

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

If the jurisprudence of remedies were understood and applied from the perspective of social efficaciousness, the problem raised in this appeal would not have ended the erroneous way it did, in the High Court. [judges](#) must never forget that every law has a social purpose and engineering process without appreciating which justice to the law cannot be done. Here, the socio-legal situation we are faced with is a colliery, an explosive, an [accident](#), luckily not lethal, caused by violation of a regulation and consequential cancellation of the certificate of the delinquent shot-firer, eventually quashed by the High Court, for processual solecisms, by a [writ](#) of certiorari.

xxx

13. The last violation regarded as a lethal objection is that the Board did not enquire of the respondent, independently of the one done by the Regional Inspector. Assuming it to be necessary, here the respondent has, in the form of an appeal against the report of the Regional Inspector, sent his explanation to the Chairman of the Board. He has thus been heard and compliance with Regulation 26, in the circumstances, is complete. [natural justice](#) is no unruly horse, no lurking landmine, nor a judicial cure-all. If fairness is shown by the decisionmaker to the man proceeded against, the form, features and the fundamentals of such essential processual propriety being conditioned by the facts and circumstances of each situation, no breach of natural justice can be complained of. Unnatural expansion of natural justice, without reference to the administrative realities and other factors of a given case, can be exasperating. We can neither be finical nor fanatical but should be flexible yet firm in this [jurisdiction](#). No man shall be hit below the belt that is the conscience of the matter.”

Chairman Board of Mining v. Ramjee, (1977) 2 SCC 256

Tags: [Chairman Board of Mining v. Ramjee](#), [Natural justice](#), [Practice and Procedure](#)