



SC Verdict on Rafale Deal

Why in news?

\n\n

The Supreme Court recently gave its verdict on the Rafale aircraft acquisition deal. Click [here](#) to know more on the deal's controversy.

\n\n

What is the court's stance?

\n\n

\n

- The controversy is triggered by a media interview of former French President and press coverage alleging "favouritism" by the Modi government.
- But individual perceptions cannot be the basis of a roving judicial review and so the Court declined to intervene.
- It said it cannot sit as an appellate authority over each and every aspect of the deal.
- It refused to employ its judicial review powers to intervene in the deal's decision-making process, pricing and the choice of Indian Offset Partner (IOP).
- It agreed with government that judicial review is limited in matters of defence procurements, Inter-Governmental Agreements (IGAs) that may be vital to national security.

\n

\n\n

What is the verdict?

\n\n

- \n
- The judgment came on a batch of petitions for an independent court-monitored CBI/SIT investigation into the deal.
- \n
- There was no occasion to doubt the decision-making process which led to the IGA between the French and Indian governments.
- \n
- "Minor variations" in the decision-making process should not lead to the setting aside of the contract itself.
- \n
- The court, however, restrained itself from delving deeper into the issue.
- \n
- The Court said it could not use the mechanism of judicial review to compare the prices of aircraft between the [old and the new deal](#).
- \n
- But the judgment repeated the government's claim that the contract was of "financial advantage to the nation".
- \n
- In all, the Court held that there was no substance to the allegation that the government showed any "commercial favouritism".
- \n
- It's because it acknowledged the government stand that the choice of IOP was not in its realm; the vendor, Dassault Aviation, chooses its own IOP.
- \n

\n\n

What are the concerns?

\n\n

- \n
- **Role** - The apex court went into issues that should have been left to the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG), and after that to Parliament.
- \n
- Neither the report of the CAG on procuring Rafale aircraft nor the Parliamentary Accounts Committee (PAC) report on it has been completed.
- \n
- So in effect, the work that should have been done by the CAG has now been rendered virtually purposeless.
- \n
- The shortcomings, if any, to be highlighted by the CAG, may be pointless as the court has already determined that nothing was wrong.
- \n
- **Information** - Along the way, the court asked for information from the government in sealed covers.

- \n
- This is a practice it has resorted to in other cases as well.
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- But it is fundamentally contrary to the normal and accepted practice of judges hearing cases in open court.
- \n
- **Contradictions** - There are contradictions, too, in the judgment.
- \n
- E.g. it says “it is certainly not the job of the court to carry out a comparison of the pricing details in matters like the present”.
- \n
- But the judgement mentions on examining closely the price details and comparison of the prices.
- \n
- The correct course of action now would be for the government or the court to release the whole or at least the relevant part of what was communicated in secret.
- \n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu, Business Standard

\n



IAS PARLIAMENT
Information is Empowering
A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative