Journal of The Gujarat Research Society
ISSN: 0374-8588
Volume 21 Issue 10, October 2019

Writ of Certiorari

Vivek Devvrat Singh
Department of Law
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT: ***A form of writ, designed for rare use, by which, at its discretion, an appeal court agrees to review a lawsuit. The term certiorari derives from Latin word which means "to be more fully informed." A certiorari brief directs a lower court to include its record in a case so that it can be examined by the higher court. In selecting several of the lawsuits it hears, the U.S. Supreme Court uses certiorari. The writ of certiorari is a writ of common law, which may be repealed or regulated solely by the laws of the statute or court. A phrase that seems like a Constitutional Court's home in the midst of a tongue twister of rolled as an official route. Certiorari's prerogative writ takes its name from the tradition where a sovereign would state that he "wanted to be certified certiorari-of the matter upon hearing a complaint from a subject that injustice had been committed, and direct the records in the matter to be transmitted to the Court in which he was sitting."***

KEYWORDS: Constitution of India; Certiorari; High Court; Supreme Court; Writ.

INTRODUCTION

This decision tilts the scales in favour of a court exercising the authority to grant the Certiorari writ which would undoubtedly have the effect of extending the reach of the Certiorari Writ to further inspection of evidence. Indeed, with the extension of the scope of review of evidence, the act of calling for documents, which has become the trademark of Certiorari's writing as expressed in its etymology, acquires greater significance. However, the current author will fall short of suggesting that this tends towards the above-described UK standard as it has developed in very distinct circumstances[1].

In common-law jurisdictions, Certiorari, sometimes referred to as cert, is a writ issued by a higher court for the re-examination of a lower court action. Certiorari is often provided by a court of appeal to seek details about a lawsuit pending before it. At first, the writ of certiorari was an initial writ from the Court of Queen's Bench of England to the judges of inferior courts asking them to send those documents[1].

The chancery (equity) courts were later extended to include Certiorari. In 1938, the writ was repealed, but the High Court of Justice maintained the power to order certiorari. These directives have proven helpful in the analysis of administrative court rulings against which there is no standard means of appeal, in particular in the evaluation of problems of fault in the admission and exclusion of facts[2].

Certiorari is used by the Supreme Court of the United States to investigate questions of law or to remedy mistakes and to ensure the lower courts are avoiding excesses. In rare cases, certain writs are often issued where an urgent investigation is required. Four of the nine judges of the court must vote to hear the case in order for the Supreme Court to grant a writ of certiorari[2].

Each of the high prerogative rulings that the High Courts and the Supreme Court are empowered to deliver under the Constitution is A Certiorari Writ. In the event of a violation of a constitutional right, the Supreme Court has authority to do so under Article 32, while the

High Court has jurisdiction primarily under Article 226 and Article 227 as well. The scope of the redress of the certiorari writ can be invoked in the absence of a tribunal or authorities or subordinate courts in a patently erroneous way or without a jurisdictional warrant[3].

By issuing a certiotari brief, the Court of First Instance, by issuing the certiorari brief, legally calls on the inferior jurisdictional authority to register the case and, after considering the same quashes or sets aside the order passed by the subordinate authority[3].

In the present case, the Court of First Instance was of the view that Article 226 did not contemplate the annulment of the decision of a subordinate civil court. Certiorari, as stated above, concerns the orders of a "inferior court or tribunal or authority" After considering numerous decisions of the Supreme Court, the Court held that it is a well-established position that, while the Civil Courts are subordinate to the High Courts, they are not 'inferior courts' and thus, according to Article 226, are not suitable for certiorari[4].

It would appear like settled law is the first question raised to the Court. However, in fact, notwithstanding the catena of rulings to the contrary, the majority of proponents necessarily file written appeals pertaining to both Articles 226 and 227 for the annulment of civil/judicial orders, as opposed to the latter, even if they question the legitimacy of a civil/judicial court order. It would be fascinating to see if that decision affects the manner in which the registries of the High Court of Bombay and its seats in Nagpur and Aurangabad continue to raise objections pursuant to Article 226 to the filing of those petitions, or the judges make observations pursuant to Article 226 thereof, even though the issue of law is not addressed[5].

Furthermore, with regard to the second issue, it seems impossible that the instances of impleading by the judges of the lower courts would be diminished in any manner, as such written petitions inevitably contain charges of mala fide and prejudice, irrespective of whether they are merited. However, this decision may serve as a valuable precedent in petitions where the judges passing orders have not been impleaded (and correctly so), to get around the primary objection raised with regard to its preservation[5].

DISCUSSION

The literal sense of the 'Certiorari' letter is 'To be certified' or 'To be told.' This letter is given to a lower court or tribunal by a higher court to compel them either to move a case to themselves or to squash their order in a case. It shall be given on the pretext of an excess of jurisdiction or exclusion of jurisdiction or of an inconsistency of law. It not only stops but also cures the judiciary's errors[6].

Certiorari is provided pursuant to Article 226 for the redress of a gross error in jurisdiction, i.e. where a subordinate court is found to have acted (1) without jurisdiction or asserted jurisdiction where none remains, or (2) violates its jurisdiction by overriding or crossing the limits of jurisdiction or (3) behaving in flagrant violation of the statute or code of procedure or in infringement of the standards of jurisdiction[6].

Certiorari is a Latin word meaning tell, a passive version of the word “certiorari. A certiorari letter or a certiorari letter can be issued only by the Supreme Court pursuant to Article 32 and by the High Court pursuant to Article 226 to command, inferior courts, tribunals or authorities to convey to the court the record of proceedings ordered or pending for review and, if required,

to quash the same. Except to ask for the record or records and prosecutions of an Act or Ordinance and to quash such an Act or Ordinance, a writ of certiorari will never be issued[7].

There is a fundamental contrast between prohibition decrees and certiorari. At various points of litigation, they are published. If an inferior court takes up a hearing over a matter for which it has no authority, the party against whom the hearing is taken may petition the superior court to prohibit the injunction to prohibit the inferior court from conducting the hearings. In the other hand, the party will need to appeal to the supreme court to quash the ruling/order on the basis of loss of jurisdiction if the court hears the matter and gives the decision[7].

Certiorari simply means getting accredited. The Writ of Certiorari is issued by the Supreme Court for due consideration by a lower court or tribunal to transfer the case to it or to any other superior authority. To quash the order already passed by an inferior court, the Writ of Certiorari may be issued by the Supreme Court or by any High Court. In other words, although the ban is applicable at an earlier stage, Certiorari is usable at a later stage for similar purposes. It should also be said that the Writ of Prohibition is applicable to Certiorari only after the order or verdict has been announced during the course of litigation before a lower judge[8].

In the Province of Bombay v/s Khushaldas, in this case, it was held that if any person having legal authority to decide issues concerning the rights of subjects and having the responsibility to act judicially violates that person's legal authority, a letter of certiorari shall emerge. The simple removal of ministerial acts or the removal or cancelation of presidential administrative acts is not a deception. One of the basic rules with respect to the issuance of a certiorari writ is that the writ should never be used to remove or adjudicate on the legality of judicial actions in relation to judicial bodies[8].

Speech of judicial activities involves the execution of quasi-judicial duties by administrative bodies or officials or by individuals obligated to perform those functions, and is used, on the other hand, solely by acts of the ministry. Two measures have been put forward by the supreme court to determine if an authority could behave judicially—1. Where a law empowers an authority to resolve disputes arising out of an argument brought by one of the parties pursuant to the statute against which another party objects, the prima facie obligation of the authority to act judicially and the judgment of the authority is a quasi-judicial act, in the absence of anything in the statute to the contrary[9].

2. If a constitutional body has the right to perform any act that may affect the subject matter prejudicially, although there are not two persons other than the authority, a quasi-judicial act will be the ultimate judgment of the authority, given that the authority is needed by the legislation to act judicially. Reasons under which a writ may be issued[9].

Certiorari can, on the following grounds, be given to judicial and quasi-judicial bodies. 1. The writ of certiorari shall be given to a person exercising a judicial or quasi-judicial role to remedy violations of authority, as if the inferior court or tribunal operates without, or in excess of, jurisdiction or fails to exercise that jurisdiction. The lack of jurisdiction may emerge from the existence of the subject matter, such that there is no power for the inferior court to join the investigation or any aspect of it. The lack of jurisdiction can also result from the absence of certain preliminary hearings or the presence of any relevant evidence required for the exercise

of the jurisdiction of the courts, and the court mistakenly claims that there is a specific requirement[10].

The writ is often issued for correcting an error of law evident on the face of the record to correct an error of law apparent on the face of the record. It cannot be released in order to correct a logical mistake. What is an obvious error in law on the face of the record is to be determined on the basis of each case by the courts. In Hari Vishnu v/s Ahmed Ishaque, the Supreme Court held that if it was not self-evident, no mistake could be said to be error on the face of the record and it took an investigation and argument to determine it[10].

A writ of certiorari may correct an arror of law that is obvious on the face of the record, but not an error of fact, however significant it may appear to be. The explanation for the provision is that in a supervisory jurisdiction and not appeal jurisdiction, the court granting a certiorari letter acts. Accordingly, it cannot replace its own decision on the merits of the case or include guidance for the inferior court or tribunal to meet with it. 3. Disregard of the Natural Justice principle[10].

CONCLUSION & IMPLICATION

Since the ruling has already been made by the lower court, the writ of certiorari is issued to quash the decision. It may be that the High Court may have given both prohibitions in the litigation before an inferior court to bar the body from continuing and certiorari to further invalidate what it has already done. A supervisory jurisdiction is the jurisdiction to grant certiorari, and the High Court, exercising it, is not entitled to serve as an appeal court.

However, if it has not behaved judicially, it is issued against an act or proceedings of a judicial or quasi-judicial entity. Since the courts are obliged to behave in a certain fashion, except though the list is between private persons, the court may issue this order.

In contrast with other writings, Certiorari is a particular style of prose. This Writ is correction in nature, indicating that the object of this Writ is to correct a mistake on the documents that is obvious. Certiorari is a document given to a subordinate court by a higher court. This will be provided if the supreme court decides to resolve a matter in the case itself or if the inferior court extends its authority.

This Writ can also be issued if there is a substantive mistake in the trials pursued by the inferior court or if the standards of natural justice are infringed. If the superior court determines that a breach of natural justice or a substantive mistake in the process followed has arisen, the order of the inferior court can be quashed.

REFERENCES

[1] L. W. Goodrich *et al.*, “PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI,” *Issues Law Med.*, 2016.

[2] L. Sullivan, “Writ of Certiorari,” in *The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2012.

[3] F. J. Goodnow, “The Writ of Certiorari,” *Polit. Sci. Q.*, 1891, doi: 10.2307/2139490.

[4] G. A. Caldeira and J. R. Wright, “The Discuss List: Agenda Building in the Supreme Court,” *Law Soc. Rev.*, 1990, doi: 10.2307/3053860.

[5] M. A. J. de S. C. Oliveira and N. Garoupa, “Stare decisis and certiorari arrive to Brazil: a comparative law and economics approach,” *Emory Int. Law Rev.*, 2013.

[6] P. J. Rice, “Court Martial Jurisdiction. The Service Connection Standard in Confusion,” *J. Crim. Law. Criminol. Police Sci.*, 1970, doi: 10.2307/1141962.

[7] J. R. Wright and G. A. Caldeira, “Organized Interests Before the Supreme Court: Setting the Agenda,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1442945.

[8] J. Miller, “SEALING THE COFFIN ON THE EXPERIMENTAL USE EXCEPTION,” *Duke Law Technol. Rev.*, 2003.

[9] T. L. Fort and S. R. Salbu, “Introduction to the Special Section on Commercial Speech,” *Bus. Ethics Q.*, 2007, doi: 10.5840/beq200717117.

[10] M. Â. Jardim and N. Garoupa, “Stare decisis e certiorari chegam ao Brasil: Uma abordagem pela análise econômica do direito,” *Rev. Direito, Estado e Soc.*, 2014, doi: 10.17808/des.42.143.