



सत्यमेव जयते

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA
RAJYA SABHA

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

EIGHTY SIXTH REPORT

**Promotion of Legal Education and Research
under the Advocates Act, 1961**

(Presented to the Rajya Sabha on 4th August, 2016)
(Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 5th August, 2016)



Rajya Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi
July, 2016/Ashadha, 1938 (Saka)

Website : <http://rajyasabha.nic.in>
E-mail : rsc-pers@sansad.nic.in

Hindi version of this publication is also available

CS (P & L) - 171

**PARLIAMENT OF INDIA
RAJYA SABHA**

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

EIGHTY SIXTH REPORT

**Promotion of Legal Education and Research
under the Advocates Act, 1961**

*(Presented to the Rajya Sabha on 4th August, 2016)
(Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 5th August, 2016)*



**Rajya Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi
July, 2016/Ashadha, 1938 (Saka)**

CONTENTS

	PAGES
1. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(i)-(ii)
2. INTRODUCTION	(iii)-(iv)
3. REPORT	1-6
4. RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE AT A GLANCE	7-9
5. MINUTES	11-21
6. ANNEXURES	23-28

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

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

RAJYA SABHA

2. Ms. Anu Aga
3. Shri Majeed Memon
4. Shri Parimal Nathwani
5. Shrimati 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

LOKSABHA

11. Shri Tariq Anwar
12. Shri Subrata Bakshi
13. Adv. Sharad Bansode
14. Shri P. P. Chaudhary
15. Shri A. H. Khan Choudhary
16. Adv. Joice George
17. Choudhary Mehboob Ali Kaiser
18. Shri Santosh Kumar
19. Shri Bhagwant Mann
20. Shri B. V. Nayak
21. Shri Vincent H. Pala
22. Shri Vittalbhai Hansrajbhai Radadiya
23. Shri V. Panneer Selvam
24. Dr. A. Sampath
25. Shri Bharat Singh
26. Shri M. Udhayakumar
27. Shri Varaprasad Rao Velagapalli
28. Dr. Anshul Verma
29. Vacant
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

Dr. D. B. Singh, *Secretary*

Shri K. P. Singh, *Joint Secretary*

Shri Ashok K. Sahoo, *Joint Director*

Shrimati Niangkhanem Guite, *Assistant Director*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice, having been authorized by the Committee, present Eighty-Sixth Report on the subject "Promotion of Legal Education and Research under the Advocates Act, 1961".

2. The Committee heard Shri Vinay Sheel Oberoi, Secretary, Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Prof. Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission, Shri Ramayan Yadav, Additional Secretary, Department of Legal Affairs, Dr. Ranbir Singh, Vice Chancellor, National Law University, Delhi and Prof V. Vijayakumar, National Law School of India University, Bangalore in its meeting held on 24th May, 2016. In its meeting held on 31st May, 2016, the Committee heard the Shri Manan Kumar Mishra, Chairman, Bar Council of India, Prof. C. Raj Kumar, Vice-Chancellor, O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat, Maj. Gen. (Prof.) Nilendra Kumar, Director, Amity Law School, Noida, and Prof. (Smt.) Shashikala Gurpur, Director, Symbiosis Law School, Pune.

3. The Committee during its study-visit to Kolkata from 13th to 15th June, 2016 heard Prof. P. Ishwara Bhat, Vice-Chancellor, West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, Smt. Ananya Bandyopadhyay, Director, West Bengal Judicial Academy, Prof. J.K. Das, Dean, Faculty of Law, Calcutta University, Shri Arindam Sarkar, Khaitan & Co. and Shri Souvik Bhadra, Ashlar Law.

3.1 The Committee visited National Law School of India University, Bangalore and had interaction with Prof. R. Venkata Rao, Vice-Chancellor, Prof. V. Vijaykumar, Professor of Law, Prof. O.V. Nandimath, Registrar, National Law School of India University, Prof. C.S. Patil, Vice Chancellor, Karnataka State Law University and Prof. Dr. Suresh V. Nadagoudar, Principal & Former Dean, Faculty of Law, Bangalore University, Bengaluru, Prof. C. Basavaraju, Dean, Faculty of Law & Registrar, University of Mysore and Dr. Somu CS, Dean School of Law, Christ University, Bengaluru on 20th June, 2016.

3.2 The Committee visited the Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai and had interaction with Prof. (Dr.) P. Vanagamudi, Vice-Chancellor and Prof. (Dr.) M.S. Soundara Pandian, Registrar, Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University Prof. (Dr.) Santhosh Kumar, Director of Legal Studies, Government of The Tamil Nadu, Shri S. Prabakaran, Co-Chairman, Bar Council of Tamil Nadu, Prof. (Dr.) David Ambrose, Head, Department of Legal Studies, University of Madras, Dr. Vindod Surana, Director and Attorney, M/s. Surana & Surana International Attorneys, Shri Srinath Sridevan, M/s HSB Partners, Chennai on 22nd June, 2016. The Committee also visited Tamil Nadu State Judicial Academy at Chennai and had interaction with Hon'ble Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges of Madras High Court and Shri Sathish Kumar, Director, Tamil Nadu State Judicial Academy on 22nd June, 2016.

3.3 The Committee visited National Judicial Academy, Bhopal and had interaction with Prof (Dr.) Geeta Oberoi, Director, National Judicial Academy, Prof. S.S. Singh, Director, National Law Institute University(NLIU), Bhopal and Prof. P.P. Singh, Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Sagar on 24th June, 2016.

4. While considering the subject, the Committee has relied upon following documents/information: -

(i) The University Grants Commission Act, 1956;

(iii)

(iv)

- (ii) The Advocates Act, 1961;
- (iii) One Hundred Eighty Fourth Report of Law Commission of India on "Legal Education & Professional Training and Proposals for amendments to the Advocates Act, 1961 and the University Grants Commission Act, 1956";
- (iv) Background Note on the subject furnished by the Department of Legal Affairs;
- (v) Views/suggestions received from stakeholders during the study-visit.

5. The Committee wishes to extend sincere thanks to Officers/Professors of the Department of LA, M/o Law and Justice Ministry of HRD, University Grants Commission, Bar Council of India, Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai West Bengal National University of Judicial Sciences, Kolkata, National Law School, Delhi, National Law School of India University, Bangalore, OP Jindal Global University, Sonapat, Amity Law School, Noida, Symbiosis Law School, Pune, National Judicial Academy, Bhopal, State Judicial Academies of West Bengal and Tamil Nadu and other stakeholders who appeared before the Committee during the examination of the subject.

6. 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.

7. The Committee adopted the Report on 28th June, 2016.

NEW DELHI;
28th June, 2016

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN
*Chairman,
Department-related Parliamentary
Standing Committee on Personnel
Public Grievances, Law and Justice
Rajya Sabha*

REPORT

Legal education is fundamental to judicial system of the country. The quality of Legal education helps to create a rule of law friendly society which strengthens the foundation of democratic polity in the country. In order to achieve quality of rule of law, excellence in legal education and research is prerequisite. The role of quality institutions imparting legal education, statutory bodies regulating standard of legal education are inextricably intertwined. Inter-disciplinary approach to law, empirical and applied research to key issues concerning law and justice is the need of hour. There are approximately 1305 universities/colleges/schools imparting legal education in our country which are registered with the Bar Council of India (BCI). The details of law colleges/universities, including National Law Universities (State/UT wise) is enclosed at **Annexure-I**. Approximately 1.4 million lawyers are registered with BCI for practice of law. State/UT wise advocates enrolled with BCI is enclosed **Annexure-II**.

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

2. The Constitution of India has placed 'education' in Concurrent list. Entries 63, 64, 65 and 66 of the Union List, Entry 25 of the Concurrent List deal with education and Entry 26 of the Concurrent List deals with legal profession in the country. The University Grants Commission Act, 1956 was enacted under Entries-65 and 66 of the Union List and Entry-25 of the Concurrent List. Section 2(f) of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 empowers the UGC to exercise control over the universities and affiliated colleges for prescribing standards of education. The Advocates Act, 1961 was enacted under Entries-77 and 78 of the Union List. Section 7(h) and 7(i) of the said Act empowers the Bar Council of India to promote and regulate legal education in the country.

3. The standard of legal education as well as institutions imparting legal education is regulated by two statutory bodies, namely, University Grants Commission (UGC) and Bar Council of India (BCI). The UGC was set-up under University Grants Commission Act, 1956 and comprises 12 Members, who are full time members having distinguished career in the field of education including technical, medical and legal. The BCI is constituted under the Advocate Act, 1961 having independent members elected by the Bar. That Council under Section 7(1)(h) has been assigned the task of laying down norms and standards of legal education in consultation with universities imparting such education. The expert committee of UGC has a member from legal profession which inspects the infrastructure, faculty, etc. before granting recognition. Both UGC as well as BCI gives recognition to the legal institutions imparting legal education whenever they apply for the same. The UGC as well as BCI can de-recognize any university/institution which is not able to maintain the standard set up by those regulatory bodies. The Bar Council of India is empowered to make rules under the Section 49 of the Advocates Act, 1961. The Bar Council of India Rules (Rules of Legal Education), 2008 provides for inspection of Universities/ Colleges for recognizing its degree in law for the purpose of enrolment as advocates. The BCI has also constituted Legal Education Committee under Section 10(2) (d) of the Advocates Act, 1961, which is headed by a former judge of Supreme Court of India and has been made broad based to include Judges of High Courts, Attorney General for India, Solicitor General for India, Vice Chancellors of National Law Universities etc.

Role and Initiatives of University Grants Commission

4. The UGC provide recognitions and revokes recognitions to institutions imparting legal education in the Country. The UGC provides grants from its own funds to state universities,

Deemed universities for infrastructural development. Some of the National Law Schools/Universities have also received developmental grant which was utilized for capacity building of the institution. Developmental grant released to various law universities/institutions during Twelfth Five Year Plan is at **Annexure-III**.

Role and Initiatives of Bar Council of India

5. The Committee was apprised that the Bar Council of India has constituted a Legal Education Committee, which is the supreme body to take vital decision about the grant of recognition or de-recognition university/institution imparting legal education. A Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) under the Legal Education Committee comprising members from Bar, Bench and Academia has been constituted for updating curriculum and a Directorate of Education under Legal Education Committee has been constituted to lay down standards of continuing legal education and uphold and upgrade standard of legal research and legal profession.

5.1. In its submission, the BCI apprised the Committee that in June, 2015 the BCI resolved not to grant approval for new law colleges for coming three years and accordingly requested State Governments not to set-up law colleges for coming three years to curb and control the mushroom growth of legal institution. However, BCI received many applications for grant of recognition by it during that period. It has been observed that the student-teacher ratio of 40: 1 laid down by BCI is not adhered to by the State Governments due to the financial and infrastructural constraints faced by them. The BCI submitted that same teachers are in the rolls of several universities/colleges and there is inadequate infrastructure in many colleges/institution imparting law education. To identify fake lawyers the Certificate of Place of Practice Verification Rules has been framed by BCI. The Directorate of Education has taken up the task of setting up of Lawyers' Academy in all States for continual legal training for budding advocates. Such Advocate Academy has already been established in the State of Kerala and the second one is in process in the State of Jharkhand. Other States are trying to set up such academy from the contribution of Members of State Bar Council for the training of Members of local Bar.

6. The Bar Council of India lay down the standard of professional conduct or etiquette for Advocates under Section 7(1)(b) and 7(1)(c) read with Section 49(1)(c) of the Advocates Act, 1961 and enforce the same among the Advocates. The Chairman, Bar Council of India during its deposition before the Committee on 31st May, 2016 submitted that the Bar has decided to remove from its roll lawyers convicted in criminal and serious cases and is accordingly, verifying the antecedents of conviction in criminal and serious cases against Bar members.

Reports of other Commissions and Bodies

7. The Sixteenth Law Commission of India *suo motu* took up the subject of legal education in its One Hundred and Eighty Fourth Report titled "Legal Education and Professional Training and Proposals for amendments to the Advocates Act, 1961 and the University Grants Commission Act, 1956" has recommended as under:-

...."Bar Council of India can lay down minimum standards necessary for courses for students who will come into legal profession but not in respect of other law courses which do not lead to a professional career. UGC can prescribe higher standards"

...."UGC and BCI to introduce a system of Accreditation of law colleges. Section 7 (1) (h) should be amended to enable Bar Council of India to promote excellence in legal education for the purpose of accreditation system"¹.

¹184th Report on The Legal Education and professional Training and Proposal for Amendments to the Advocates Act, 1961 and the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 (2012) Retrieved from <http://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/reports/184threport-PartI.pdf> (page-129-130)

8. The National Knowledge Commission (NKC) under the Chairmanship of Shri Sam Pitroda has recognized legal education as an important constituent of professional education. The NKC recommended the setting up of a new regulatory mechanism under the Independent Regulatory Authority for Higher Education (IRAHE), vested with powers to deal with all aspects of legal education and whose decisions are binding on the institutions teaching law and on the union and state governments. The NKC vide its report and opined the following:-

...."In the last three decades, ... the BCI, by virtue of its Resolutions, Rules and Regulations, has taken over the entire body of powers in relation to legal education which is not the intention of the Advocates Act, 1961, which is a legislation under Entries-77 and 78 of List I Schedule VII of the Constitution of India. The BCI, under its powers to grant recognition to universities for the purpose of enrolment of law graduates has been also dealing with inspection, affiliation or disaffiliation of various law colleges, granting annual affiliation or permanent affiliation etc..... It has also been laying down conditions for establishment of law schools, buildings, appointment of faculty, and a variety of other matters in which the faculty and other players have not been allowed to have any effective role. These powers were extended by the BCI under Resolutions, Rules and Regulations as stated above, though such extension of powers is not permitted by the Advocates Act, 1961."

9. In the year 2011 the Department of Legal Affairs had prepared the National Law School Bill, 2011, the Centre for Advanced Legal Studies and Research Bill, 2011 and Legal Education and Research Bill, 2011 to bring excellence in legal education.

10. The following view points were received from the stakeholder during its meeting in Delhi, Kolkata, Bengaluru, Chennai and Bhopal:-

- (i) The quality of legal services, including legal aid under Article 39A of the constitution largely depends on quality of legal education. There is urgent need to streamline the existing legal education in majority of law colleges. A provision of "legal budgeting" may be included in the budget of all Government for the purpose of upholding and upgrading standard of legal education.
- (ii) Dr. B.R. Ambedkar had suggested for the establishment of a Council of Legal Education to supervise legal education and to conduct examination in law, as far back in 1936 (Law College Magazine, Bombay, 1936, at 15; cited from Fourteenth Report of the Law Commission of India on Reforms of Judicial Administration, 1958, para 51 at 544). A National Council for legal education having corporation and coordination amongst Bench, the Bar, academia, UGC and Union and State Government may be created with the single objective of streamlining entire education. The said council may assist the BCI for conducting the Bar admission test which is being currently outsourced by the BCI. It may evolve and administer continuing legal education and training for advocates and law teachers.
- (iii) The Department of Legal Affairs is entrusted with the administration of Advocates Act, 1961 and Legal profession only. The subject of legal education may also be looked after by the UGC, while the BCI should exercise the power to recommend the minimum standard for practice as an advocate and in disciplinary matters.
- (iv) National Law Universities are established under various State Acts and barring a few, most of them are having financial problems as State Governments have stopped the funding after establishing them and on the other hand, the Union Government does not fund them as they are established by State legislatures. These institutes had to generate its own funds, mainly from students' fees, for its day-to day activities.

- (v) The BCI is mainly concerned with the advocates who are enrolled in Bar Councils for practice in the court of law. However, they were of the view that they would be happy to have overall charge of legal education in the country.
- (vi) Lawyers academies to be set-up in each states from the contributions of Bar members of the State.
- (vii) Like the Bar Council of America, the Bar Council of India should regulate all sorts of legal education and research as well as profession including entry of international law firms into our country for the sake of upgrading standard of legal education.
- (viii) The brightest law graduates prefer to join the corporate law firms due to difficulty in getting good mentorship. Senior lawyers should play the role of mentor for the first-generation young law graduates and law students from under-privileged section of society to enable them to join the Bar.
- (ix) Teaching in law schools is theoretical in nature and out of touch with the practical reality. Classroom for law students should be student-centric rather than teacher-centric and participation of students for legal research may be given due attention. Emphasis should be given on andragogy rather than on pedagogy.
- (x) The compulsory attendance of seventy-five percent for students should be done away and more practical training should be introduced in law schools to make the students more employable in the market. However, another view received was that compulsory attendance rule prescribed for law graduates should be strictly maintained and if necessary biometric attendance systems should be introduced in law colleges and universities to uphold standards of legal education in the country.
- (xi) Similar to Corporate Social Responsibility, senior lawyers should have Professional Social Responsibility to contribute certain percentage of their taxable income for promoting legal education and profession in the country. Philanthropy in legal education is essential for its growth and development. Accordingly effort ought to be made by all stakeholders for promoting philanthropic initiatives in legal education and research.
- (xii) The avenues for professional engagement of lawyers have significantly expanded with the liberalization of the economy. The curriculum and pedagogy at law schools, therefore, must reflect the requirements of these new demands and its structure must not be built around the needs of a litigating lawyer alone. There is also need to introduce courses relating to tribal issues and agriculture *etc.* in the curriculum.
- (xiii) The legal education transcends the legal profession and has other dimensions as well. Therefore, Bar Council should not regulate legal education. The UGC is also not suitable to regulate the legal education given its technical and specialised nature. Therefore, there must be a separate regulatory body at national level for legal education in the lines of All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). Bar Council of India should focus on improving the quality of Bar and regulation of quality of legal education should be left to University Grants Commission (UGC) or any other super-regulatory body on the line of All India Council for Technical Education.
- (xiv) The legal education system in the country needs to be regulated comprehensively by a body to be known as Indian Council of Legal Research (ICLR) with regional branches to audit and review legal education and research to uphold the rule of law.

- (xv) Maximum age limit should be prescribed to pursue LL.B programmes in the country as we cannot expect a 21 years student to sit in a class with 60 years old man. There should be age limit to pursue LL.B programmes in the country.
- (xvi) Three years law course may be abolished in phased manner. Part-time law degree, law degree by correspondence may be abolished.
- (xvii) There should be one legal standard for the institutions throughout the country. One model National law school may be set up in every State, which should be assigned the duty of regulating law colleges within that State.
- (xviii) There is all India entrance examination for admission to other professional course, *i.e.* Medical and Engineering, known as National Eligibility cum Entrance Test (NEET) and Joint Entrance Examination (JEE), respectively. The Common Law Admission Test (CLAT) is limited to the 17 National Law School Universities offering five years (Hons) undergraduate legal education. Whereas admission to undergraduate legal education in other law colleges and departments/universities is either made on marks basis secured on 12th standard or specific entrance examinations regulated by concerned college/university. There should be common entrance test for admission into undergraduate law courses on the lines of National Eligibility cum Entrance Test (NEET), Joint Entrance Examination (JEE) and Common Law Admission Test. There is a need of a body to conduct common National Level Aptitude Test for screening student opting for five years law degree in the country.
- (xix) Like IITs and IIMs, the National Law Schools should be granted autonomy and status of institute of national importance/excellence for maintaining the standards of legal education in the country. They may be re-christened as Indian Institute of Law (IIL). All the law colleges in a particular state may be affiliated to those universities for the purpose of standardization of legal education.
- (xx) The constituency of law academia is neglected by the Bar and also unrepresented in the Benches, even though; the Constitution of India has a provision for elevation of jurist to the Bench. Law teachers are not allowed to take higher judicial service examination nor can they can practise in the court of law, as a result of which clinical legal education has remained a mere façade. In USA and other developed countries full time law teachers are allowed to practise law which may be adopted to making suitable amendment to Advocates Act, 1961, which may enable them to provide insight of the conventions /procedures of court room to the law students.
- (xxi) The members of Bar usually have knowledge of lawyering and advocacy but may not have domain knowledge of teaching and research. The academic qualifications of Members of Bar in usually lower than that of academicians teaching law. The BCI and State Bar Councils (SBC) have been changing the student-teacher ratio which is difficult to follow by the State governments due to infrastructural, capacity adjustment and inadequate human resource support. Therefore, there is a need to amend Advocates Act, 1961 so as to confine BCI and SBC for regulation of legal profession and leave legal education to a plural body comprising of distinguished legal academicians.
- (xxii) Mushrooming of law colleges /departments without proper faculty is a serious concern for the legal education. The 1.5 lakh fee charged by BCI is very high as compared to fee charged by AICTE and MCI for giving affiliation to Engineering and Medical courses, respectively. In many cases colleges are given recognition

without proper inspection. The recognition of law colleges should be handled by a regulatory body having representatives of law academicians, experts and recognition fee should be nominal.

- (xxiii) The law universities may be given option to design course curriculum to complement choice based credit system insisted by the UGC. The Curriculum Development Committee of BCI should not design course curriculum for law students.
- (xxiv) Judicial officers and advocates are pre-occupied with their profession and hardly find time to do legal research. The academicians and research scholars may be given small projects by the law department to do empirical legal research on specific burning legal problems. The empirical research should complement doctoral/post-doctoral research in law.
- (xxv) The quality of legal education largely depends on quality of students, facilities and student-teacher ratio. Students studying in vernacular languages find it difficult join national law schools as the medium of instruction is English in the latter. The CLAT exam is urban oriented and advantageous to students of public schools. The students in local law colleges, State Universities and National Law Schools get different kinds of training. Therefore, law students in local colleges may be given exposure to the training and infrastructure in the state universities and national universities, which is far excellent from the law colleges in States.
- (xxvi) There are paucity of academicians to impart legal education and legal drafting in the country. Many law colleges are having faculty of other institution in their roll. The guest lecturers or ad-junct lecturers in colleges are not also available from the Bar.
- (xxvii) The pay and allowances of law teachers is at par which teachers in Arts and Science colleges. Except law teachers, all other professional having law degrees, including members of Bench and Bar are highly respected and rewarded. The salary and retirement age of law professors in national law school universities is higher than their peers in other State universities. Tamil Nadu Government was generous enough to provide higher salary at the initial appointment of law teachers which may be adopted by other States to attract better law teachers. Since teachers are not allowed to practice on Advocates Act, 1961, they may be provided non-practicing allowances as in case of doctors teaching in medical colleges.
- (xxviii) There are many untrained lawyers having fake certificate as members of Bar which is creating indiscipline in the legal profession. The initiative of Bar Councils to check credentials of advocates should be completed in time bound manner.
- (xxix) There is no R & D investment in legal education sector so as to improve the state of affairs on quality of justice system professionals, quality of law making and quality of institutions providing justice to citizens; and
- (xxx) There is a paucity of quality law teachers and lawyers in the country and therefore, the retirement age of law teachers and High Court judges needs to be enhanced to 65 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE — AT A GLANCE

1. The Committee observes that legal education taught in universities enables the products of those universities to join as Judge, Advocate, Legislative Draftsman, Law Officer, Treaty Negotiator, Legal Journalist, etc. In this era of globalization, liberalization and privatization, there is a growing need of legal professional in fields of trade, commerce and industry as well. Further, the knowledge of law also enables to understand its impact and implication upon the lives of common man. It can be said that anyone can manage without having the knowledge of technical or medical education but knowledge of law is essential in every social, economic and political system. Even the treaty obligations of the country are affecting the lives of every man in the remote corner of the country. The legal education is not restricted to the students who are intending to practise law in the court of law. Higher education at the level of post-graduate and doctorate is now enabling them to become negotiator and arbitrator in international fora.

2. As many as seventeen national law schools have been set up by various States through their own legislations *inter-alia* to impart five year Hons law degree which encompasses law in various fields as well as practical training in terms of internship, mock trial and moot courts which sharpen communication and argument skill of the students which are essential attributes of a solicitor or an advocate. The Committee notes that these institutions are self-financed; some of them are in receipt of developmental grant from University Grants Commission (UGC). All of them are called as universities without having any colleges affiliated to them for the purpose of functional autonomy. Those law schools have evolved a Common Law Admission Test (CLAT) to select candidates having aptitude and flair to study law. The product of those institutes are getting placement in corporate law houses, legal processing outsourcing, etc. The fees from students are not sufficient to put those in proper growth trajectory. During its study visit to some of the national law schools in the country, it found excellent faculty, infrastructure and research resources for promotion of legal education. These types of institutes may be set up in other States as well and also be treated at par with institutions like AIIMS, IIT with the financial support from Union Government. The legal education should not be neglected as it affects the common life. The Committee recommends that National Law Schools set up under State legislation may be declared as institute of national eminence and can be a role model for other law institutions to emulate their standard in research, curriculum, faculty, etc. which could be a real asset for the legal fraternity.

3. The legal education is regulated by two statutory bodies' *i.e.*, Bar Council of India and University Grant Commission. While the Bar Council of India regulates legal education which is essential for an individual to enrol him/her as an advocate. The University Grant Commission regulates entire gamut of legal education as well as medical and technical education. The Bar Council of India is democratically elected body from the legal profession while the UGC members including its Chairman and Vice-Chairman are whole time salaried officers specially drawn from the field of education in medical, technical and legal having distinguished career in those fields. The Bar Council of India under Section 10 (2)(b) of the Advocate Act, 1961 and rules framed thereunder has re-constituted Legal Education Committee having more than thirty members under the Chairmanship of a retired judge of

the Supreme Court of India. The members of that Committee are chosen from Bar, Law Universities including National Law Schools to regulate the standard of basic LL.B degree. The Committee notes that the Legal Education Committee (LEC) of Bar Council of India is broad-based and having more membership than what is contemplated under Section 10 (2)(b) of the Advocate Act, 1961. The Bar Council of India under Rules have also constituted Curriculum Development Committee and Directorate of Legal Education for the purpose of upholding and upgrading standard of legal education. The Committee feels that the expansion of Legal Education Committee, constitution of Curriculum Committee and also setting up of the Directorate of Legal Education was done by the BCI by exercising the powers beyond the Advocates Act. The Committee is not, in anyway, opposed to the aforementioned arrangements but desires that attempts made by BCI be given the statutory support by incorporating restructured Legal Education Committee, Curriculum Development Committee and Directorate of Legal Education in the Advocate Act itself. The Committee accordingly recommends for the amendment of the Advocates Act and advises the Department of Legal Affairs to initiate action in this regard.

4. The Committee is of the view that role of BCI is restricted to the LLB degree which is an essential eligibility for enrolment at Bar under the Advocates Act. However, the postgraduate, specialised courses and the research comes under the higher education which is largely governed by the UGC. The Committee suggests that the Universities need to be given full autonomy in designing the courses.

5. The Committee strongly feels that the National Law Schools, Law Collages and Law Departments of the Universities need adequate financial support. The role of University Grants Commission can be vital in this regard. The Committee suggests the UGC should also frame Rules under the Section 25 read with Section 12B of the UGC Act providing for 'fitness' of the institutions imparting legal education on the lines of Technological and Agricultural universities etc.

6. The Committee considers that it is high time now to acknowledge the new dimensions like arbitration, mediation, consultancy which have now become part of general stream but not necessarily the practicing lawyers who are to be enrolled under the Advocates Act. These have now become the integral part of the legal profession through out the world. The Committee impress upon all the institutions imparting legal education also to focus in these fields as well. The Committee also feels that basic law courses like drafting of deeds, conciliation and mediation may be made part of school curriculum in higher secondary school level.

7. In our country, there are two models offering basic legal education, *i.e.* 3 years LLB and 5 years integrated BA (H) LLB offered by National Law Universities and some other universities. In order to purify and promote legal education in the country, Madras High Court in October, 2015 suggested to the BCI to scrap 3 year LLB Programme and retain only 5 years law programme. The Juris Doctor (JD) programme are being offered in most of the common law countries, *i.e.* Australia, England etc. Our legal education system may adopt similar type of education pattern in addition to 5 years law degree. Law Schools starting with National Law School of India University, Bangalore has provided institutional leadership in the field of teaching, research and learning. The law schools have become a recruitment platform, commercial law firms and Legal Process Outsourcing (LPO).

8. The Committee is happy to note that BCI is going to set-up one Lawyer Academy in each state for ongoing training of practicing lawyers to equip them with the development in law in the globalised economy. The first academy has been set-up in Kerala and the second is under progress in Jharkhand. The Committee feels that the academies would

provide research and resource material to young lawyer to keep them abreast of emerging trends in legal profession. It can also provide continued legal education by giving training by senior members of the Bar on latest rulings of Supreme Court and High Courts. The General body of Bar Council of Gujarat has resolved to constitute Gujarat Bar Council Advocates Academy (GBCAA) for continued legal education in association with National Law University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat (GNLU). The Committee feels that the Union Government may encourage all the States to setup Advocates Academy on the lines of State Judicial Academy for providing training to advocates in the States for an independent and integrated judiciary as envisaged under the Constitution of India. The Committee also impress upon the Union Government to provide financial assistance for establishing and nurturing Advocate Academies. In the mean time the infrastructural facilities of State Judicial Academy may be utilized to provide training for advocates, particularly when these academies are not imparting training to judicial academies officers.

MINUTES

XXIV
TWENTY FOURTH MEETING

The Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice met at 3.00 P.M. on Monday, the 24th May, 2016 in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

RAJYA SABHA

2. Shri Majeed Memon
3. Smt. Rajani Patil
4. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy

LOKSABHA

5. Shri Tariq Anwar
6. Shri P. P. Chaudhary
7. Adv. Joice George
8. Choudhary Mehboob Ali Kaiser
9. Shri Santosh Kumar
10. Shri Bhagwant Mann
11. Shri Vincent H. Pala
12. Shri M Udhayakumar
13. Shri Varaprasad Rao Velagapalli

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. P. Singh, *Joint Secretary*

Shri Ashok K. Sahoo, *Joint Director*

WITNESSES

I. Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development

1. Shir Vinay Sheel Oberoi, Secretary;
2. Shri Praveen Kumar, Joint Secretary;
3. Smt. Ishita Roy, Joint Secretary; and
4. Shri Amit Shukla, Director.

II. Department of Legal Affairs

1. Shri Ramayan Yadav, Additional Secretary; and
2. Shri Y. K. Singh, DLA.

III. University Grants Commission (UGC)

Prof. Ved Prakash, Chairman, UGC.

IV. National Law University, Delhi

1. Dr. Ranbir Singh, Vice-Chancellor ; and
2. Prof. Sachidanandam, former Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Tamil Nadu.

V. National Law School of India University, Bangalore

Prof V. Vijayakumar, former Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Tamil Nadu

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee. He then apprised that the representatives of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Legal Affairs, University Grants Commission, National Law School, Delhi and National Law School of India University, Bangalore have been invited to present their view on the subject “Promotion of Legal Education and Research under the Advocates Act, 1961”.

(After the arrival of the witnesses)

3. The Chairman welcomed Shri Vinay Sheel Oberoi, Secretary (Higher Education), Ministry of Human Resource and Development, Shri Ramayan Yadav, Additional Secretary, Department of Legal Affairs, Prof. Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission, Prof. Ranbir Singh, Vice Chancellor, National Law School, Delhi, Prof V. Vijayakumar, National Law School of India University, Bangalore and other officers present in the meeting of the Committee. He then highlighted role of Bar Council of India under the Advocates Act, 1961 in regulating and promoting legal education in the country, role of Department of Higher Education, Ministry of HRD, University Grants Commission (UGC) for laying down guidelines/norms to regulate standard of higher education and funding in the country. He added that the nomenclature of National Law Schools prima facie is a misnomer, as they are neither funded by Union Government, nor have any colleges affiliated to them and many of them are suffering due to inadequate funds. He requested the witnesses to touch upon the issues relating to the provisions of Advocates Act, 1961 dealing with legal education, role and relevance of Bar Council of India in promoting legal education in the country, issue of affiliation and inspection of law institutions, encroachment of powers of UGC by BCI, role of the Department/institutions with regard to curriculum, recruitment and promotion of faculties, research output, and also the issues regarding admission in law programmes while making their presentation.

3. The Secretary (Higher Education), Ministry of Human Resource and Development apprised the Committee of the recommendations of the One Hundredth and Eighty Fourth Report on the “Legal Education and professional Training and Proposal for Amendments to the Advocates Act, 1961 and the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 (2002)” for inserting Legal Education Committee of University Grants Commission (UGC) in the Section 5 of the UGC Act, 1956 in view of the inability of Bar Council of India to undertake consultation with universities in setting norms and standards for legal education. The Secretary further apprised the Committee of the withdrawal of Higher Education and Research Bill, 2011 from Rajya Sabha, which provided for the creation of the National Commission for Higher Education and Research subsuming University Grants Commission (UGC), All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) and National Council for Teachers Education (NCTE) to address the challenges of higher education in the country.

4. The Chairman, University Grants Commission submitted that the UGC sanctions grants to different universities in the country based on its criteria and guidelines. He added that since 2013 the UGC has been sanctioning grants to National Law Schools in the country.

5. The Additional Secretary, Department of Legal Affairs submitted that Entry 65 and 66 of the List I (Union List) and Entry 25 of List III (Concurrent List) of the Seventh Schedule of the

Constitution deal with education in the country. He added that as per the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961, the Department of Legal Affairs is entrusted with the administration of Advocates Act, 1961 and Legal profession only, whereas the Department of Higher Education is entrusted with university education, higher education and research. He apprised the Committee of the judgment of Madras High Court in Cr. O.P. (MD) No. 14573 of 2014 for phasing out three year LLB programmes. He submitted that the subject of legal education may be looked after by the UGC, while the BCI should exercise the power to recommend the minimum standard for practice as an advocate and in disciplinary matters.

6. The Vice Chancellor, National Law University, Delhi submitted that the National Law Schools are established under various State Acts in the country and barring a few, most of them are having financial problems as State Governments have stopped the funding after establishing them and on the other hand, the Union Government does not fund them as they are established by State legislatures. He added that like IITs and IIMs, the National Law Schools should be granted status of institute of national importance for maintain the standards of legal education in the country.

(The witnesses then withdrew)

7. Members sought clarifications on certain issues, to which the witnesses responded to and the Chairman directed them to give written clarifications on issues not responded to.

8. * * *

9. Verbatim record of meeting of the Committee was kept.

10. The meeting adjourned at 5.15 P.M.

* Relates to some other matter.

XXV
TWENTY FIFTH MEETING

The Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice met at 3.00 P.M. on Tuesday, the 31st May, 2016 in Committee Room 'A', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

RAJYA SABHA

2. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
3. Shri K. T .S. Tulsi

LOKSABHA

4. Shri Tariq Anwar
5. Shri P. P. Chaudhary
6. Shri A. H. Khan Choudhary
7. Adv. Joice George
8. Choudhary Mehboob Ali Kaiser
9. Shri Santosh Kumar
10. Shri B. V. Nayak
11. Dr. A. Sampath
12. Shri M. Udhayakumar
13. Dr. Anshul Verma

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. P. Singh, *Joint Secretary*

Shri Ashok K. Sahoo, *Joint Director*

Shrimati Niangkhanem Guite, *Assistant Director*

WITNESSES

- I. **Bar Council of India**
 1. Shri Manan Kumar Mishra, Chairman;
 2. Shri Debi Prasad Dhal, Co-Chairman;
 3. Shri S. Prabakran, Member;
 4. Shri Ramchander Rao, Member;
 5. Shri Amit Rana, Member;
 6. Shri Ashok Kumar Pandey, Joint Secretary; and
 7. Shri Senthil Kumar, Assistant Secretary.

II. O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat, Haryana

1. Professor (Dr) C. Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor; and
2. Shri K. Harish Chander Rao, Deputy Director.

III. Symbiosis Law School, Pune

Professor Shashikala Gurpur, Director.

IV. Amity Law School, Amity University, Noida, UP

1. Maj. Gen. (Prof.) Nilendra Kumar, Director;
2. Mr. Indranil Banerjee;
3. Ms. Mokshda Bhushan; and
4. Dr. Kavita Surabhi.

V. Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice

Shri Y. K. Singh, Deputy Legislative Adviser.

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee. He then apprised that the Bar Council of India, Jindal Global University, Symbiosis Law School and Amity Law School have been invited to present their views on the subject "Promotion of Legal Education and Research under the Advocates Act, 1961". * * *

(After the arrival of the witnesses)

3. The Chairman welcomed the Chairperson and Members of Bar Council of India (BCI) to the meeting on the subject – Promotion of legal Education and Research under the Advocates Act, 1961. Thereafter, he requested the Chairperson to make a brief submission on the role and contribution of the Commission for upholding and promoting standards of legal education and legal profession in the country.

4. The Chairperson, Bar Council of India in his opening observation submitted that the Bar Council has been assigned the task of promotion of legal education for the purpose of legal profession under Section 7 of the Advocates Act, 1961. That Commission has framed Legal Education Rules, 2008 under the Advocate Act. Legal Education Committee having representation of Attorney General for India, Solicitor General of India, legal luminaries/jurists, academicians and Vice-Chancellors/Deans of Law Universities/Colleges has been constituted for recognition, affiliation and inspection of universities/colleges imparting legal education under the Advocates Act, 1961.

5. The Chairman of the Bar Council of India submitted that the Legal Education Committee is the supreme body which takes vital decision about the grant of recognition or de-recognition university/institution imparting legal education. During inspection by the Legal Education Committee instances of teachers being in the roll of several universities/colleges and the inadequate infrastructure of colleges have come to the notice of Bar Council. He apprised that the Bar Council in 2015 had taken a decision not to give recognition to the new colleges for the forthcoming three years and had requested State Governments not to give NOC to such private institutions in order to curb and control the mushroom growth of legal institution. A Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) under the Legal Education Committee comprising members from Bar, Bench and Academia has been constituted for updating curriculum to be followed uniformly by all the universities/colleges imparting legal education to be in line with contemporary developments/

*** Relates to some other matter.

requirements of the legal education. A Directorate of Education under Legal Education Committee has been constituted to lay down standards of continuing legal education and uphold and upgrade standard of legal research and legal profession. That Directorate has taken up the onerous task of setting up of Lawyers' Academy in all States for continual legal training for budding advocates. Such Advocate Academy has already been established in the State of Kerala and the second one is offing in the State of Jharkhand. Through the Certificate of Place of Practice Verification Rules, the BCI has taken initiative to verify LLB Degree Certificate and licence of all advocates in the legal profession to identify fake lawyers in the profession.

6. Members sought data relating to number of law universities/colleges/schools in each State, student-teacher ratio, infrastructure and faculty position, etc. Responses of BCI for the steps to check mushroom growth of private law colleges, falling standard of legal education, large-scale absenteeism amongst the students, malpractices in the examination was sought for. Some of the Members were of the view that the Bar Council being democratically elected Body should be equally held responsible for independence of judiciary and felt that active involvement of BCI could improve standard of legal education and profession.

7. In his opening remarks, the Vice-Chancellor of O.P. Jindal Global University, Haryana gave an overview of evolution of five years law schools. While lauding the role of Bar Council in setting standard of legal education and implementing those standards, he was of the view that curriculum of law need to be continually updated having specific emphasis upon comparative laws of other countries, international law and laws on Intellectual Property Rights to keep pace with development of laws in international arena. He apprised that most of the brightest law graduates of five years law school preferred to join the corporate law firms, Legal Process Outsourcing (LPO), Non-governmental Organization/Inter-governmental Organizations rather than the academics or litigation. He requested the Bar Council to urge senior lawyers to play the role of mentor for the first-generation young law graduates and law students from under-privileged section of society to enable them to join the Bar. Like the Bar Council of America, the Bar Council of India should regulate all sorts of legal education and research as well as profession including entry of international law firms into our country for the sake of upgrading standard of legal education.

8. Director, Symbiosis Law School, Pune submitted legal education in the country needs to be looked in a holistic manner and the present scattered approach needs to be regulated comprehensively by a body to be known as Indian Council of Legal Research (ICLR) with regional branches which would audit and review legal education and research to uphold rule of law. She added that research output would be important for the growth of the profession, however, very few institutions in the country are seriously engaged in legal research. She added that more research fellowships, grants and sponsorships should be provided in legal education field along with a network of national law schools in the country.

9. Director Amity Law School, Amity University submitted that syllabus prescribed by the BCI happened to be urban oriented and added that law courses relating to tribal issues and agriculture etc. needed to be introduced in the curriculum. He suggested that senior advocates must also take social responsibility and contribute atleast one percent of their taxable income to a law college of their choice as a professional social responsibility to reduce the resource crunch faced by law schools in the country. He apprised that the teaching in law schools is theoretical in nature and out of touch with the practical reality. He suggested that compulsory attendance of seventy-five percent should be done away and more practical training should be introduced in law schools to make the students more employable in the market.

10. Members sought clarifications on certain issues, to which the witnesses responded to and the Chairman directed them to give written clarifications on issues not responded to.

(The witnesses then withdrew)

11. Verbatim record of meeting of the Committee was kept.

12. The meeting adjourned at 5.20 P.M.

XXVII
TWENTY SEVENTH MEETING

The Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice met at 11.00 A.M. on Tuesday, the 28th June, 2016 in Room No. 63, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

RAJYA SABHA

2. Shri Majeed Memon
3. Shrimati Rajani Patil
4. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
5. Shri Ramchandra Prasad Singh
6. Shri Bhupender Yadav

LOK SABHA

7. Shri P. P. Chaudhary
8. Shri A. H. Khan Choudhary
9. Adv. Joice George
10. Choudhary Mehboob Ali Kaiser
11. Shri Santosh Kumar
12. Shri B.V. Nayak
13. Dr. A. Sampath
14. Shri M. Udhayakumar
15. Shri Varaprasad Rao Velagapalli

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. P. Singh, *Joint Secretary*

Shri Ashok K. Sahoo, *Joint Director*

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1. | * | * | * |
| 2. | * | * | * |
| 3. | * | * | * |
| 4. | * | * | * |

5. The Committee then took up the consideration and adoption of the draft Eighty-sixth Report on the 'Promotion of Legal Education and Research under the Advocates Act, 1961.' Some Members suggested the addition of the following lines in the beginning of paragraph six of the recommendations-

*** Relate to some other matters.

6. *The Committee considers that it is high time now to acknowledge the new dimensions like arbitration, mediation, consultancy which have now become part of general stream but not necessarily the practicing lawyers who are to be enrolled under the Advocates Act. These have now become the integral part of the legal profession through out the world. The Committee impress upon all the institutions imparting legal education also to focus in these fields as well.'*

Some Members suggested that an addition may be made which would provide for training of advocates in the State Judicial Academies until the Advocates Academies are established in the States in the paragraph number eight of the recommendations regarding establishment of Advocates Academy for training of advocates. Further, it was suggested that the following line may be added at the end of the same recommendation-

'which also needed to be nurtured by financial help from the Union Government.'

7. The Members of the Committee congratulated the Chairman on the successful completion of his tenure as a Member of Parliament.

(The Committee adjourned to call on the Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha)

(The Committee reassembled after call on Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha)

8. The Report was adopted with necessary changes. The Committee authorized Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy, and in his absence Shri Majeed Memon to present the Report to Rajya Sabha and Adv. Joice George and in his absence, Shri M. Udhayakumar to lay the same in Lok Sabha at the first opportune time of the forth coming Monsoon Session of Parliament.

9. Verbatim record of meeting of the Committee was kept.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12.46 P.M.

ANNEXURES

State/UT wise details Law Universities and Law Colleges in the country

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	Number of University	Total College
1.	Andhra Pradesh	16	60
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3	3
3.	Assam	4	29
4.	Bihar	10	28
5.	Chhattisgarh	7	25
6.	Delhi	4	19
7.	Goa	1	2
8.	Jharkhand	5	14
9.	Gujarat	16	78
10.	Haryana	20	36
11.	Jammu and Kashmir	2	16
12.	Himachal Pradesh	8	17
13.	Karnataka	6	108
14.	Kerala	6	28
15.	Madhya Pradesh	13	121
16.	Manipur	1	3
17.	Maharashtra	14	129
18.	Meghalaya	3	6
19.	Mizoram	1	1
20.	Nagaland	1	3
21.	Odisha	7	32
22.	Puducherry	1	2
23.	Punjab	7	33
24.	Rajasthan	32	105
25.	Sikkim	2	2
26.	Tamil Nadu	7	16
27.	Tripura	2	2
28.	Uttar Pradesh	32	320
29.	Uttarakhand	5	30
30.	West Bengal	13	37
	TOTAL	249	1305

**Statement of total number of Advocates enrolled with the State Bar Councils
As per Detaild**

Sl. No.	Name of the St. Bar Council	Male	Female	Total	As on
1.	Andhra Pradesh			90,813	31.01.15
2.	Assam, Nagaland			23,077	5.3. 2011
3.	Bihar			1,06,784	28.02.15
4.	Chhattisgarh			25,000	6.2.2015
5.	Delhi			74,500	31.12.14
6.	Gujarat	59910	17629	77,539	7.2.2015
7.	Himachal Pradesh	6802	1826	8628	31.12.14
8.	Jharkhand			25,211	15.01.15
9.	Karnataka			79,025	31.12.12
10.	Kerala			45,945	31.12.12
11.	Madhya Pradesh			93,286	13.02.15
12.	Maharashtra & Goa	1,03,456	45,000	1,48,456	08.02.15
13.	Orissa			45,087	31.12.13
14.	Punjab & Haryana	69360	10085	79,445	31.12.14
15.	Rajasthan	61,377	9982	71,359	8.2.2015
16.	Tamil Nadu			67,000	31.08.11
17.	Uttarakhand			11,749	27.02.15
18.	Uttar Pradesh	2,84,249	19,428	3,03,677	31.01.15
19.	West Bengal			62,977	31.12.13
20.	Jammu & Kashmir			5498	05.03.11
	TOTAL			14,45,056	

Statement showing the grants released by UGC to individual State Law Universities during Twelfth Five Year Plan

(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of State/Universities	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16 (Provisional)
1	2	3	4	5	6
ANDHRA PRADESH					
1.	Damodram Sanjivayya National Law Univ., Visakhapatnam	56.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
ASSAM					
2.	National Law Univ. and Judicial Academy, Guwahati*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIHAR					
3.	Chanakya National Law Univ., Patna	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00
CHHATTISGARH					
4.	Hidayatullah National Law Univ., Raipur	265.65	244.39	100.67	234.30
DELHI					
5.	Indian Law Instt., New Delhi	000	240.00	0.00	0.00
6.	National Law Univ., Dwarka, New Delhi	119.15	242.39	204.89	142.45
GUJARAT					
7.	Gujarat National Law Univ., Gandhinagar	185.25	217.80	0.00	8.38
JHARKHAND					
8.	National Univ. of Study & Res. in Law, Ranchi*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KARNATAKA					
9.	National Law School of India University, Bangalore	153.18	234.50	68.08	113.51
10.	Karnataka State Law Univ., Hubli	56.25	11.24	0.00	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
KERALA					
11.	National Univ. of Advanced Legal Studies, Kaloor, Kochi	0.00	200.00	0.00	0.00
MADHYA PRADESH					
12.	National Law Instt., Bhopal	347.95	249.80	0.00	8.00
ORISSA					
13.	National Law Univ., Cuttak	0.00	280.00	0.00	37.58
PUNJAB					
14.	The Rajiv Gandhi National Univ. of Law, Patiala	246.57	217.12	42.25	519.90
RAJASTHAN					
15.	Naiionai Law Univ., Jodhpur	132.20	195.00	1.86	0.00
16.	Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Law Univ., Jaipur*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TAMILNADU					
17.	Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Law Univ, Chennai	158.12	219.80	0.00	21.82
18.	Tamilnadu National Law School, Tiruchirapalli*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TELANGANA					
19.	National Academy of Legal Studies & Res. Univ. of Law, Hyderabad	129.03	208.60	166.80	102.12
UTTAR PRADESH					
20.	Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia National Law Univ., Lucknow	90.00	372.47	0.00	4.42
WEST BENGAL					
21.	The W.B. National Univ. of Juridical Science, Kolkata	229.85	225.60	0.00	0.00
TOTAL:		2169.45	3378.71	584,55	1192.48

* These universities are not fit under 12B for receiving central assistance.