

**Shrimati G. Durgabai** (Madras : General): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this article. While doing so, I wish to place a few points before the House for its consideration.

Sir, the right to move the Supreme Court by appropriate proceedings for the enforcement of a person's rights is a very valuable right that is guaranteed under this Constitution. In my view this is a right which is fundamental to all the fundamental rights guaranteed under this Constitution. The main principle of this article is to secure an effective remedy to the fundamental rights guaranteed under this Constitution. As we are all aware, a right without an expeditious and effective remedy serves no purpose at all, nor is it worth the paper on which it is written. Therefore, as I have already stated, this article secures that kind of advantage that it will ensure the effective enforcement of the fundamental rights guaranteed to a person.

Sir, then, all of us are aware, and the Drafting Committee is quite alive to the fact, that in recent times in England the procedure under ancient writs has been considerably modified and a simple remedy by a petition has been substituted for writs in a recent enactment in England. Perhaps that is the reason why the Drafting Committee has put in this article directions or orders in the nature of writs of *habeas corpus* etc.

Another point is that the right that is vested in the Supreme Court in no way affects the right of the High Courts in any part of India to issue similar writs or to enable Parliament to make laws empowering any other Courts to exercise the same power within the local limits of its jurisdiction. The question might arise in this connection as to what happens if the High Court refuses to issue a writ, and whether in the absence of a specific provision to that effect, an application for the issue of a writ is barred to the Supreme Court. To that my answer is, "No", because I consider that in these matters there is no question of *res judicata*. A person can move any number of courts and before any judge an application for the issue of this writ, though the Supreme Court naturally takes into consideration the order passed either by the High Court or any other Court in granting or refusing to issue this writ. Therefore, the application is not barred.

There are some other points also to be mentioned in this connection, but I feel these are the two main questions that might arise in this connection. One is whether the right that is vested in the Supreme Court bars the right of the other High Courts to issue similar writs; that question, I think, I have answered. The other question is whether in the case of concurrent jurisdiction, that is if the High Court refuses to issue this writ, whether an application is barred to the Supreme Court. That also I have answered by stating that any number of times a person can go to any number of Courts and move this application. Sir, with these few words I have great pleasure in supporting this article. I commend it to acceptance of the House.