



Mr.Sodhan Babu, Adv.  
Ms. Neelam Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Supriya Garg, Adv.

For UT of Puducherry Mr.R.Venkataramani, Sr.Adv.  
Mr.V.G.Pragasam, Adv.  
Mr.S.J.Aristotle, Adv.  
Mr.Prabu Ramasubramanain, Adv.

For States of  
M.P. and  
Chhattisgarh Mr.C.D.Singh, Adv.  
Mr.Anshuman Srivastava, Adv.

For State of Haryana Mr.Manjit Singh, AAG  
Mr.Tarjit Singh, Adv.  
Mr.Kamal Mohann Gupta, AOR

For State of Kerala Mr. C.S. Rajan, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. M.T. George, Adv.  
Ms. Kavitha K.T, Adv.

For State of  
Jharkhand Mr. Tapeshe Kumar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Kr. Anurag Singh, Adv.  
Mohd. Waquar, Adv.

For State of Raj. Mr. Siddharth Mittal, Adv.

For State of H.P. Mr.Suryanaryana Singh, AAG  
Ms.Pragati Neekhara, Adv.

For State of  
Meghalaya Mr.Subhro Sanyal, Adv.  
Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee, AOR

Mr. Altaf Ahmad, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. A.D.N. Rao, Adv.  
Ms. Neelam Jain, Adv.

For State of Sikkim Mr. A.K. Ganguli, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. A. Mariarputham, AG, Sikkim  
Ms. Aruna Mathur, Adv.  
Ms. Movita, Adv.  
Mr. Yusuf Khan, Adv.

For State of  
Uttarakhand Mr.Ashutosh Kr.Sharma, Adv.  
Mr.J.K.Bhatia, Adv.

For State of Assam Mr.Navnit Kumar, Adv.

For State of  
Arunachal Pradesh Mr.Anil Shrivastav, Adv.  
Mr.Rituraj Biswas, Adv.

For State of  
Nagaland Ms.K.Enatoli Sema, Adv.  
Mr.Amit Kr. Singh, Adv.

For State of Tripura Mr.Gopal Singh, Adv.  
Mr.Rituraj Biswas, Adv.

For State of J & K Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Adv.  
Ms. Astha Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Insha Mir, Adv.  
Mr. Raghav Chadha, Adv.

For State of Manipur Mr. Sapam Biswajit, Adv.  
Mr.Khwairakpam Nobin Singh, AOR

For State of Gujarat Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Tushar Mehta, AAG  
Ms.Hemantika Wahi, Adv.  
Ms.Subhada Deshpande, Adv.

For State of Karnataka Mr.V.N.Raghupathy, Adv.

For State of W.B. Mr.Avijit Bhattacharjee, Adv.  
Mr.Bikas Kar Gupta, Adv.  
Mrs.Sarbani Kar, Adv.

For U.T.,Chandigarh Mr.Ashok Thakur, Adv.  
Mr.Imran K.Burney, Adv.  
Mr. Anil K. Chopra, Adv.

for State of Maharashtra Mr. Shekhar Naphde, Sr. Adv.  
Mr.D.J. Khambata, AG, Maharashtra  
Mr.Sanjay V.Kharde, Adv.  
Ms. Asha Gopalan Nair, AOR

for State of Odisha Mr. Radha Shyam Jena, Adv.  
Mr. Siddharth P, Adv.  
Mr. Siddharth Luthra, ASG  
Mr. S.W.A. Qadri, Adv.  
Ms. Manju Jena, Adv.  
Ms. Minakshi Grover, Adv.  
Mr. Arjun Dewan, Adv.  
Mr. Satya Siddiqui, Adv.  
Mr. P.L. Nigam, Adv.  
Mr. Syed Tanweer Ahmad, Adv.

Mr. Pratap Venugopal, Adv.  
Mr. Gaurav Nair, Adv.  
Ms. Meenakshi Chauhan, Adv.

Mr. Shadan Farasat, Adv.

Mr. Pragyan P. Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Mandakini Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Heshu Kayina, Adv.  
Mr. P.V. Yogeswaran, AOR

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

While taking suo-motu cognizance of the newspaper reports showing that women were beaten by Punjab and Patna police, we had requested the learned Attorney General to assist the Court as an amicus. He graciously agreed to the Court's request and appeared on almost all subsequent dates.

After taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned amicus (learned Attorney General and Shri Harish N. Salve), Shri Prashant Bhushan and Shri Prakash Singh whose petition was decided by this Court in 2006 and a number of directions were given for ensuring reforms in the functioning of the police throughout the country, this Court also called upon the various State Governments and the Union Territories to file their response. Many of them filed affidavits willingly and many filed unwillingly but every time it was noticed by the Court that copy of one or the other has not been supplied to the learned amicus necessitating adjournment of the case.

It appears that the counsel representing the State Governments and the Union Territories do not realise the importance of the issues being dealt with by the Court in these matters, of which suo motu cognizance was taken by the Court as early as on 6.3.2013.

A little sensitiveness on the part of the learned States counsel and the officers would have enabled the Court to effectively hear the arguments and issue appropriate directions in the matter of implementation of the judgment in Prakash Singh v. Union of India (2006) 8 SCC 1.

Shri Prashant Bhushan brought to our notice that the Governments of the Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu have neither filed affidavits nor furnished the required information.

This has not been controverted by the learned counsel representing concerned States.

Let Chief Secretaries of the four States mentioned above, i.e., State of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu appear and assist their counsel in furnishing detailed information on the issue of implementation of the directions contained in the judgment in Prakash Singh case (supra).

List the case on 31.07.2013.

Learned counsel representing the States of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu are requested to personally contact their Chief Secretaries and inform them about today's direction so as to enable the concerned officers to accordingly schedule their work and attend the Court on the appointed date.

Copies of this order be made available to all the learned amicus, Shri Prakash Singh and learned counsel representing the State Governments and the Union Territories.

Writ Petition (C) No.169 of 2013

We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

At our request, Shri Siddharth Luthra, the learned Additional Solicitor General agreed to indicate names of one or more senior officers who can be entrusted with the task of independently making an enquiry into the entire episode in which people are alleged to have been subjected to brutality by the police at the instance of the Inspector General of Police of the State.

Shri Luthra requests for two days time.

Put up on 18.07.2013.

(Parveen Kr. Chawla)  
Court Master

(Usha Sharma)  
Court Master