CONVERSATION WITH STUDENTS OF THE HIDAYATULLAH NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY RAIPUR

BY
JUSTICE RAGHURAM GODA (Retd)

Role and Responsibility of the Trial lawyer in the Administration of Justice

Dear graduate and post-graduate and students of Law of HNLU. I am delighted; as another eternal student, to being amidst you having this conversation.

I will begin with a famous quotation from the famous French scientist, philosopher, Jacques Lucient Monod[1] who perceptively observed:

Man must at last finally awake from his millenary dream; and in doing so awake to his total solitude, his fundamental isolation. Now does he at last realize that, like a gypsy, he lives on the boundary of an alien world. A world that is deaf to his music, just as indifferent to his hopes as it is to his sufferings or his success.

In a society inexorably sliding towards an abyss of value sterility, where the moral landscape is progressively getting blurred by counter-social aspirations; where subjective aspirations trump societal equilibria; where individual progress is indexed by wealth and position, not by ability or the integrity of public purpose, deep and recurrent reflections on what our society was designed to be and what we presently are, reflections on what were our constitutional aspirations and to what extent have we moved away from those foundational

[1] 1910-1976; Nobel Laureate (1965) for physiology/medicine; French biochemist and philosopher.

assumptions of democratic existence, are thoughts worth serious reflection.

Today therefore, I intend to converse with you on a vital area of study, reflection and deliberation; for all citizens of India, and particularly those who are choosing to enter the legal profession.

Dear students and respected teachers of this esteemed law school,

The survival and longevity of our species, the homo-sapiens is contingent on adopting nobility as an intrinsic trait of existence; be it as individuals or in the aggregate, as a society. This trait is neither natural nor easy. It requires assiduous practice and constant monitor, internally and externally, by the organizations which we create in our societal arrangements.

Of all modern formats of social governance, particularly the currently predominant - the democratic form, the legislative and judicial branches of social organization have a special invitation to nobility, especially the later, the judicial branch.

As the tiller and the farmer assuage the hunger of society; the mother nurtures the family and children; the teacher pursues the noble calling of dispelling the darkness of ignorance from the human breast, each of these assiduously going about their obligations unmindful of power or pelf, recognition or glory, seeking no hosannas for enduring

service, so does the trial lawyer serve the cause of justice and the institutions of the Law. He is the ark of the covenant of the law, the most accessible and visible image to the consumer of the quality and vitality of our legal institutions.

You would have heard earlier and will hear hereafter too, eminent persons, your illustrious teachers, more qualified than I to address the particular topic of this seminar. I have not been a trial lawyer. Such understanding as I have of the art and craft at the trial level comes from studying the product and its pathologies through the appellate and revisional lens. Such study is not of a pure product of the trial lawyer's exertions. It is too often the trial or the 1st appellate judges' amalgam of experiences and perceptions. There are yet certain inalienable and generic norms; of equipment, traits and attributes of the legal profession as there are pathologies, common to all levels of the legal practice that must be understood and addressed.

I would sound a caveat. There are lawyers in abundance at every level and in each area of practice, who are role models in every measure of all that is noble and sublime in this calling, of law. These venerable practitioners are an asset to the society and truly provide continuing education, guidance and wise counsel to the judges as well. The judiciary is eternally indebted for their services. When we address

issues like those in this seminar, the effort is to disseminate values that should inform the lawyers' calling, to those members of this varied family, who are yet to measure up to the exacting standards of the profession.

Alexis De Tocqueville in his 19th century incisive and penetrating study of American democracy observed that *lawyers are called upon to play a leading part in the political society striving to be born.*

Democracy is a complex and a unique experiment in governance; and has received a wide measure of acceptance in modern society amongst a broad spectrum of social aggregations. The legal community performs a critical role in the sustenance and nurturing of democracy. This is a community eminently suited to keep their fellow citizens aware of the eternal paradox that there can be no liberty without law. The legal profession serves as a rudder for the democratic boat as she and her mutinous passengers set out on the perilous voyage of government. What then is the role and responsibility of this vital profession?

The greatest turning point in the drama of evolution was the appearance of the sapient amongst species, the *Homo sapiens*. The defining characteristic of this puny, physiologically fragile and the latest product of evolution is perhaps reasoning and development of the thought. This is the defining mystery of our being, the reason for the

survival and progress of the species. Will Durant, the philosopher, historian and man of letters par excellence describes the evolution of human thought in inimitable prose, I quote:

The bewilderment of baffled instinct begot the first timid hypothesis, the first tentative putting together of two and two, the first generalizations, the first painful studies of similarities of quality and regularities of sequence, the first adaptation of things learned to situations so novel that reactions instinctive and immediate broke down in utter failure. It was then that certain instincts of action evolved into modes of thought and instruments of intelligence: pugnacity and assault became curiosity and analysis; manipulation became experiment. The animal stood up erect and became man, slave still to a thousand circumstances, timidly brave before countless perils, but in his precarious way destined henceforth to be lord of the earth. (end of quote)

Throughout the verdure landscape of the human drama the defining characteristic of civilization has been the adventure of human reason. This is the singular justification for our description and recognition as the sapient amongst species. The community of men learned in law has often been conceded the leadership of the larger sapient community; in particular since the onset and acceptance of the consensual mode of governance. This leadership is an awesome

responsibility. We may not and it is heartening to know that we cannot, trivialize this responsibility by substituting reason with force; rational behavior with demagoguery; debate, dialogue and accommodation with coercion, vacuous hectoring and insular persistence.

As lawyers we inherit an awesome legacy; of towering intellect, deep scholarship, great moral force and vision. We tread in the footsteps of and practice our craft from the values and principles distilled and refined by Yajnavalkya, Manu, Gautama, Parashara, the Buddha, Shounaka; the acharyas and seers: Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhwa, the Sikh gurus, the reformers: Swami Narayan, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Dayananda Saraswati; from the ancient wisdom of the Vedas, the Upanishads and the Puranas. We remember with pride and emulate with veneration the founding and visionary men and women who formulated of our organic document (the Constitution of India) and the lawyers in particular among that illustrious pantheon.

Look beyond our shores, into the treasures of text and human intellect of other societies which have enriched our legacy of law; the Sumerian texts and the Roman codes, the Holy Koran, the Old and the New Testaments, the Judaic codices; Hammurabi, Moses, Homer, Solon, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, Cicero, Ulpian, Von Leibnitz, Montesquieu, Justinian, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Luther and

Calvin, Napoleon, Hobbes and Locke, Hamilton and Madison, Hugo Grotius, Henry Bracton and Francis Bacon. These are a few of the infinite stars on the expansive firmament of jurists and lawgivers to mankind. Even a nodding acquaintance with this immense treasure trove of our jurisprudential genealogy provides us stabilizing, inspiring and moderating ballast for our runaway, venal or lowly impulses.

Edward Coke of England, John Marshall of United States and H.R. Khanna of India are among those illustrious members of the legal community who are eternal stars of the normative universe - of laws, who exhorted civilized society that democratic governments are not of men but of law. When Archibald Cox, the Watergate special prosecutor was removed by a Presidential directive, he issued a terse one-line statement: *Whether we shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for the Congress and the people to decide*. This was yet another defining moment for the legal profession.

Fortunately, there is abundant example of the great, exalted and the noble in the legal profession. We have but to make a modest effort, not to permit vile example to eclipse the exemplar fecundity of precedent.

Over the past few decades' world over and in India, disturbing transformations have occurred and are accentuating in the cultural

bases of the legal community. Prominent law teachers scoff at the rule of law; even judicial moderates openly cavil popular government; practitioners of law adapt ethical rules to fit changing behavior rather than orienting behavior towards standards deliberately set high. Several radical propositions, which were hitherto counter-currents in the mainstream legal culture, have achieved respectability, prominence; and of late dominance.

Many today believe that we live under a rule of men and not of law, that the constitution and the laws are mere texts that mean whatever the current crop of judges say that they do; that all norms including of professional ethics are infinity manipulable; and that law is a business like any other; and, that business is the unrestrained pursuit of myopic self-interest.

In a significant study: Systems of survival - a dialogue on the moral foundations of commerce and politics, Jane Jacobs[2] observes that human beings *have had basically only two ways of making a living from pre-historic times to the present, one concerned with acquiring and protecting territory and the other with trading and producing for trade. By a process akin to natural selection, mankind developed its*

[2] 1916 - 2006, American-Canadian journalist, author, social theorist, sociologist, economist and activist.

approaches to the ethics of making a living only around these two matrices. Each system of economic ethics is precisely calibrated to promote success and survival in the way of life. In modern societies these two survival strategies are symbiotic (inter-dependent). *While society needs traders to invent, produce and market goods and services, it equally needs guardians and regulators like soldiers, policemen, executors and courts to maintain conditions of order and stability*.

Lawyers are the hyphen between the traders and the guardians. They are associated both with guardian and commercial roles and concomitant ethics; seamlessly switching from one role to the other depending upon the brief. In earlier periods however, they pursued the role in harmony with the ethical bases of whichever class role they were playing for the time being; each role inhering a package of established and internalized ethics.

Of late however, all bets are off. Ethical norms were once a fundamental value and the religion of the legal profession. Shortly after the industrial revolution and its aftermath economic juggernaut, ethics regressed into a fashion and is now largely perceived to be perhaps an obsolete fad, to be derived and scoffed at rather than entrenched and practiced.

Law is not merely a system of rules to be observed, sanctioned for its breach, evolved and nuanced for no substantial purpose. Law is the definitional paradigm of the world in which we live. We inhabit a normative universe.

By laws international or municipal; custom; usage; convention; statute; rule or directive we constantly create and maintain a world of right and wrong; lawful and unlawful; valid and void. Many in the legal community, lawyers and judges alike identify this normative world of legal order with the professional props of social control. The formal institutions of law, the rules and principles of justice, the conventions of social order, while important, constitute but a small part of the normative universe that must in its expansive glory and complexity deserve our study, comprehension and deliberation.

Drawing up and putting in place the architecture for a just, enduring and vibrant civil society, a society that is dynamic, plural, multicultural and endemically divisive involves a convergence of multi-disciplinary specialties; of sociology and anthropology, history, political science, demography, economics, management, engineering, communications expertise; and, above all the law.

Law synthesizes the richness of the diverse frontiers of human knowledge, represented by the several disciplines and distils the inputs

through the process of legal hermeneutics to provide form, shape, structure and detail to the architecture of the civil society; in the form of legal rules to homogenize, define, flesh out and orchestrate a raft of hierarchical and inter-meshing norms for orderly growth and sustenance of civil society.

Crafting rules for a society calls for sterling character built on a bedrock of ethical values; resoluteness of propose; deep understanding of the larger and immediate societal structure, its identities and insularities; and a principled spirit of accommodation and empathy for conflicting and competing perspective.

Daunting as the task is, crafting the rules is just the beginning of an enduring engagement in statesmanship. History informs us that men, societies and civilizations have floundered and perished on more occasions for faltering in the execution of agreed norms than for failing to identify appropriate normative principles.

Enduring and great civilizations and social aggregations are marked by more than heuristic, dialectic or technical virtuosity in their treatment of practical affairs; by more than elegance and the rhetorical power in the composition of their texts; by more than brilliance in the invention of forms and solutions for emerging or regnant problems.

A great civilization is indexed by the richness of the normative content and the epochal narratives in which it is located and which it helps to constitute and nurture.

Our legal community was at the forefront of the momentous bend in history, from imperial serfdom to representative, democratic governance. This was our tryst with destiny, with strong underpinnings of normative narrative. India inherited a cosmopolitan, transnational package of norms adapted and tailored to the felt needs of our polychromatic society. We refined and added to the inherited body of rules since independence. At federal, state and provincial levels we are engaged in accreting a bewildering array and variety of substantive and procedural rules to the inherited cornucopia of laws. Such evolution is the heritance and condition of every dynamic society.

Where we are perhaps unique or nearly so is in our collective capacity to subvert and atrophy the normative fundamentals. Infidelity to the ordained values of society is a shared and dominant characteristic of our times. We are witnessing, in our times, a disturbing consensus on this delusional journey towards chaos and anarchy.

The rule of law is a seminal and the non-derogable charter for the success of democracy, not a vacuous norm. It is the set of

institutionalized, time-tested principles, which are realistic about human nature towards the objective of minimizing official arbitrariness and securing reasonably stable conditions for social and political life.

Rule of law posits that law is preferable to the use of private force as a means of resolving disputes; that executives, legislators and judges are all subject to the law and are to be held accountable if they transgress; that official decisions must be grounded in pre-established principles of general application; and that no citizen shall be deprived of freedom or property except in accordance with due procedural safeguards.

The rule of law ideal is the benchmark to assess the performance of our public officials and the quality of our society. Our post-independence response to the failures by those who administer and execute our laws has been to shift or change the offender, on occasion and fortunately; not to formally eschew the norms. Law's ideals and norms are thus and as yet a basic component of our society.

In the sphere of law, the courts are increasingly having the determinant voice on fundamental and the most divisive issues of our times. It is for this reason that an exponential regress to unprofessionalism, arrogance, incompetence, greed, cynicism, and value sterile commercialization of the legal profession is of greater

debilitating potential that similar pathologies in other spheres of our community.

The legal profession must be above the morals of the marketplace, if we are to successfully navigate the democratic ship through the tumultuous sea of volatile, anarchic and accelerating pace of change that is upon us.

Carl Llewellyn, a leading protagonist of the legal realist school, while a professor at the University of Chicago law school exhorted this oath to law students:

In accepting the honor and responsibility of a life in the profession of law, I engage as best I can; to work always with care and a whole heart and in good faith; to weigh my conflicting loyalties and guide my work with and eye to the good less of myself than of justice and the people; and to be at all times, even at personal sacrifice, a champion of fairness and due process; in court or out of it, and for all, whether the powerful or the envied, or my neighbors or the helpless or the hated or the oppressed.

How each in our profession measures up to the yet relevant, publicly professed; though not often or widely practiced, ethical and professional values, is an intensely personal dilemma that must regularly exercise us; an issue that vitally impacts the larger society as well.

Till a couple of decades ago, till the mid-eighties, a period of association in the chambers of a recognized senior lawyer, ranging from a few years to upwards of 10 years was an invariable phenomenon for a young lawyer. These were profoundly productive years, contributing to the learning curve; affording a rich opportunity to reflect, learn and develop the art and craft; drafting skills; legal research; litigation costs and risk assessment; courtroom behavior; professional ethics, norms and courtesies; forensic and logical skills; graces and decorum of this noble profession. This mentoring opportunity has unfortunately almost become obsolescent. Today the young lawyer either does not associate with a senior's chamber or quits within an unrealistically short span, to set up independent *shop* - the pun is intended.

Many today enter the profession and hit the deck running. Graduating mostly from certificate distributing law schools, affiliated to universities with complementary and equally flexible academic standards, the young lawyer enters what ought to be a stimulating, satisfying, intellectual and socially responsible collegium, inadequately equipped - in craft, commitment and value and often runs amuck, if not disillusioned sufficiently to quit the profession, in quick time.

The formal code of ethics for the legal profession, you must remember is not the entire ensemble of norms that lawyers must

observe in their dealings with one another, with clients, and with the courts. The code of ethics merely encapsulates a small body of fairly obvious duties with which we must comply on pain of discipline. Where ethical issues of great moment or complexity are presented, formal canons afford little guidance. They are least of use when most needed.

There is another factor that impacts the internalization of ethics and its practice in the legal profession. In the past couple of decades, increasing number of persons are entering the profession with no family background in law. I am one such. Irrespective of personal traits, the cultural impress of a lineage helps moderate the rough edges.

It is however, a welcome development that the profession increasingly welcomes diversity. Honing this diversity to the inalienable norms of the profession would be an investment for the future.

There is another emerging diversity issue for the profession. This is the arrival of the transactional practice, distinct from the litigation practice. Till the other day, the product of our better equipped and premier law schools by and large pursued this facet of the profession. While their work has significant impact on the litigation area as well, the transactional practitioners are not absorbed into the participatory processes of our peer body, the Bar Councils. This lacuna debilitates the profession. Transactional practice is today a growing component of

the profession of law and contributes significantly to jurisprudence, to conflict generation or resolution and is potentially the catalyst and the future of technological, business and commercial developments of the civil society. The challenges for and of the transactional practitioner to himself and to the society are another issue, for another occasion.

The salient fact about litigation lawyers in the adversary legal system is that it is perceived to require zealous representation of particular clients rather than justice writ large and to manipulating facts and law to benefit their clients. Unlike legislators who are required to fairly balance the interest and claims of all persons and judges who are charged to discern the true account of the facts of a case and to apply the law dispassionately to these facts; adversary lawyers are often required to do things for clients that would be immoral if done by ordinary people in ordinary circumstances. The legal profession is seen to pursue and to be duty-bound to chase outcomes that clients favour but which may be unfair to others.

There is another charge that accuses lawyers not merely of generic unfairness but of particular vices, namely that they indulge in presenting versions of facts that they themselves do not believe, make colorable legal arguments that they reject; present passionately valid claims for their clients in order to delay the law suit or otherwise gain

a strategic advantage and that they endeavor to impeach opposition witnesses in order to undermine even testimony they believe to be truthful. This charge in substance means that the adversarial role requires lawyers to act ordinarily in immoral and vicious ways, namely to lie, cheat and abuse others. It is on account of the increasing perception of the moral malignancy of the adversarial system that the system itself is coming into disrepute and increasingly so.

On the whole however, the adversarial method is not inherently evil. It is the normative indifference and value sterility of a significant number of the members of the profession that contributes to this pathology. The general ideals of professional ethics are considered mere fraternal admonitions and the rules of professional conduct are not internalized even on their explicit terms.

The return to ethical values is a journey that faces many road blocks. The principal impediment is the contemporary culture that places emphasis on success at all costs, regardless of means; and on success calibrated in terms of self-interest measured on a scale of results.

Legal ethics occupy a low priority in law school curricula; and the obsolescence of the apprenticeship system and of association in the chambers of reputed senior advocates disable the mentoring

opportunity. Ethical role models are few and far in between; the toxic exemplars being those who have succeeded in any which way.

When we pause and consider; the consequences of the departure from professionalism and ethical values is apparent. Influential sections of the society or organizations and institutions have eschewed the dilatory, inefficient and erratic system of adjudication for drastic, summary and minimal procedure models of determination. Debt Relief Tribunals, Securitisation Laws, the advent and growth of hybrid Tribunals in service matters, in taxation and in corporate matters are all indicative of the perceived debilitation of traditional systems of adjudication. The incremental substitution of the courts system with arbitration, mediation, negotiation and other ADR methods is also a pointer to the desuetude of traditional systems of adjudication.

Elsewhere professional bodies have recognized the dangers of complacency and have brought in a measure of structured reforms. The Americans Bar Association's Code of professional responsibility prohibits a lawyer from collecting an illegal fee; requires that lawyers' fees must be reasonable; and prohibits lawyers from engaging in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice.

In certain legal jurisdictions conduct prejudicial to effective and expeditious administration of justice is considered professional misconduct.

At a functional level, given the importance of the trial lawyer in the administration of justice and the verity that the trial stage constitutes the bedrock of the pyramid of justice administration, indifference to core professional competencies is as fatal as indifference to ethics. Irrespective of the branch/domain in which we practice, we should have an empirical understanding of the fundamental purposes of law.

To illustrate, we must ever be conscious that rules of evidence while an important tool in the armory of justice administration are but a tool for efficient ascertainment of facts and the truth of the matter. Rules of evidence may not be employed as a conjurer's kit to pick out a particular trick to smother truth and camouflage fact. Principles of admissibility of evidence, of relevancy of facts, of standards and onus of proof, of presumptions, of estoppel, competence of and regarding examination of witnesses and the several other rules of evidence are time-tested principles for efficient ascertainment of truth. These principles may never be employed to dazzle and blindfold the judge in the noble pursuit of the judicial role, which is to channelize relief

towards the ends of justice as prescribed by the edicts of substantive law.

The Code of Civil Procedure incorporates broad prescriptions that enable fair opportunity by disclosure of the cause pleaded to the other side whether by a plaint or a written statement; the identification of the necessary and proper parties; identification of the appropriate forum having subject matter, territorial or pecuniary jurisdiction; the procedural tools for ascertainment of further information from the other side such as by interrogatories or discoveries; stipulating the contents of pleadings; the framing of points or issues for determination to enable focus on the core areas of conflict; fair procedures for trial that enable efficient ascertainment of facts necessary for resolution; guidelines to the adjudicator for competent drafting of judgment; principles for execution of the product of determination; and enumeration of available remedies of appeal or revision and other housekeeping provisions.

Given the significant but nevertheless complementary role of procedural law, long abuse by some clever but unsocial practioners has brought about a pass where the laity equates the procedural code to an instrument of oppression. In a majority of cases, execution proceedings consume more time than the main litigation. This can only be the

product of incompetent or unethical practice standards. The public experience with the criminal procedure is similar. We will do well to remember that procedural law is the facilitator and not the solvent of substantive law.

The dominance of procedure over substance in the scheme of legal practice values, signals ignorance as to the underlying purposes of law, namely that it is a facilitative arrangement intended to achieve equilibrium of conflict in a deeply competitive, combative or fractured social order.

The execution and implementation of substantive laws is the core concern of the law particularly since there is large-scale transgression of the substantive and the agreed legal values of the society, by individuals and by the instrumentalities of the State as well. The effective execution of laws cannot be achieved by nitpicking on particular sections of portions of a statute.

We must realize that the values of our civil society and the equilibrium of the social order is conditional upon the efficient and expeditious execution of the wide range and variety of substantive laws which guide, regulate permit, prohibit or sanction specified conduct. The sum of our substantive legal prescriptions informs the civilization index of our society. Substantive laws conflate to express the rights and

obligations of individuals and institutions. They spell-out permitted and prohibited conduct on a wide range of issues relevant to contemporaneous society as evolved in the crucible of consensual government - the legislatures, through legal instruments such as statutes and rules.

We not only live in the normative universe of laws but in the system of laws, which are also relative. The several laws together form the raft of norms that guide and sustain the social order. All legal practitioners and led by the example of the trail lawyers must therefore be informed of the overarching and intermeshing principles enjoined in the several laws.

All of us are aware that there exists a synergy between the provisions of different laws; provisions of the Transfer of Property Act and the Special Relief Act; between provisions of the Income Tax Act and family and property laws; between the agrarian or urban ceiling legislation and several laws regulating property, inheritance and the like; synergies between laws that spell out rights and the statute of repose, the Limitation Act. While interpreting a particular provision of a Statute for the consideration of the court, we cannot therefore be oblivious to the reality that a provision takes color from the provisions of the several other enactments as well.

Without a holistic perspective of the enterprise called lawyering, the administration of justice according to law becomes skewed and atrophied. Many errors at the trial stage are incurable later. The result is an irretrievable failure of justice.

I have occasionally noticed that in presenting land acquisition claims or in suits seeking relief from instrumentalities of the State such as a State Electricity Board or a Bank, the State or the State instrumentality concerned is not impleaded as a respondent. Instead, an executive authority by designation such as the manager of the particular Bank; or the Land Acquisition Officer is impleaded. This results in a situation where the decree becomes in-executable since the Bank's or the State's accounts or funds are not in the name of or to the credit of designated authorities; they are invariably in the institutional names or accounts. Such common errors occur on account of the failure to recognize the distinction between the State or a juristic persona and a State-actor. These are professional competence issues and must be addressed.

During appellate and revisional scrutiny, I often came across headnotes of decisions extracted in judgments. A headnote is not the judicial opinion. It is the publisher or editor's account of the content. The summary may on occasion be faulty and too often is. Further no

single expression in a judgment must be understood as the *ratio*, which is the component of the judgment providing the precedent and binding in subsequent cases. Principles too often take color from the facts considered. Identifying the *ratio* in a judgment is a painstaking and a professional process. We cannot abdicate this critical function by blind dependance on a journal editor. We must not resort to short cuts that lead to nowhere.

The awesome responsibility of restructuring the profession and guiding it back to the highway of justice delivery rests primarily on the trial lawyer, that stout, sturdy and principled foot soldier of Justice Administration. Just as no Nation has succeeded over another in the human history of armed conflict by mere superiority in air power, no legal institution can succeed without efficient, studious, committed and an ethics driven class of trial lawyers.

Success in the profession must in the ultimate analysis, be calibrated on the success in negotiating equilibrium in the society; in guiding the deserts of law to the deserving party, be it one's client or the adversary; on reducing discord and conflict in relationships; and in endeavoring to nurture a just, humane and sustainable social order. A lawyer has failed the society when he has employed his skills, such as they are, to contrive an unjust result. When he exults at such success

and to peer envy and accolades too, he has failed the professional community of which he is a member; subverted its relevance and contributed to its terminal pathology and in peer company.

The trial lawyer is the foundation of the justice delivery system. His function is critical. His is the most visible face of justice administration and he is our brand ambassador to the public, the consumer of law and to the larger society. On this realization must rest our concerns with the performance in this bastion of law.

I thank you all for a very patient hearing; and wish you all a glorious, satisfying and fulfilling career in law. I convey my regards to the Vice Chancellor, Prof. Vivekanandan and all the luminous members of the faculty of HNLU,

Warm regards,

GODA RAGHURAM.

29-03-2024.