

REPORT NO.

72



सत्यमेव जयते

**PARLIAMENT OF INDIA**  
**RAJYA SABHA**

DEPARTMENT-RELATED PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES, LAW AND JUSTICE

**SEVENTY-SECOND REPORT**

**The Delhi High Court (Amendment) Bill, 2014**

*(Presented to the Rajya Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014)*

*(Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014)*



**Rajya Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi**  
**November, 2014/ Agrahayana 1936 (Saka)**



**PARLIAMENT OF INDIA**  
**RAJYA SABHA**

DEPARTMENT-RELATED PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES, LAW AND JUSTICE

**SEVENTY-SECOND REPORT**

**The Delhi High Court (Amendment) Bill, 2014**

*(Presented to the Rajya Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014)*

*(Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014)*



**Rajya Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi**  
**November, 2014/ Agrahayana, 1936 (Saka)**

## **ACRONYM**

<b>APAA</b>	<b>Asian Patent Attorneys' Association</b>
<b>CPC</b>	<b>Code of Civil Procedure 1908</b>
<b>NCT</b>	<b>National Capital Territory of Delhi</b>

# CONTENTS

	PAGES
1. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(i) - (ii)
2. INTRODUCTION	(iii) - (iv)
3. REPORT	1 - 8
4. RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS AT A GLANCE	
*5. RELEVANT MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE	.....
*6. ANNEXURES	.....
I. THE DELHI HIGH COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2014.	
II. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS/ORGANIZATION WHO DEPOSED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.	
III. COMMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON THE VIEWS/SUGGESTIONS CONTAINED IN MEMORANDA SUBMITTED BY INDIVIDUALS/ORGANIZATIONS/ EXPERTS ON THE BILL.	
IV. DETAILED STATISTICAL INFORMATION RELATING TO HIGH COURT OF DELHI AND DISTRICT COURTS IN DELHI.	

---

\* To be appended at printing stage.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE**  
**(As Constituted on 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2013)**

1. Shri Shantaram Naik — *Chairman*

**RAJYA SABHA**

2. Ms. Anu Aga
3. Shri Ram Jethmalani
4. Shri Sanjiv Kumar
5. Shri Parimal Nathwani
6. Shri Ram Vilas Paswan
7. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
8. Shri Ramchandra Prasad Singh
9. Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi
10. Shri Bhupender Yadav

**LOK SABHA**

11. Maulana Badruddin Ajmal
12. Shri T. R. Baalu
13. Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer
14. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
15. Shri P.C. Gaddigoudar
16. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
17. Shri Shailendra Kumar
18. Shri Jitender Singh Malik
19. Shri Arjun Meghwal
20. Shri Pinaki Misra
21. Shri Abhijit Mukherjee
22. Shri S.S. Ramasubbu
23. Shri S. Semmalai
24. Shri S.D. "Shariq"
25. Smt. Meena Singh
26. Shri Vijay Bahadur Singh
27. Dr. Prabha Kishore Taviad
28. Shri Suresh Kashinath Taware
29. Shri Madhusudan Yadav
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE**  
*(As Constituted on 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2014)*

1. Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan — *Chairman*

**RAJYA SABHA**

2. Ms. Anu Aga
3. Shri Majeed Memon
4. Shri Parimal Nathwani
5. Smt. Rajani Patil
6. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
7. Shri Ramchandra Prasad Singh
8. Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi
9. Shri K.T.S. Tulsi
10. Shri Bhupender Yadav

**LOK SABHA**

11. Shri Suwendu Adhikari
12. Shri Subrata Bakshi
13. Adv. Sharad Bansode
14. Shri P.P. Chaudhary
15. Shri Abu Hasem Khan Chowdhury
16. Shri Innocent
17. Choudhary Mehboob Ali Kaiser
18. Shri Shanta Kumar
19. Shri Santosh Kumar
20. Shri S. Bhagwant Mann
21. Shri Anoop Mishra
22. Shri B.V. Naik
23. Shri Vincent H. Pala
24. Shri V. Panneerselvam
25. Shri Vithalbhai Hansrajbhai Radadiya
26. Dr. A. Sampath
27. Shri Bharat Singh
28. Shri Udhayakumar M.
29. Shri Varaprasad Rao Velagapalli
30. Dr. Anshul Verma
31. Shri Tariq Anwar

**SECRETARIAT**

Dr. D.B. Singh, Additional Secretary  
Shri K.P. Singh, Director  
Shri Ashok K. Sahoo, Joint Director  
Smt. Niangkhanem Guite, Assistant Director

## INTRODUCTION

I, Chairman of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice, having been authorised by the Committee on its behalf, do hereby present the Seventy-second Report of the Committee on the Delhi High Court (Amendment) Bill, 2014. (**Annexure-I**)

2. In pursuance of the Rules relating to the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committees, the Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha referred the Bill, as introduced in the Rajya Sabha on the 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 to the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice on the 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2014, for examination and report to Parliament within two months *i.e.* by the 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2014. The Committee, however, in view of busy schedule of Members during the General Elections to the Sixteenth Lok Sabha, could not complete consideration of the Bill during its term. The Committee was reconstituted *w.e.f.* the 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2014. After its reconstitution, extension of time for presentation of its report was granted till the 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2014.

3. The Committee issued a press communiqué on the 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2014 to solicit views/suggestions from desirous individuals/organisations on various provisions of the Bill. In response thereto the Committee received several memoranda containing suggestions from various organizations/ individuals / experts. Comments of the Department of Justice on the views/suggestions thereon were obtained for consideration of the Committee.

4. The Committee heard the presentation of the Secretary, Department of Justice, Ministry of Law and Justice on various provisions of the Bill in its meetings held on the 13<sup>th</sup> March and the 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2014. During its local Study-visit to Saket Court Complex and Patiala House Court Complex, Delhi on the 28<sup>th</sup> October, 2014, the Committee also interacted with the judicial officers of both these Court Complexes. It gathered an impression that these Courts are well-equipped with infrastructure, information technology and human resources to handle ensuing work load with the enactment of the proposed legislation.

5. In its sittings held on the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2014, the Committee recorded oral evidence of District Court Bar Associations in Delhi and Delhi High Court Bar Association, respectively. In its sitting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2014, the Committee heard non-official witnesses on the subject matter of the Bill. List of individuals/organizations who deposed before the Committee are appended as **Annexure-II**. In its meeting held on the 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2014, the Committee heard views of Law Secretaries to Government of India as well as Government of Maharashtra on issue of legislative competence of Parliament/State Legislature to alter or abolish original civil jurisdiction of chartered High Courts at Mumbai, Chennai and Kolkata as also of Delhi High Court.

6. While considering the Bill, the Committee took note of the following documents/information placed before it:-

- (i) Background note on the Bill submitted by the Department of Justice, Ministry of Law and Justice;

(iii)

- (ii) Views/suggestions contained in the memoranda received from various organisations/institutions/individuals/experts on the provisions of the Bill and the comments of the Department of Justice thereon (**Annexure-III**);
- (iii) Views expressed during the oral evidence tendered before the Committee by District Court Bar Associations in Delhi, Delhi High Court Bar Association and Non-official witnesses; and
- (iv) Replies of Department of Justice to Questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat on the issues dealt with by the Bill.
- (v) Detailed Statistical information relating to High Court of Delhi and District Courts in Delhi (**Annexure IV**).

7. The Committee considered and adopted its Report in its meeting held on the 25<sup>th</sup> November, 2014.

8. For the facility of reference and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the body of the Report.

**New Delhi;**  
25<sup>th</sup> November, 2014

**(Dr. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN)**  
*Chairman,*  
*Department-related Parliamentary Standing*  
*Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice*



# REPORT

## **Objective of the Bill**

The Delhi High Court (Amendment) Bill, 2014 seeks to amend Section 5 of the Delhi High Court Act, 1966 and Section 25 of the Punjab Courts Act, 1918 for the purpose of enhancing original pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi and eleven District Courts in National Capital Territory of Delhi from rupees twenty lakhs to rupees two crores. Pecuniary jurisdiction of District Courts in National Capital Territory of Delhi is provided in the Punjab Courts Act, 1918 and is applicable to Delhi also in accordance with Section 1 (2) of the said Act.

2. The Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Bill mentions that enhancement of said jurisdiction would reduce the work load of High Court of Delhi as well as pendency therein and also provide justice at door steps of the litigant public with reduced cost of litigation and maximum convenience.

## **Background of pecuniary jurisdiction of Delhi High Court and Chartered High Courts.**

3. Like chartered High Courts at Mumbai, Kolkata and Chennai (set up in 1962 through identical Letters of Patent issued under the Indian High Court Act, 1861) the High Court of Delhi is endowed with pecuniary jurisdiction on Original Side. The Delhi High Court owes its origin to the High Court at Lahore which was set up in 1919. After independence Punjab High Court was set up for Punjab and Union Territory of Delhi. That court continued to be governed by Letters of Patent (Clause 9) which had conferred extra-ordinary original jurisdiction. The Delhi High Court was established on 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1966 with sanctioned Bench strength of four judges and was also conferred with original jurisdiction under Section 5 (2) of the Delhi High Court Act, 1966. Out of present strength of 60 judges of the High Court, 6 judges are entrusted with the duty to adjudicate civil suits on Original Side. There are 24 vacancies existing at present in High Court of Delhi.

4. The National Capital Territory of Delhi which was only one judicial district way back in 1966 has now been divided into eleven judicial districts for administrative convenience. These District Courts are now functioning from six Court Complexes at Tis Hazari, Patiala House, Rohini, Karkardooma, Dwarka and Saket with 250 judicial officers including 11 District judges. Initially the pecuniary jurisdiction of Delhi

High Court on Original Side was above rupees twenty five thousand which was subsequently raised to rupees fifty thousand in the year 1970. It was further enhanced to rupees one lakh in 1980, to rupees five lakhs in the year 1992 and to rupees twenty lakhs in the year 2003. The proposed amendment to the Delhi High Court Act, 1966 is to further enhance the said jurisdiction to rupees two crores from present rupees twenty lakhs. Following the proposed amendment, civil suits and proceedings not exceeding rupees two crores would be filed in respective District Courts in National Capital Territory of Delhi. Furthermore, cases in which valuation is less than rupees two crores and are pending in High Court of Delhi would be transferred to the concerned District Courts in the National Capital Territory of Delhi. As per information submitted to the Committee by the Registrar General of High Court of Delhi, a total number of 12,211 cases which are pending in Delhi High Court for adjudication would be transferred to concerned District Courts. Eight judicial officers who are presently working as Joint Registrar (Judicial) on deputation in High Court of Delhi are proposed to be repatriated to District Courts for dealing with cases transferred to those courts.

5. In the course of examination of the Bill, the Committee took note of the status of jurisdiction in the chartered High Courts. The pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Bombay was last revised in the year 2012 to rupees one crore by effecting amendment to the Bombay City Civil Court Act, 1948. However, Section 3 of the said Act permits the High Court of Bombay to retain jurisdiction over matters connected with Intellectual Property Right, Letters of Patent, Parsi Marriage and Divorce, etc. even if valuation of suits thereon is less than rupees one crore.

6. The pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Calcutta was last revised in the year 2013 from rupees ten lakhs to rupees one crore by effecting amendment to the Kolkata City Civil Court Act, 1953. Section 5 of that Act, however, provides concurrent jurisdiction of both High Court of Calcutta and Kolkata City civil Courts on the suits whose valuation exceeds rupees ten lakhs but not exceeds rupees one crore. Similarly, the pecuniary jurisdiction on original side of Madras High Court was enhanced to rupees twenty five lakhs in the year 2010 by effecting amendment to Madras City Civil Courts Act, 1892.

7. The full Bench of High Court of Delhi through Resolution dated 21<sup>st</sup> November, 2012 recommended for increasing the original pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi as well as District Courts under its jurisdiction to rupees two crores. The said decision of the High Court of Delhi was communicated to the Department of Justice, Government of India on 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 by the Registrar General of High Court of Delhi.

## **Deposition of Secretary, Department of Justice**

8. The Secretary, Department of Justice in her deposition submitted that the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi after careful consideration of the request of the Co-ordination Committee of all Bar Associations of Delhi had recommended to the Union Government for enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of Delhi High Court as well as District Courts in Delhi. That Government also felt that such an increase would lessen burden on High Court and be helpful to the litigants in providing them justice at their doorsteps as District Courts have been set-up in different locations of Delhi.

### **Views of Stake holders**

9. The District Courts Bar Associations as well as Delhi High Court Bar Association are amongst the principal stakeholders so far as the subject matter of the Bill is concerned. The Committee heard the Coordination Committee of all District Courts Bar Associations and Delhi High Court Bar Association, separately. While District Courts Bar Associations supported the move of the Government for enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of District Courts, their peers in Delhi High Court opposed the move citing various reasons in favour of their stand. The Committee also heard Asian Patent Attorneys' Association (APAA), New Delhi and other individuals who responded to the Press Communiqué of the Committee published on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2014. The gist of important suggestions made by the stakeholders in their oral as well as written submissions is given below.

- (i) *Enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of District Courts in Delhi would provide justice at doorsteps of the litigant besides ensuring speedier disposal of cases by the concerned District Courts. In addition to benefiting legal practitioners in District Courts such a move would also be beneficial to the litigants as well as the witnesses:*
- (ii) *Out of 24 High Courts, 20 High Courts do not have original civil jurisdiction. For the sake of uniformity, original pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi as well as chartered High Courts may be abolished by conferring unlimited pecuniary jurisdiction upon City Civil Courts in metropolitan cities of Delhi, Kolkata, Mumbai and Chennai. High Courts should be exclusively a forum for adjudicating cases filed under Writ and Appellate side.*
- (iii) *Evidence of parties under Original Side in High Court of Delhi is generally recorded by Joint Registrar or the*

*Advocate Commissioner not by judges. Moreover, fees of counsel and total cost of litigation by including examination of witnesses in High Court are higher than that of District Courts. In order to provide justice at minimum cost and maximum convenience, cases on civil side ought to be tried by District Courts:*

- (iv) District Courts in neighbourhood of Delhi, Gurgaon, Noida, Gaziabad and Faridabad enjoy unlimited pecuniary jurisdiction. District Courts in Delhi need to be equated with District courts in adjoining areas of Delhi so far as pecuniary jurisdiction is concerned:*
- (v) Litigants prefer High Court for injunctive relief for which valuation of suit is done without having nexus with the real valuation of the property. Parties may revalue their suit under Rule 17 of Order VI of CPC, 1908 to bring the case to High Court. With the enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court, the litigant has to pay more court fee which will adversely affect the interest of litigants and advocates in High Court of Delhi.*
- (vi) In accordance with Section 134 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the District Court is the minimum judicial forum for adjudication of cases relating to trade mark, copy rights, etc. Similarly, Section 104 of the Patents Act, 1970 provides that the minimum judicial forum for infringement of a patent is the District Court. In the commercial dispute involving Intellectual Property Right, Letters of Patent, commercial arbitration, etc. parties prefer High Court for efficacious and expeditious adjudication of the issue involved in those cases as both Bench and Bar of the High Court are having specialization for the purpose. With the enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction, the owner of copy right/patent need to pay more court fee enabling them to bring it to the High Court. Therefore, exception may be provided for hyper technical cases to be tried by High Court of Delhi irrespective of their valuations on the lines similar exception done for the High Court of Bombay by legislature.*
- (vii) The ten-fold increase of pecuniary jurisdiction of District Courts needs rationalisation taking into account the price index of commodities.*
- (viii) Delhi High Court has lost its jurisdiction on many issues consequent upon creation of Tribunals as an aid in administration of justice.*

- (ix) *The Commercial Division of High Court Bill, 2009, if enacted, will provide an Original jurisdiction to every High Court of the country to hear commercial cases of more than rupees one crore valuation. Hiving off the Original Side of Delhi High Court to the District and Civil Courts under the garb of enhancement of jurisdiction will be antithetical to the aforesaid proposed law.*
- (x) *In accordance with Section 21 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 the jurisdiction of National Commission is to entertain complaint where the value of service or goods exceeds rupees one crore. The appeal against the order of National Commission under Section 23 of the said Act lies to Supreme Court. In view of the above provisions, it was submitted by a non-official witness that pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi should not be raised beyond rupees one crore as an appeal against the decisions of High Court lies to Supreme Court also. In case pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court is raised to rupees two crores, the relevant Section of Consumer Protection Act, 1986 may also be amended to increase the jurisdiction of National Commission to rupees two crores.*
- (xi) *Rules made by Chartered High Courts ensure faster disposal of cases. The rules made by High Court of Delhi under the Delhi High Court Act, 1966 should be tuned with the Rules made by Chartered High Courts for speedier disposal of cases.*
- (xii) *There would be no additional burden on account of Court fee on the litigants in the event of transfer of suits from High Court of Delhi to concerned District Courts in Delhi rather it would be convenient for the litigants and witnesses to approach District Courts with minimum cost and maximum convenience. There would be no loss of revenue to the Government on account of Court fee as court fee is charged ad-velrom both in High Court and District Courts and rates are same.*

### **Deposition of Law Secretary**

10. The Law Secretary, Government of India submitted that the limit of pecuniary jurisdiction is not mentioned in the Code of Civil Procedure 1908. The pecuniary jurisdiction of Subordinate Courts and High Court is of substantive nature which can only be altered by legislature itself. These alterations cannot be made by the High Court under its rules. Both Union

Parliament and State legislature have concurrent power and competence to alter the pecuniary jurisdiction of High Courts and District Courts by the combined reading of Article 225, Entry 78 of List I (Union List) and Entry 11A, 13, 46 of List III (Concurrent List) of the Constitution. He further added that both Delhi High Court Act, 1966 and Punjab Courts Act, 1918 are central Acts which deal with pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi as well as District Courts in Delhi, respectively. Article 239 AA(3)(a) under Part VIII of Constitution *inter-alia* expressly curtail the legislative power of National Capital Territory of Delhi to make law under Entry 65 of List II (State List) under Seventh Schedule of Constitution in so far as that relate to Entry I (Public Order), Entry 2 (Police) and Entry 18 (Land). It is relevant to note that Entry 65 of State List talks about jurisdiction and power of all courts except the Supreme Court with respect to any matters in the said List. Furthermore, the full Bench of the Delhi High Court in the case of the Geetika Panwar and Delhi High Courts Bar Association and Anr.Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi and Ors. (AIR, 2003, Delhi, 317) had held that the Delhi High Courts (Amendment) Act, 2001 passed by Legislative Assembly of NCT of Delhi to increase pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi and District Courts in Delhi from rupees five lakhs to rupees twenty lakhs as *ultra vires* as the NCT of Delhi has no legislative competence to amend the Delhi High Court Act, 1966. It had held that Parliament alone has the power to alter jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi. This decision of Delhi High Court was not challenged in the Supreme Court by the NCT of Delhi. Moreover, pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi and District Courts in Delhi was enhanced by Parliamentary enactment in 2003 to rupees twenty lakhs from rupees five lakhs.

11. While responding to a query as to whether exclusion of certain technical matters especially the Intellectual Property Rights can be provided under the Rules framed by the concerned High Court, the Law Secretary submitted that the power of giving exception to certain technical areas to be filed under Original jurisdiction of High Court irrespective of its valuation lies with the legislature.

### **Deposition of Law Secretary, Government of Maharashtra**

12. The Law Secretary, Government of Maharashtra was also invited before the Committee to dwell on the issue of exclusion of certain areas of law from the ambit of Bombay City Civil Court and the process adopted in this regard. The Law Secretary then explained that the Section 3 of Bombay City Civil Court Act, 1948 empowers the State Government to enhance pecuniary jurisdiction of the City Courts at Mumbai and correspondingly alter pecuniary jurisdiction of Bombay High Court after

consultation with the said High Court by notification. The constitutional validity of the said Act was challenged in the case of Jamshed N. Gazdar Vs. State of Maharashtra (2005) SCC 591 and Five Judge Bench of the Supreme Court declared the Act *intra vires* and held that both State Legislature and Union Parliament have power to confer jurisdiction on High Courts in view of Entry 11 A of List III (Concurrent List) under Seventh Schedule of Constitution.

13. The Committee was also apprised by the Department of Justice through its written submissions, that the Calcutta High Court is the only High Court in the country which has concurrent jurisdiction with the City Civil Courts over suits valued between rupees ten lakhs and one crore, since 2013. The case of Indu Bhushan De Vs. State of West Bengal 1986 SCC (3) 682 was referred to the Apex Court where it was held that the state legislature of West Bengal is competent to amend Calcutta City Civil Court Act, 1953 to enhance the pecuniary jurisdiction of city civil courts as well as the Calcutta High Court.

#### **Recommendations/Observations**

14. **Out of 24 High Courts in the country, only 4 High Courts i.e. High Courts of Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi have original civil jurisdiction. Therefore, a limit has been fixed on the pecuniary jurisdiction of District Courts only in metropolitan cities of Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai and Calcutta. The limit on pecuniary jurisdiction was imposed through Statute/Charter/Letters of Patent under which the concerned court is instituted, which can be enhanced or reduced by making amendment therein. The Committee understands that Parliament alone has legislative competence to constitute and organize the High Courts in view of Entry 78 of List-I (Union List) under Seventh Schedule of Constitution. But, both Parliament and the concerned State Legislature have concurrent jurisdiction to confer general jurisdiction and power including pecuniary and territorial jurisdictions of the High Courts of concerned State in accordance with Entry 11A of List III (Concurrent List). The Committee observes that original jurisdiction of the Chartered High Courts at Mumbai, Kolkata and Chennai were provided under Letters of Patent which can be amended by the concerned State Legislature.**

15. The Committee understands that enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of Courts in metropolitan cities has been a periodic exercise which depends upon increase in value of property in the territory over which those courts exercise their jurisdiction. Since

**2003 circle rate of property has been enhanced leading to increase of their value by several times. The Committee feels that enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of High Court of Delhi as well as District Courts in Delhi is over due in view of devaluation of currency as well as increase of property rates in Delhi during the last one decade. The Committee is happy to note that 12,211 cases which are pending in High Court of Delhi would be distributed amongst eleven District Courts which would facilitate their speedier disposal. There would be neither additional burden on account of court fee on the parties to dispute nor loss of revenue to Government on the same account. Rather it would provide justice at door steps of the litigants with reduced cost of litigation and maximum convenience which would further the ends of justice. In addition to facilitating the speedier disposal of cases such a measure would also provide an opportunity to the litigants to file an appeal in the High Court.**

**16. The Committee while endorsing the enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of Delhi High Court and District Courts in Delhi to rupees two crores from twenty lakhs as proposed in the Bill, is of the view that there is also a need to bring in uniformity in the pecuniary jurisdiction of all High Courts in the country. It is high time for the Government to realise that the legacy of original jurisdiction of Chartered High Courts of colonial era needs a review and in the spirit of the provisions of the Section 6 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, all District Civil Courts in the country including the City Civil Courts in the metropolitan cities of Mumbai, Kolkata, Chennai and Delhi need to be given unlimited pecuniary jurisdiction. The Committee believes that it would lighten the burden on the High Courts if these are made exclusive forum for entertaining appeals and exercise of writ jurisdiction.**

**17. The Committee further observes that now the District Courts are being set up with proper infrastructure, it would be a further motivating factor if the District Courts are allowed to adjudicate in the technical areas of law as well which have been kept under the original jurisdiction of some of the High Courts. These technical matters, no doubt, would continue to be dealt by the concerned statute regulating that area and jurisdiction would be exercisable by minimum judicial forum provided in that statute.**

**18. Taking note of the provision of the Commercial Division of High Court Bill, 2009 which has since lapsed consequent upon the dissolution of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha, the Committee observed that**



**in case such a Bill is enacted, High Court alone would have jurisdiction to adjudicate all commercial disputes of specified value and commercial disputes pending in Subordinate Courts of value above the specified value would have to be transferred to the Commercial Division of the High Court.**

- - - - -