

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat): Sir, it has been stated by the hon. the Deputy Minister that it was the managing agency system that **had** so far protected the industry and helped to industrialise the country, but really speaking, it is the purchaser or the consumer who has given that protection and the managing agents have completely exploited the consumer. As such, what protection are you going to give, under this Company Law Bill, to the consumer who has hitherto been exploited, is being exploited and will be exploited by these managing agents?

SHRI M. C. SHAH: The Company Law Bill is with regard to the formation of companies and the management of joint stock companies or corporate bodies. There are to be shareholders, some people gather together, they subscribe the sharecapital and the company is formed. Therefore, the Company Law Bill is not concerned with the protection of the interests of consumers. For that, Government must take some other measures.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): The question is:

"That this Council concurs in the recommendation of the House of the People that the Council do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to companies and certain other associations and resolves that the following Members of the Council of States be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee : —

1. Dr. P. Subbarayan
2. Shri S. P. Jain
3. Shri Somnath P. Dave
4. Dr. R. P. Dube
5. Shri B. K. P. Sinha
6. Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt
7. Shri R. S. Doogar
8. Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor
9. Shri S. Chattanatha Karayalar
10. Shri Amolakh Chand
11. Shri M. C. Shah

12. Shri V. K. Dhage
13. Shri G. Ranga
14. Shri Satyapriya Banerjee
15. Shri B. C. Ghose
16. Dr. P. V. Kane."

The motion was adopted.

THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move:

"That this Council concurs in the recommendation of the House of the People that the Council do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, and resolves that the following Members of the Council of States be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee : —

1. Shri K. Madhava Menon
2. Shri T. S. Pattabiraman
3. Shri Barkatulla Khan
4. Shri Biswanath Das
5. Shri Sumat Prasad
6. Shri J. S. Bisht
7. Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya
8. Diwan Chaman Lall
9. Shri K. B. Lall
10. Shri P. T. Leuva
11. Shri S. D. Misra
12. Shri M. P. N. Sinha
13. S. N. Dwivedy
14. Shri Bhaskara Rao
15. Shri P. Sundarayya
16. Shri M. Roufique"

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the importance of

[Dr. K. N. Katju.] the measure which the Select Committee will be called upon to consider. The Code of Criminal Procedure, is one of our three great Codes—the Code of Civil Procedure, the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Indian Penal Code. They have guided our daily life and the law courts now for nearly a hundred years and have stood the test of time. But with the changing conditions there is now a unanimity of opinion that the procedure followed in courts are cumbersome, dilatory, and apt to be expensive and require considerable simplification.

In the olden days, law courts were supposed to be a playing ground for wealthy people. Therefore, it was commonly said that the man with the larger purse was better off. Conditions have now changed; the common man has come into his own and he requires speedy and, of course, efficient justice; justice brought to his home, as near to him as possible.

Sir, there has been enormous discussion about this measure in the other place and I am more anxious to hear the opinions of my hon. friends here rather than to inflict a speech of my own in the very beginning. I only want to say that this Bill has been the product of infinite labour. I want to remove the misconception expressed sometimes as if it was the brain-wave of a single individual, or only some individuals and there had been no preceding labour behind these provisions. That is not so. There have been numerous committees appointed during the last 25 years by the various State Governments which have examined this question and made various suggestions. Somehow or other, more important measures or, it may be, measures which are of greater interest—topical interest—or of interest to the Members of the Houses of Legislature have taken precedence, and the committee reports and the other reports have been generally pigeon holed, and so far no action has been taken. From 1951 the matter has been consistently before the Government. Twice we have addressed the State Governments and have had

the benefit of the opinions sent to us, not only of the State Governments but also of Judges, members of the Bar—opinions collected by them—and somewhere about September or October 1953, last year, I prepared a memorandum, a fairly comprehensive one, and sent it to the Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts, Advocates-General, members of the Bar, leading public men and the State Governments. I have already expressed my deep gratitude for the response which I received in the matter. Every single man favoured me with his considered opinion. The Advocates-General sent me their opinions after consulting the important members of the Bar. Similarly, the Chief Justice consulted his brother Judges and sent his opinion. When we got all this material, a Bill was prepared. That Bill was not formally introduced in the Legislature, but with the permission of the Speaker of the House of the People, it was published in the *Gazette*. That was on the 24th of December 1953, and I extended a public invitation to everybody in India, everyone concerned and everyone interested, to send us their opinions. And this Bill was published at our request by every State Government in the local *Gazette*, and opinions were invited from the various Bar Associations, and as I said, from persons interested. In between three months from January to March we received 207 opinions. These include 60 opinions from Bar Associations. Then there are opinions from District and Sessions Judges, Judges of the High Courts and the persons interested, individual advocates and all the rest of it. Now all that was considered and the Bill, as it was published in the *Gazette*, was very carefully reviewed and suggestions were made and some of them were adopted. And the present Bill is the outcome of all this effort. And I may also add that every single section of the Criminal Procedure Code has been considered by us in the light of the opinions received and in the light of our judicial experience and the opinions expressed by different public men, and we have endeavoured to improve the Code as best as we could. I am saying

this because I noticed a tendency in the great debate that we had in the other House to concentrate only on four or five matters. I think there were about 100 or over 100 amendments of varying importance. So it is a measure which has been very carefully drafted and it merits your serious consideration.

I have already said that the Government is not wedded to any particular provision of the Bill, because it has nothing to do with party politics. It is a matter in which we are all interested. The objects are pure justice, protection of the citizen, punishment of the guilty, etc. Now who is there who would not subscribe to these general aims? Now how to carry them out requires our attention. It may be that the amendments that have been proposed in this Bill require a review. Review them if you like. If the Sovereign Parliament in its wisdom says that the amendments should take this form or that form, I am quite willing. If the portions which have been left out untouched require a review, review them. I am not saying that the Select Committee should confine its remarks to the Bill as it is before them. Personally speaking, I hope that there is very little left untouched. But I should be most happy if this House, the other House and the Select Committee, all go over the whole Bill, over the whole code, if they like, from clause 1 onwards—I do not know how many there are—there are perhaps 600 or 700 clauses—and suggest amendments on the merits. And we will certainly consider them.

Now, there are just one or two points. I want, if I may respectfully say so, discussion—I won't say, to be confined, but—to be mainly devoted to the topic before you, namely, the simplification of the criminal procedure. What is a procedure? How to start a criminal case? There if you want to impose certain restrictions before a case is allowed to start, what we may call the previous consent of anybody consider that

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin): May I interrupt the hon. Minister for a while? Does the hon. Minister think that discussion should have no relation to the amendments proposed?

DR. K. N. KATJU: For God's sake, do not interrupt. What I was saying was this. What is a criminal case? I was interrupted, Mr. Vice-Chairman. The procedure relates to how the case is to be started. Having started, how is an accused to be summoned? If he is summoned, how is the case to proceed? In what manner are the witnesses to be examined—both prosecution and defence? And lastly, how is the judgment to be delivered and what is the punishment to be imposed? That is criminal procedure in essence. Now the hon. Members may say, "We are not going to touch the Criminal Procedure Code. First reform the police; secondly, reform the judiciary; thirdly, reform the Bar; and fourthly, separate the judiciary from the executive."

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: May I know, Sir,

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I seek your protection. No jumping up here. Now if you say that you would not touch this Criminal Procedure Code unless these four objects have been carried out, it is a matter for you to decide. I can't prevent you. Otherwise, the efficiency of the police is a matter on which there can be no quarrel. The police maintains law and order, keeps a watch, protects people, checks people from committing robberies, etc., etc. So far as the judiciary is concerned, it must be properly recruited, its independence should be guaranteed, and it should be put in a position to dispense pure justice. So far as the Bar is concerned, well, every member of the Bar, including myself says that our ethical standards are high, should be high, our standards of profession are high, should be high; and if you like, make them still higher, and we are trying to assist in the administration of justice.

[Dr. K. N. Katju.]

There is one thing which I should like to emphasise; the question of the separation of the judiciary from the executive has no relation with this topic. In the first place, I join issue most strongly with any insinuation that the Indian judiciary, from the lowest to the highest rung, has not dispensed justice. I have often thought of this topic of the separation of the judiciary from the executive. Of course, there is a directive in the Constitution, but what does it mean? Let us proceed from the top. The High Court Judges are independent of the executive. The District and Sessions Judges are independent of the executive. The whole blame rests upon the poor magistrate, and the suggestion is that the magistrate, as was said in picturesque language by someone, is under the thumb of the police, in the pocket of the police and carries out the orders of the police. Whatever may have been the situation in the olden days, today to say of our magistrates that they do not dispense justice according to their lights and with perfect freedom I say, is a lie.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: Question.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Let it be questioned. My opinion is that it is a lie. It may be a questionable lie. It is a different matter. There is one thing which is of importance and which troubles me greatly, *viz.*, the contaminated atmosphere of the law courts. It is a matter of some importance because, some of the provisions of this amending Bill which have been gravely attacked have lost sight of it. Throughout India the law court seems to be the one place where you are expected to lie, where, if you do not tell lies, you are a fool, and if you tell the truth, you are a bigger fool. No one expects you to tell the truth there. In ordinary conversation when people are talking, they will say, "For God's sake tell the truth. This is not a law court." What is the result? The result is that justice miscarries. I wish to emphasise one thing with all the earnestness at my command, *viz.*, I

that hon. Members probably do not realise that respect for law and order deteriorates; it is dwindling, it is crumbling, among the people, particularly the people in the rural areas, who have now become politically conscious, who have got a very fine civic sense, who want to see this country prosper. These people have now come to the conclusion that justice is not to be found in the law courts. Over and over again I have been in the habit of touring in the countryside. I go about and talk to people and they say, "What is the use of my going to the civil court? I have got a just claim but it will take three years for me to get a decree and it will take about five years to get the decree realised. I had better settle the terms with my borrower or with the opposite party on a 25 per cent, or 30 per cent, basis but not go to court." Similar is the case when you go to the criminal courts. Delay and delay. Date of occurrence 12th May; case pending for months, more than a year. Often in serious cases the commitment proceedings will take six months. The Sessions Court may take another six months. What happens? When a murder is committed in a village, people find the dead lying there. There is horror. People who have seen it come forward to tell the truth, and among them—I tell you from my own experience—may be mothers testifying against their own sons, may be relations testifying against relations, because social consciousness is aroused. They say that this thing should not be tolerated but should be punished. But as these delays occur, there is a tremendous effort to win over the prosecution witnesses. All sorts of influences and pressures are brought to bear upon them, and what is the result? Acquittals. I do not want to disparage any Judge, but a court of justice does not become or remain a court of justice this way; it becomes a court of acquittal. The Bar—I am speaking as a member of the Bar—is interested in getting acquittals in criminal cases. You may have one of the able lawyers

appointed as the Government pleader,
but otherwise the whole strength of the

Bar is available to the accused. What is the result? The result is that—you take it from me—when murders are committed, there is miscarriage of justice. I have seen and I see it every day in connection with mercy petitions in instance after instance that the public would not tolerate it.

The relations of the deceased would not tolerate it. Sometimes the acquitted man is shot in the court compound. Sometimes he is killed before he returns to his village and gets down from his bullock cart. Sometimes

he dies within two or three months. They won't spare him. If you have a dacoity or robbery, everybody knows who is the dacoit or robber, and¹ do you mean to say that they are

going to sit over it? They take vengeance. Vengeance should be taken in the law courts, but people say that no justice is done there. In properly administered countries, if I am acquitted by a court of law, that is a guarantee that I was innocent. I do not require any other guarantee. I tell you with a sense of responsibility that here in India an acquittal by a law court does not convey to the common people any guarantee that the man is innocent.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: So is the case with conviction.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Now, I will give you some figures. I have been speaking generally that there are 75 per cent, acquittals and 8 per cent, acquittals on appeal to the High Court. The other day about two or three weeks ago, I went to a neighbouring district—just for the day. The District Magistrate met me and because I was full of this amending Bill, I told him, "would you please send me the figures of the sessions cases tried in your district during the years 1952 and 1953 and tell me what actually happened, how many were acquitted and how many were convicted?" Yesterday I got the figures, and the House might like to hear them. 1952—nineteen people were accused and¹ put up on a charge of having committed murder, and every single case was acquitted, not one conviction. Then we come to

dacoities. Sixty people were put up for trial on charges of dacoity. One died in jail; 59 were proceeded with. Convicted 14; acquitted 45. Robbery: 9 people were prosecuted; acquitted 7; convicted 2. Rape: half and half; eight prosecuted; four acquitted and four convicted. Miscellaneous offences tried by Sessions Judges, and every miscellaneous case coming before a Session Judge. Mr. Vice-Chairman is a serious case. 269 were prosecuted; 38 were convicted; 231 were acquitted. That is the position.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): There is something extraordinarily wrong with the police.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): In which district?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am only giving you the figures. I am not making any inferences. (*Interruptions.*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): Lit him proceed.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I really don't understand these interruptions.

AN. HON. MEMBER: We are entitled to know.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): You will have time to say what you wish to say.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have made up my mind to- remain standing. Let us come to the year 1953. I shall take the various alternatives. Murders— accused, put up for trial 28, one died pending the trial. Out of 27 persons, 4 were convicted and 23 were acquitted. Robbery—3 were tried or put up for trial and all were acquitted. Dacoities — 92 were tried, 33 were convicted¹ and 59 were acquitted. In rape cases, 6 put up for trial, acquittals 5, conviction 1. Miscellaneous cases 60 tried, 15 were convicted and 45 were acquitted.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Any cases of official corruption?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have given yc.4 the names here. There are various alternatives. Hon. Members may say

[Dr. K. N. Katju.] that this is an indication that in the cases of murder, dacoity etc. the police is entirely corrupt and dishonest and had deliberately sent up for trial completely innocent men.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

DR. K. N. KATJU: That is one alternative. Nineteen people who were all acquitted on murder charges were all innocent. Similarly 23 people who were acquitted in the year 1953 were being roped in on completely false charges. I don't know, you may not share my opinion. I am only expressing my opinion—of course formed after some experience that in these cases as many as 95 per cent, of the cases are correct.

SHRI B. GUPTA: How do you say that?

DR. K. N. KATJU: You read¹ the police diaries.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh) : The cases are correct.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My hon. friend has now agreed with me that the cases are correct. Murders take place and the people who are being prosecuted are murderers. (Interruption.) What is the good of your shaking your head?

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Minister used to say that there should be no aspersion on the judiciary. He is casting aspersions now on the judiciary just because these figures do not suit him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE) : There is no aspersion.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Words of wisdom have fallen.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): On a point of order. When the speaker does not give way, other Members should not be allowed to speak.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Vice-Chair-man, I was trying to take the different alternatives. To say that there has been a murder requires no assertion. The dead body is there. The question is that the 19 people who were prosecuted had committed that murder or not and on that I am expressing my opinion. You may not share the opinion that out of these 19 persons or 23 persons or 200 persons, 95 per cent, of the people are really guilty of having done that thing. That is number one.

SHRI B. GUPTA: That is number nil.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Then you go to the judge. If a judge acquitted a guilty man, then what does that show? Very well, let us say judicial inefficiency or an acquitting tendency. The judge will say, "Nothing of the kind. You come and look at the evidence. If you were to try, how can you possibly convict a man on that evidence?" In judgement after judgement lawyers—senior lawyers here—will remember an observation from the judge at least in the concluding portion of the judgement as follows: —

"I have the strongest moral suspicion that this accused is guilty but I am very sorry that on this evidence it is impossible to record a finding."

Maybe the judge goes away. Then what remains? Who produces those false witnesses? Most of the prosecution witnesses are tampered with. So far as the public is concerned, the public who have suffered, what they require is this. They are not concerned with these subtleties whether the police has produced what you call embroideries or whether the judge has a moral suspicion but will not be able to give effect to it. What they want is that a man who is guilty ought to be hanged or punished. The man who is really innocent should be acquitted but your villagers find today, week after week, dacoits, robbers, murderers coming back to the village acquitted, with a sense of bravado, twirling their

moustaches. I have seen that they do this and say, "come along, I shall commit another murder." What happens to them? They curse the law courts—I don't know how many people they curse. They curse the vakils and they lose all respect for law and order and they say a court of justice is not a court of justice, you don't get it there.

I come back to the fountain-head. The fountain-heads that we must stop perjury. Hon. Members say that that is not a matter for legislative process or judicial process. Employ *sadhus* and *sanyasis* and people who sing *bhajans* and preach sermons and arouse the social conscience. When you have big schemes for law breaking like Telangana scheme and the Pepsu scheme, where is that popular opinion? Various political parties, different parties, people, factions, groups etc., want to commit crime, then they want also to get away and there is a space, as I said just now, of 12 months dividing the date of occurrence and the date of the trial and the witnesses are won over and they will not give evidence. I therefore suggest to the House that the chief factor is to make the trial speedy, so that the social conscience remain warm, that sense of outrage may continue to exist and people may be disinclined to tell lies even in spite of pressure and if they do tell lies and if their lies are found out—they are lies not on the point at issue but in order to escape and the lies are found out—then I suggest to you that moral sermons are not enough. We should follow the good old practice which is prevalent in other countries of punishing perjurers there on the spot and there is a provision here—an amendment— which has been very much criticised, *viz.*, what they call summary conviction for perjury. I repeat what I said elsewhere, that there is no intention that a judge should pronounce judgment before hearing the whole evidence. That is not the proposition. So far as the point at issue is concerned he must listen to all the evidence, hear the arguments and then come to a conclusion. There might be an appeal about it. But if you go and see you

will find in law courts questions put to a witness questioning his veracity intending to show that the man is a hopeless liar. A witness comes and says, "Yes, I saw this and this." He pretends to be an eyewitness. Then the cross-examining counsel says, "You have said such and such thing and you say you were present in Chandni Chowk at Delhi, you saw this. May I put it to you that on this very day, at this very time you were in Lucknow?" The witness says: "No". Then the counsel, says, "Will you look at this post card?" He looks at it and asks: "Is it in your handwriting?" "Yes," says the witness. "Will you read it?" He reads it. There on the very date, at the very time—the post-mark is there—the man was at Lucknow. What is to be done? The suggestion is that the man should be sent at least for fifteen days to prison so that he may think over it and other witnesses may also know that lying and telling untruth in law courts is not a simple matter, that it is no joke. Witnesses consider it now to be a great joke. Everybody says, "Oh try to defend my man. Get him out. Just say this or say that and it is done. You have been examined there in the committing court. But now say these words and if you do that, your whole statement will become improper."

The second thing is this and on this there has been a lot of criticism. What is the procedure today? The police start the investigation. They examine the witnesses on the spot and the policeman, the inspector, takes notes of any depositions. When he goes to the police station, or where he stays, he takes out his diary and sends a **report** to the headquarters. Should the law provide that the witness should be asked to sign the.....

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): How does the hon. Minister propose to ensure the correctness of the police diary?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am coming to that. The policeman makes the entry

[Dr. K. N. Katju.] in the diary. There was some proposal but it was rejected, that the people should be asked to sign the diary. We thought that it might be a dangerous thing because there is the policeman and there is the witness. The witness may be illiterate and the policeman may read out the whole of it or may not read out the whole of it to the witness. What would happen? Therefore, this statement should not be signed. But if it is not signed, then the result is that it is practically of no use to anybody—practically of no use to anyone, for the purpose of corroborative evidence. Because, please consider this Sir. A copy of the statement as recorded in the diary is furnished to the accused before the witness is examined. The vakil looks at it. The witness has given the evidence in answer to the Government pleader. Then the defence counsel is examining him and if he finds that there is no divergence between the statement recorded in the diary and the statement which is now being made on oath before the sessions judge, then the defence counsel says, "This man has stuck to what he told as truth or to what he has been taught by the police to say. There is no difference." But if he finds that there is variation, that there is any improvement or anything, then the defence counsel will put the question, "You have said this just now. You have said that four people were present at the time of the murder. Did you say that to the police?" The man says, "Yes, I said so." There the matter stops. Then the inspector comes—the investigating officer—and there the defence counsel puts him the question, "I suppose you have taken down correctly what this man stated?" The inspector says, "Yes." Then he asks, "Did he tell you that these four people were present?" And he says, "No." At once there is "a contradiction. The witness has improved his statement by mentioning the four people whom he did not name before the inspector. Otherwise there is no defect. No improvement. But how would you use it? There is another section, Mr. Vice-Chairman, as you may remember, sec-

tion 162 which as it stands today

SHS ' K. S. HEGDE: It is section 164.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Yes, it is section 164. That section authorises the police officer, gives him the requisite power at his discretion, if he wants to do so, to take any particular witness examined by him during the course of the investigation, to a magistrate and get his statement recorded by the magistrate on oath and that statement, of course, is signed.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Sir, on a point of information, does the hon. Minister realise that even under that section, the Privy Council has decided that a statement recorded under section 164 is no good except for contradiction?

DR. K. N. KATJU: Sir, one thing that I have done at the Bar is not to mention the Judicial Committee before a legislature. We are legislating here, we are not therefore guided by the Privy Council.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am only interrupting with something which may be useful.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I know that the Privy Council has said so; and I also know that not only the Privy Council but also what all the Judicial Commissioners, all the Courts and all the Sessions Judges and High Courts have said. Well, I do not know how to describe it. If a witness comes before a sessions judge, then the presumption is that that particular individual at that time is entirely under the control of the police and therefore, he has told lies before the magistrate. He is a truthful man; he would have told the truth, but for the police. And when he comes before the sessions judge and tells an entirely different story then my hon. friend will argue, "He is now free from police pressure. What he has now said before the sessions judge is true, Whatever he said before the police were lies." Now, please remember—and this may also apply to my hon. friend—

suppose my friend comes up as a witness. Suppose at the place where he lives, somebody is murdered. In this amended clause, as it is before the House, it is made compulsory to stop perjury changing sides, pressure over witnesses. Every witness who in a sessions case is likely to be produced at the trial should be examined. He should be taken before a magistrate and his statement should be taken there on oath. Now it is so very easy to

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: But we want corroborative evidence.

DR. K. N. KATJU: It is very easy, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to say that the witnesses are under the thumb of the police. But would my hon. friend Mr. Hegde say that he was under the thumb of the police if he was examined before the sessions judge? Sir, it is very easy, as a matter of argument to say that every single witness.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: You have not caught my point.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have caught your point very well. It is easy to say that every single witness, except Mr. Hegde will be under the pressure of the police. He will not be under their thumb. Anyway, this point will be discussed at great length. The exact object of the provision under section

164 is not to entangle any particular accused or to deprive him of a sound defence. The aim was that the truth should be told. But there are

opportunities which are well-known—he knows them all, he has been working at it. Let him deny it. Let any lawyer

deny that efforts are not made, most violent efforts are made to persuade prosecution witnesses by all sorts of temptations and pressures.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: You are hundred per cent, right.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Pressures from relatives and other pressures, political, social, economic and "*Nakad Narayan*"—that is to say pecuniary pressure—they are all brought in to change the statement of the witness so that you get out all the nineteen men—every one of them. Do you love it? Do you want it? It is easy to become eloquent and say this may go against the poor accused. But no one sheds a single tear, I tell you, when you see the guilty man—man after man—walking away from the court and saying, "Well here I am, what can you do to me? That is the object which I have in mind.

Lastly, Mr. Vice-Chairman—I would only take five minutes and not more because I want to listen to others—much has been said about this defamation business.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time is up. Tomorrow.

DR. K. N. KATJU: All right, tomorrow, as you please, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. C. GHOSE): The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Friday, the 14th May 1954.