai, the former Prime Minister of India, against Mr. Seymour Hersh for his writing in his book that the former was a CIA agent.

Around the Courts

(A) Group Insurance Scheme-Claims under-employer - respondent paid the premium on 27-10-1989 as against the due date of 1-7-1989-Petitioner employee died on 21-10-1989-whether petitioner is disentitled to benefits since premium was paid after his death.

Clause 11 allows the Corporation to exercise discretion in accepting the premium even on a date subsequent to the annual renewal date. When once it is accepted it cannot be said that it has been accepted from a date other than for which the payment has been made. The contention advanced on behalf of the Corporation that the policy was accepted only with effect from 27 - 10 - 89 cannot stand scrutiny. If this position is correct, then it must be held that on the date when the petitioner's husband died, there was a valid policy in force. If that is so the petitioner is entitled to the reliefs sought for—

(B) Whether there was privity of contract between the petitioner (deceased's wife) and the Insurance Company under which the petitioner can claim compensation.

When the policy itself makes it clear that the beneficiaries under the policy are the employees or their heirs, the policy itself is for their benefit under which the payments will have to be made by the Corporation. Although it is a rule of English law that normally a stranger to consideration or control cannot bring legal action, Indian law is quite different. Section 2 (a) of the Contract Act, while defining "Consideration" includes the words "the promisee or any other person" and that clearly shows that a stranger to consideration can sue.

(C) Constitution of India, Article 226-writ-Maintainability of - whether petition for money claim under an

insurance policy is maintainable under Article 226.

It is no doubt true that the High Court does not entertain cases where parties can obtain reliefs at the hands of the Civil Court and particularly when there is a disputed question of fact and which needs investigation, the parties are relegated to avail of those remedies. But it is not a rigid rule that the High Court cannot grant any relief where relief can also be obtained by way of a suit. If there is no disputed question of fact but only application of law arises in a case, the High Court can certainly examine the matter and give relief.

Smt. S. Premalatha Vs Mysore Minerals Ltd., Bangalore & Another 1992 (3) Kar. L. J. 312.

Lawasia Seminar

An International Seminar on "Legal Aid--Human Right or a Favour" was held at New Delhi on 8-9 November 1992 under the auspices of Lawasia.

ATTACK on A.K.S

Recently local BJP activists attempted to prevent A. K. Subbaiah, Advocate, from representing the accused involved in hoisting the Pakistani National Flag over a Mosque in Somavarpet, in the Court of the Magistrate at Mysore. The irate mob pelted stones over the car used by A.K Subbaiah to arrive at the court.

HUMOUR IN COURTS

- "Why did you throw the flowerpot at the plaintiff?" "Because of the advertisement, your honour." "What advertisement?" "Say it with flowers." □ Lawyer: "And why exactly do you want a divorce?" Husband: "Well, my wife has decided that we must both be free to do what she decides."

collection by : K. R. Dinakar Advocate.

Miscellany

□ On 1-8-92 P. Manohar, Advocate, opened his chamber at Room Nos. 11&12, Cellar, Amar Towers, No. 1, 1st Cross, Gandhinagar, Bangalore-560 009.

□ With effect from 30-9-92 B.C.Thiruvengadam, Advocate, shifted his chamber from No. 7, Kamala Mansion, H. Siddaiah Road, Bangalore-560 002 to No. 14/6, Queens Road, Bangalore-560 052.

□ On 1-10-92 R. Sampath Kumar, Advocate, opened his chamber at Lakshmaiah Reddy Bldg., 1st Floor, Varthur Main Road, Marathahalli, Bangalore-560 037.

□ With effect from 5-10-92 G. R. Ramesh, Advocate, shifted his chamber from No. 65-68, "Krishna Vasa", 1st Main, Seshadripuram, Bangalore-560 020 to No. 55, Railway Parallel Road, Kumarapark West, Bangalore-20.

□ On 6-10-92 V. Jayalakshmi, G. R. Sampangappa and H. Basavaraja, Advocates, opened their new chamber at No. 18/1, Upstairs, K.G. Nagar Main Road, Bangalore-19.

□ On 11-10-92 H. S. Rukkoji Rao, Advocate, opened his chamber at R. No. 12, 1st Floor, Muneswara Nilaya, 80 feet Road, 13th Cross, Rajajinagar, Bangalore-10.

□ On 23-10-92 S.M. Razvi, Advocate, opened his law chamber at No. 87, S.C. Road, Opp. Kino Talkies, Bangalore-560 020.

□ On 1-11-92 K.P. Rangan, Advocate, opened his law chamber at Balaji Medicals Building (upstairs), Near Bus stop, Nagasettiahalli, Bangalore-560 092.

□ On 4-11-92 T. M. Venkatarreddy, Advocate & Additional Central Govt. Standing Counsel opened his law chamber at No. 9/A, Ground Floor, Vokkaligasangha Complex, Hudson Circle, Bangalore-560 027.

When Nehru Confessed

N. M. Mulchandani, an advocate, in his letter dated 7-5-1962 pointed out to Pt. Nehru some grammatical mistakes apparent in his magnum opus "The Discovery of India". On 13-5-1962 when happened to receive an envelope he was profusely surprised to see Nehru's reply therein. The doyen texted his confession as under :

Dear Mulchandani,

Thank you for pointing out some grammatical mistakes in my Discovery of India. Some of the corrections that you have referred to are I think correct. Others are not perhaps necessarily correct. Both versions appear to me to be correct. Although I write in English, it so happens that, I have never studied English Grammar with any care.

Sd-Jawaharlal Nehru
9-5-62

So humble was the giant. A great leader of the nation who had little time to dine replies to his lilliputian citizen so simply and that too so swiftly.

Collection: Krishna S. Dixit,
Advocate

Views and Vignettes

□ I am not a hypocrite, perhaps an English judge would have appreciated my approach. A judge must be impartial; he must also know the law..... P. P. Muthanna, Advocate-General.

While reacting to the demand for making a statement about his remarks against Justice G. P. Shivaprakash.

□ God alone should save your Government Justice S. Rajendrababu.

While reacting when it was brought to his notice that a copy of the statement filed by the Chief Minister S. Bangarappa was not made available to Mr. Ko. Channabasappa, the counsel for petitioners.

News Focus

□ On 19-10-92 under the auspices of Bangalore Literary Union Mr. M.M. Raju, Advocate and international Yoga Teache raddressed the members on the topic "Science of Yoga". Mr. T.C. Joshi, national champion of Yoga, demonstrated Yogasanas.

□ On 31-10-92 Bangalore District Legal Aid Board held a Lok-Adalat to settle cases pending before the Family Courts. Seven cases were settled on the day.

□ On 5-11-92 Justice N. Y. Hanumanthappa released a Kannada tele-serial titled "Self Defence" under Indian Penal Code. Among others the casting of the serial includes C. H. Hanumantharaya and H. Billappa, Advocates and K. Krishnappa, Principal, V.V. Puram Law College.

□ On 3rd and 4th Nov 92 Bangalore Literary Union, BLP Co-op Society and AAB jointly celebrated Kannada Rajyothsava.

Costly Faux Pas

(from page No. 2)

would have appreciated his statement in its right perspective and that the judges should know law was totally uncalled for. The position was worst confounded by the Advocate-General before the Division Bench which varies with the court proceedings as recorded by the learned judge. It may not be wrong to state that the Advocate-General invited a contempt notice from the Division Bench considering his efforts to justify his unsupportable stand.

Many persons in the past have occupied the exalted post of the Advocate-General and enhanced the prestige of the office by their allround contribution. Perhaps for the first time in the history of our State that an Advocate-General is charged with committing contempt of Court. What a fall in the professional standard?

Painting Competition

Under the auspices of Lahari a Painting Competition for the Children, will be held in the middle of December, 1992. Children of Advocates, Judicial officers and Judicial staff, below the age of 15 years, are eligible to participate.

Interested participants may contact, Sri S. N. Prashanth Chandra, Advocate, Room No. 4, No. 11, Jeevan Building, Kumara Park East, Bangalore-560 001 or contact 263879, and register the names before 30th November, 1992.

Munsiffs Recruitment

By a Notification dated 17-9-92 the Secretary, Munsiffs Selection Committee, High Court of Karnataka, Bangalore has called for applications (in duplicate) from eligible candidates willing to serve as Munsiff / Magistrates. There are 39 posts to be filled and the last date for receipt of applications by the secretary is 20-11-92.

BOOK RELEASED

On 21-10-92 Justice K. A. Swami, Acting Chief Justice of the High Court of Karnataka released the book "Consolidated Law Digest of Karnataka" compiled by Prof. V. Narayana Swamy, Advocate and Deputy Director of Legal studies, B. M. S. Law College. The Digest has covered all the reported decisions of our High Court for the period 1990 to June 1992.

Obituary

□ On 3-10-92 Basavalingappa, Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

□ On 7-10-92 D. Sathyanarayana Setty, Advocate passed away at Bangalore.

□ On 26-10-92 Dr. N. C. Biligirangaiah, Advocate, passed away at Bangalore.

□ On 31-10-92 C. H. Nanjappa, Additional City Civil Judge, Bangalore expired.