

The reason is that right through in the States Chapter we have been omitting specific reference to States in Part III of the First Schedule and it would only be following the same practice which we have hitherto followed. I hope the House will agree to this and omit clause (2). Sir, I move.

**Shri R. K. Sidhwa :** Mr. President, I know, as you have rightly pointed out, that in the previous clauses as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, we have passed a similar article. But I do not understand why the Judge of a High Court should be above criticism as far as his conduct is concerned. Sometimes he misbehaves, he is not a super-man, his conduct also should be subject to question somewhere and if you do not allow the House to discuss his conduct, you know sometimes what happens. We know what happened in a recent case. While I say that his judgment should not be under discussion of the House, his conduct should be certainly subject to discussion. There is nothing wrong and it does not in any way derogate from his position. If you have some kind of restriction upon a judge, I think it will be a very healthy procedure.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari :** May I point out that we have accepted 101 which is practically the same so far as Parliament is concerned and we are applying the same provision with regard to Legislatures of the States?

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That clause (2) of article 185 be deleted.”

The amendment was adopted.

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That article 185, as amended, stand part of the Constitution.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 185, as amended, was added to the Constitution.

---

#### Article 186

**Mr. President :** We go to No. 186.

(Amendment No. 2520 was not moved.)

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That article 186 stand part of the Constitution.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 186, was added to the Constitution.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eight of the Clock on Monday, the 13th June, 1949.

---