



## 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.
- 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.
- **The problems** - There is an ongoing strain between the government and the judiciary over judicial appointments.
- 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.
- Recently, as many as 6 major parties from the opposition benches had moved a motion for the removal of CJI - thereby accentuating the crisis.
- **Removal** - Rajya Sabha rules prohibit the revelation of details about the motion before it is admitted and hence exact content is not known.
- 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



**IAS PARLIAMENT**

*Information is Empowering*

A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative