

S.P. Anand Vs State of M.P. and Others

Court: Madhya Pradesh High Court (Indore Bench)

Date of Decision: July 4, 2000

Citation: (2000) 2 JLJ 182 : (2000) 3 MPHT 460 : (2001) 1 MPJR 253

Hon'ble Judges: Jayant Govind Chitre, J; A.K. Gohil, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Party in Person, for the Appellant; D.D. Vyas, A.A.G. and Anita Sharma, Panel Lawyer, Z.A. Khan, for Respondent Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6 and Surjit Singh, for the Respondent

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

All of them have been heard.

In this petition the petitioner has written the name of Chief Minister of M.P. State, Shri Digvijay Singh and has impleaded him as party. So also he

has written the name of Mayor Shri Kailash Vijayvargiya; as well as name of Ex-Mayor has been mentioned in this petition and these two mayors

have been impleaded as parties in the present Public Interest Litigation (PIL).

Shri D.D. Vyas, A.A.G. raised objection at initial stage that the petitioner should be directed to delete the name of Chief Minister because when

State of M.P. is party, it is not necessary that Chief Minister should be impleaded as party in this PIL and that too with his name. He pointed out

that there are no personal allegations against the Chief Minister.

Shri Z.A. Khan, submitted that the name of present Mayor Shri Kailash Vijayvargiya also needs to be deleted from the petition. He also submitted

that Mayor, Indore Municipal Corporation is not necessary party in this PIL. He advanced the same sort of arguments in respect of Ex-Mayor,

Shri Madhukar Verma.

Shri S.P. Anand by quoting the observations of Supreme Court in some cases and the observations of Lord Justice Diplock submitted that in view

of the recent life and the grievance echoed on behalf of the public in PILs, the Chief Minister, the Ministers, Mayors and other such dignitaries can

be impleaded in the litigations in their personal capacities and by their names. He submitted that scope of PIL is wider and, therefore, he be not

directed to delete the names of Chief Minister of M.P. State, present Mayor Shri Kailash Vijayvargiya and Ex-Mayor Shri Madhukar Verma.

Shri S.P. Anand has impliedly touched the doctrines of "Droit Administratif" while making submissions on this point. The same thing has been done

by Shri D.D. Vyas, and Shri Z.A. Khan. "Droit Administratif had been familiar for number of centuries in France. Dicey who wrote in his "Law of

Constitution", 9th Edition, page 384 that "Droit administratif" is not to be identified with any part of English Law. According to him, English Official

Law is something quite different. The law which regulates the privileges of civil servants in England is merely the law of a class where as "Droit

administratif is not the law of a class but a body of law which in given circumstances may affect the rights of any French citizen. Administrative Law

in France comprises the whole body of law relating to public administration. The distinguishing features which Dicey noticed in this system of Droit

administratif were : first, that the rights of the State are determined by special rules not applicable to private individuals; second, that the Courts of

Law are without jurisdiction in matters concerning the State and Government litigation is tried by Administrative Courts; third, that a special

protection is afforded to officials in respect of wrongful acts committed in the course of their official duties. The underlying principles which he

observed were that the State is given exceptional and extensive privileges; and that a rigid distinction is maintained between administrative and

other acts.

The doctrine of "Droit Administratif was prevalent for some years in France and it had some similarities with Common Law of England as well as

dissimilarities. A protection which was available to government servants and the persons forming the government did progress as civilisation

progressed even in France. In England partly in later portion of the years of 18th and 19th centuries did render that much of protection to the

powers of Crown and its servants. The powers available to them were to be exercised in accordance with the ordinary common law principles,

which governed the relations of one English man to another. The activities of State in England till recently has been extremely limited and that has

come in the limits of Common Law. Our system of functioning of State inherited something from English legal system. However, there has been a

significant difference which is according to suitability of our conditions, our civilisation and our behaviour pattern.

Droit administratif has got long history and number of juris did speak about it and its applicability. By our constitutional protection and its wider

impact, fortunately the persons forming the government, are answerable to the public and Courts. Therefore, in fit cases they can be impleaded as

parties and can be made answerable to the Courts of law even by naming them and arraying them as defendants. If there are personal allegations

and the matters are necessitating their presence in personal capacities, the Courts in India are empowered to do so. By self imposed discipline and

restrains the Courts are reluctant to do so. The Courts are also watchful to see that these persons are not dragged unnecessarily in the litigations

and are not required to attend the Courts at the cost of duties which they do in service of public in our democratic system. The Courts are watchful

to see that in rare and fit cases only they are to be summoned before the Courts in their personal capacities.

In the present matter the State of M.P. is the party and the State stands represented through the Chief Secretary. It is one of the duties of Chief

Secretary of State of M.P. to represent the State and to answer allegations and queries before the Courts. It is one of the functions of the Chief

Secretary to the State of M.P. in which he functions as such. When he stands in the array of the respondents, it is not necessary that the Chief

Minister should be impleaded as party because no personal allegations are made against him and the Chief Secretary to the State of M.P. is

capable of discharging the obligation cast on him as such.

The Mayor of Municipal Corporation acts also in accordance with advice of Mayor-in-council. He takes some decisions independently.

Therefore, he is permitted to be impleaded as party. But not by mentioning name because he is not to face any personal allegations made against

him in his personal capacity.

There are number of Ex-Mayors of Municipal Corporations for the purpose of identifying a particular Ex-Mayor in context with the period in

question, Shri Madhukar Verma has to be a party by name. Otherwise, there would be inconvenience and hardship to other Ex-Mayors.

Therefore, we direct the petitioner to delete the name of Shri Digvijay Singh. So also we direct to delete the ""Chief Minister of State of M.P."" from

the array of respondents. Instead of Chief Minister of M.P. State, the Chief Secretary of M.P. State would discharge obligation on behalf of State

of M.P., who would be responsible to answer queries made by this Court whenever necessary. We direct the petitioner to delete name of Shri

Kailash Vijayvargiya. Only Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Indore be mentioned as one of the respondents. We direct the name of Shri Madhukar

Verma, Ex-Mayor of Municipal Corporation, Indore to remain in the array of respondents in petition. Thus, petitioner to amend petition as

directed and that too within seven days. After such amendment is effected, notices be issued to the respondents at government cost; returnable on

21st July, 2000. C.C. free of costs.