

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3154

ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST JUDGES

3154. SHRI P. WILSON:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of complaints received against Judges since 2021, including the names of Judges concerned, nature of complaints and the action taken or status thereof, year-wise;
- (b) the internal procedure and mechanism adopted by the Supreme Court of India for receiving, examining and disposing of such complaints, the authorities involved and the year-wise number of complaints received and disposed of since 2021; and
- (c) the details of recommendations made by the Supreme Court Collegium that have been pending with Government for more than one year, including the names of recommended candidates, the dates of recommendation and the reasons for delay?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF STATE (INDEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE; AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

(SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL)

(a) to (c): Independence of Judiciary is enshrined in the Constitution of India. The complaints received against Judges and Chief Justices of the High Courts are handled by the judiciary through an “in-house mechanism”. The Supreme Court of India, on 7th May, 1997, adopted two Resolutions namely (i) "The Restatement of Values of Judicial Life" which lays down certain judicial standards and principles to be observed and followed by the Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts and (ii) "In-house procedure" for taking suitable remedial measure against Judges who do not follow the universally accepted values of judicial life including those in the Restatement of values of Judicial Life. As per the established “In-house procedure” for the Higher Judiciary, the Chief Justice of India is competent to receive

complaints against Judges of the Supreme Court and Chief Justices of the High Courts. Similarly, the Chief Justices of the High Courts are competent to receive complaints against the conduct of High Court Judges.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. As per the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998 (Third Judges case), the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, in consultation with two senior-most puisne Judges of the High Court. As per the MoP, the High Courts are required to make recommendations at least 06 months before the occurrence of a vacancy. However, this time limit is rarely observed. For appointments to the High Courts, the views of concerned State Government are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

Through this continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary, 157 Judges were appointed in various High Courts during 2025.
