



EVENT REPORT

REGIONAL CONCLAVE

THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE EDUCATION IN SOUTH ASIA

8-9 NOVEMBER 2019



Azim Premji
University



REGIONAL CONCLAVE: THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE EDUCATION IN SOUTH ASIA

8 & 9 November, 2019 | ILNU, Nirma University, Ahmedabad | India

EVENT REPORT

(This report has been authored by Shrutanjaya Bhardwaj and Abhayraj Naik with useful inputs from Arpit Sharma, Asha Bajpai, Ekakshra Mahajan, Jane Schukoske, Purvi Pokhariyal, and Sarasu Esther Thomas. Dhruvi Dharia and Satyender Saharan contributed to the writing of this report through diligent transcription of the video recorded proceedings.)

The video recordings from the event will soon be made accessible at:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCPTJrIAxGDO9gClx6jTFGGQ>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Detailed Event Report	4
Background: Vision and Objectives	4
Introductory and Key-Note Session	5
Panel Discussions and Small Group Special Sessions	8
Outcomes and Conclusions	27
Synthesis and Steps Ahead	29
Annexure I: Final Schedule	i
Annexure II: List of Final Participants	iii
Annexure III: List of Organizing Team Members	vi

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The first Regional Conclave on the Future of Justice Education in South Asia led to the incubation and genesis of SANJE i.e. The South Asia Network for Justice Education. Responding to the lack of an adequate platform at the South Asian and Indian levels to promote Justice Education and human rights, thirty three accomplished educators and practitioners deliberated and discussed the prevailing state of justice education in their respective nations and the potential of a collaborative platform to advance new approaches, initiatives and best practices in Justice Education across South Asia. The Conclave was conceptualized by four prominent educators from India - Mr. Abhayraj Naik, Prof. Asha Bajpai, Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal, and Prof. Sarasu Esther Thomas.

A rather solemn introductory note highlighted the grim position of legal education in South Asia emphasizing on the need of a network to explore the potential of education as a harbinger of justice. The Introduction was followed by Panel discussions on issues of seminal importance with small-group special sessions that aided in fostering meaningful dialogue and interaction between the participants. The first panel discussion discoursed Reforming Legal Education to focus on Justice and led to a powerful deliberation on an idea floated by one of speakers on training and monitoring the quality of justice workers who do not belong to a legal background. Cautioning against empowering non-lawyers with the power bestowed upon lawyers and judges, the discussion paved the way for identifying diversity and inclusion as imperative questions requiring reflection. A Special Small-Group Session on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 trailed the first panel discussion which gave a brief background to Sustainable Development Goals and the need to devise parameters which could be used in the future to measure the progress of justice education. The goal of the exercise was aimed around raising awareness about the United Nation's SDG 16 aimed at promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, providing access to justice for all and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

The second Panel Discussion discussed the broad theme of Learning Outcomes and Justice Education. A common theme which resonated amongst all speakers was the malice of a regimented form of education which potentially stunts creation of ideas amongst students. Deliberating possible solutions, the speakers weighed adoption of pedagogical tools to serve the vision of a cohesive justice education which would also help navigate differences of identity while dealing with vulnerable communities. The Panel Discussion was followed by a Network Building Small-Group discussion which aimed at exploring the potential of building a justice education network and posing questions to the participants, nurturing a meaningful exchange and collaboration. The subsequent Panel Discussion invited thoughts on Old Challenges and New Approaches in Justice Education. Speakers suggested offering first hand experience to students through clinical education in law schools and different approaches adopted in various institutions were discussed including initiatives which focussed on classroom tools, development of educational aids and equipping teachers. Successful initiatives by a few law sc-

hools were referred to and their success stories were pondered upon. This was followed by a Panel Discussion on Working with Communities and Appreciating Context wherein limited government funding for legal aid and geographical limitations were highlighted as pertinent issues plaguing the advancement of justice education and promotion of human rights. Emphasis was laid on teaching integrity and ethics in law schools and the rigorous academic curriculum laid down by the UGC in India was condescended.

The Discussion was followed by a Small-group session to discuss the building of a Justice Education Network in South Asia. Various questions of seminal importance such as the need for such a network, membership to the network, creation of a common database, potential challenges and barriers, purpose of the network, funding and awarding appropriate credit to the work done by students and educators were posed to the participants and their responses were solicited. The final Panel Discussion ensued after this discussion which highlighted the outcomes and conclusions. Emphasis was laid on development of pedagogical resources and clinical education. Common themes plaguing the incumbent education system were identified such as the rigidity of the existing Bar Council curriculum, existing practice of legal education, funding constraints and ambiguity in defining the term justice education.

The key takeaways of each discussion condensed into a unanimous consensus of building a cohesive South Asian Network which would advance delivery of justice and aid in building an inclusive society. Changing status quo and encouraging novel pedagogical ideas were identified as key components of facilitating change and allowing students and professionals alike to foster innovation and experiment in diverse fields which would aid in justice delivery. Experiential learning was identified as a core activity to promote sensitivity amongst students and develop adequate and customized evaluations. The event concluded with suggestions about next steps in taking the initiative forward and suggestions were solicited from each participant about their expectations from the network.

DETAILED EVENT REPORT

The conclave, organized at the Institute of Law, Nirma University in Ahmedabad, India on 8 and 9 November 2019, brought together 33 accomplished educators and practitioners from across India and the South Asian region to speak about new approaches and initiatives, best practices, and collaborative opportunities in justice education. The conclave was attended by active clinical professors from Bangladesh, Nepal, Maldives and India (along with a short video presentation submitted by an academic from Pakistan), human rights lawyers, and members of the civil society.

I. Background: Vision and Objectives

The conclave was conceptualised and co-organized by four educators from India – Mr. Abhayraj Naik, Prof. Asha Bajpai, Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal, and Prof. Sarasu Esther Thomas – having a wealth of experience in clinical legal education, access to justice initiatives, human rights lawyering and research, community empowerment, social impact and development, and justice education. It was aimed at responding to the lack of an adequate collaborative platform and the paucity of high-quality research at the Indian and the South Asian regional levels for educators and practitioners involved in justice education and the promotion of human rights. Besides a grant from the GAJE Regional Committee, the conclave was generously supported by the Institute of Law Nirma University, Azim Premji University, National Law School of India Bengaluru, National Law University Odisha, and the Gujarat National Law University.

The main goals of the conclave were:

- To enable justice educators and practitioners to take stock of what has been done in justice education in India and South Asia,
- To share and foster dialogue on new approaches and initiatives, best practices, collaborative opportunities, and insights on addressing recurrent challenges in the context of justice education in South Asia,
- To develop and commit to publishing a body of relevant and useful knowledge relating to justice education in India and South Asia, and
- To build commitment and momentum for a new collaborative network of justice educators and practitioners in the South Asian region, called 'SANJE' – The South Asia Network for Justice Education.

II. Introductory and Key-Note Session

Chairperson: Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal

Speakers: Prof. B.B. Pande, Distinguished Professor at National Law University, Delhi (Key Note Speaker); Prof. Anup Singh, Vice Chancellor, Nirma University; Prof. Sri Krishna Deva Rao, Vice Chancellor, National Law University, Odisha; Prof. S. Shanthakumar, Director, Gujarat National Law University, Gandhinagar; Prof. Sitharamam Kakarala, Director, School for Policy and Governance, Azim Premji University; Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal, Director and Dean, Institute of Law, Nirma University; Prof. Sarasu Esther Thomas, Professor of Law and Registrar, National Law School of India University, Bangalore; Prof. Asha Bajpai, Founder Dean, Tata Institute of Social Sciences Faculty of Law; and Mr. Abhayraj Naik, Consultant and Visiting Faculty at Azim Premji University.



Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal delivered the welcome address of the introductory session. She stated that the complex issue of access to justice involves many actors, and law schools are one of those actors. Appealing to Article 39A of the Constitution of India, she suggested that law schools can play a pivotal role in achieving the constitutional goal of access of justice by imparting the right kind of training to students. Law schools would hence not merely produce lawyers but would also shape them as justice professionals. In turn, this would further the ideals of Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16), i.e. to providing justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.



Mr. Abhayraj Naik began with a story about Mahatma Gandhi in which an interlocutor academic told him that he had studied all of history and Satyagraha was an unviable political tool. Gandhiji is known to have responded by saying, “You study history and I make history.” Mr. Naik suggested that justice educators across the world have slowly but surely begun to make history, and that the present conclave was a step forward in making possible the claim that a new order of legal education – and a new vision for education in general – is now possible in India. Adverting to the prevailing climate crisis, technological challenges and sectarian differences, he proposed that it was an opportune moment to revisit what it means to be a university, an educator, and a learner.

Prof. Asha Bajpai stressed the importance of law schools crediting field work and legal aid services of both teachers and students. Recounting her experiences with clinical work, she said that providing legal services can make communities feel empowered in a socially meaningful way. She further emphasized that justice is fairness to all, and if unfairness exists anywhere, there should be an easily accessible remedy against that unfairness.



Prof. Sarasu Esther Thomas remembered late Prof. N.R. Madhava Menon and his inspiring ideas about how we should all be social engineers. Highlighting that all students – and not just those who are interested in human rights – are at the core of the justice system, Prof. Thomas emphasized the need to better align classroom education with social reality. In the same vein, she also spoke about unequal access to law schools for students from privileged and underprivileged backgrounds and the consequent lack of diversity inside classrooms. Therefore, she said, justice education is no longer an option. Finally, Prof. Thomas identified various practical advantages and incentives of clinic-based education for students, including credits, CV enrichment and all-round development of the student.



Prof. Sitharamam Kakarala highlighted the fact that in every search meeting, there is a frustration with how much has been achieved and how much has not been achieved. However, he highlighted the importance of that frustration in that the frustration makes us realize that we must do something better and we are not doing enough in terms of the larger goals that we have. He stressed the need to learn from the utopia of the younger people and justice enthusiasts who would be participating in the conclave. He said that the purpose for which this network is being created is to explore how education could be a vehicle of justice.



Prof. Sri Krishna Deva Rao spoke about the frustration of not being able to fulfill the dream of a just and equitable society and the so-called justice mission of legal education. He invited everyone to share their frustrations and their hopes, and to learn from each other and work towards rethinking and reactivating the social justice vision of clinical legal education.



Prof. S. Shanthakumar began by inviting everyone to introspect on the quality of legal education that India is presently offering. He said that out of the 1,40,000 law graduates who graduate every year, hardly 2000 students get access to good legal education. Recounting his experience as part of an inspection team of the Bar Council of India – travelling around the country and inspecting law schools – he recounted the sorry state of affairs in respect of the salaries that are being paid to teachers. In this context, he highlighted the need to address injustice within the law school as well. He expressed delight at the fact that some institutions have joined together to talk about the future of justice education.



Prof. B.B. Pande, who delivered the key note address for the event, began by speaking about the importance of involving the younger generation in the goal of justice because the younger generation are richer in idealism even though they are poorer in learning and experience. He then highlighted four “backgrounders” in respect of access to justice. First, access to justice is a constitutional right and deserves to be seen as such, and those participating in legal aid clinics should not view their work as charity. Second, there needs to be a shift from reactive to proactive access to justice, where justice lawyers must go to the problem instead of waiting for the client to come to them. This is because the clients are not in a position to move about as freely as the lawyers. Third, justice can never be overdone; it will always remain underdone. And fourth, new areas of access of justice – beyond the traditionally focussed area of litigation – have recently emerged and must be paid attention to. These include rights recognized under the Right to Information Act, MNREGA, Forest Rights Act, and now the Foreigners’ Act. Speaking about the recent citizenship-related developments in the country, Prof. Pande expressed the wish that more National Law Universities will join efforts in ensuring legal representation to those wrongly excluded from the NRC process and imagining strategies, tools and possible remedies. The legal battle in the NRC context would require lawyers to be sensitive to the particular historical, geographical and political contexts in each State as well as recognize and fight the reverse burden of proof placed upon those excluded. While recognizing involvement of NLUs as imperative, Prof. Pande also stressed that youth idealism must not be killed by making these programmes compulsory, for volunteerism is the essence of justice.

The session concluded with a vote of thanks by Mr. Arpit Sharma.



III. Panel Discussions and Small Group Special Sessions

A. Panel: Reforming Legal Education to Focus on Justice



Chairperson: Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal

Speakers: Prof. Ved Kumari, Prof. Rejitha, Nair, Mr. Harsh Mahaseth, Ms. Ekakshra Mahajan and Mr. Gagan Sethi

Ms. Rejitha Nair posed two questions for consideration. First, what are the values, attitudes and perspectives that ought to be imparted in students to enable them to deliver justice? In other words, what is the goal? Second, what are the pedagogical tools that ought to be adopted to first reach that goal, and later to assess whether the goal has been reached? As to the first question, Ms. Nair invoked the idea of CHAMPS advocated by the late Prof. Shamnad Basheer, which imagines students who are Creative, Holistic, Altruistic, Maverick/Moral, and Problem Solvers. Regarding the second question, she acknowledged experiential learning as an important pedagogical tool, but highlighted the problem that every student learns something different in an experiential learning process, which makes it difficult to ensure that the teacher would be able to reach a pre-determined goal. Ms. Nair also stated that assessment should be designed flexibly to allow students to customize their assessment process. While flagging the issue that such a flexible design would not allow the instructor to assess all the students through the same lens, she stressed that such an approach would allow the students to take control and the instructor to assess whether the core aspects of the course – values, perspectives and attitudes – have been meaningfully imbibed by the students.





Prof. Ved Kumari began by outlining certain elements of justice education and urging participants to reflect on whether any of those are the goals of this group. Some of these elements are (1) social, political and historical awareness, (2) access to information and legal services, (3) inclusiveness, (4) participation of non-lawyer actors in the legal process. These aspirations are high and they should be kept in mind and not reduced to the singular goal of ‘knowledge’. Classroom discussions should be structured with these goals in mind. Some questions should necessarily be asked, including what is the context of law, and for what, why, and by whom is the law used? For instance, exploring the gender implications of various aspects of the law is important. Another important question to ask is whether justice education is only about clinical education or also about improving classroom discussions.

Mr. Harsh Mahaseth spoke about the state of clinical legal education in Nepal. After highlighting the lack of availability of accessible information on this issue, he pointed out that apart from three law schools identified by him, courses on professional ethics seem to be absent in the other law schools in the country, and programs on clinical education and legal aid are few. While some international organizations have facilitated access to justice projects in Nepal, the funding for those remains contingent on foreign channels, which means that there is a risk of collapse in case the funding is stopped. In fact, there is little to no enthusiasm from the Government to promote legal education in Nepal. Another problem is that students are not always aware about such projects, and when they are, they are unable to participate based on their interest because the projects are gated by a selection process. Lack of inclusiveness and diversity (earlier pointed out in context of Indian law schools) was found to exist in Nepalese law schools as well. One positive aspect highlighted by Mr. Mahaseth, however, was that legal practitioners in Nepal are permitted to teach in law schools; as a result, students find the existing human rights and criminal justice clinics – where they are mentored by practitioners – extremely beneficial.



Ms. Ekakshra Mahajan stressed the importance of inculcating a sense of social responsibility in law students (and thus in lawyers). This may be done through a credit system, and clinic courses need not be limited to a handful subject areas. Speaking from a litigator’s perspective, she highlighted the problematic concerns associated with lawyer strikes which take place despite a Supreme Court judgment denying to lawyers the right to strike. Lawyer groups are not sensitive to people’s lives and liberties which are at stake and get compromised during strikes. Ms. Mahajan also highlighted the exorbitant fees charged by big lawyers and suggested the need for change in this context. She referred to the bar examinations of other countries and highlighted that those exams have a high standard and require a prior understanding of professional responsibility. In conclusion, she emphasized that lawyers must understand their place in a society.

Mr. Gagan Sethi suggested at the outset that the myth that justice can only be provided by lawyers is a Brahminical construct and must be rejected. This notion is responsible for ensuring that justice is not delivered. Rather, we should recognize “justice professionals” – who may even be considered to be like community healthcare professionals, e.g. – as a separate class. A good justice education institution must focus on training, engaging and monitoring the quality of first-line justice workers. Front-line justice workers, who come not just from a legal background and reflect a multidisciplinary class, are better suited to deliver justice. The constitutional goal of legal aid cannot be realized unless justice workers are permitted to engage with the system without the help of lawyers. Highlighting practical problems with the present legal aid system at the taluka level, Mr. Sethi said that first-line justice workers can be much more effective than lawyers in ensuring justice because they engage with the community, understand on-ground problems and strategize effectively. These workers, who are paralegals, deserve to be respected and not viewed or treated as inferior to lawyers. In fact, as part of justice education, those lawyers who wish to be justice professionals should undergo a one-year training under on-ground justice workers. Mr. Sethi also suggested that the rule that only lawyers can become judges is incestuous, and that we should look forward to a day where people without law qualifications are also recruited as judges.



In the Q&A Session, responding to Mr. Sethi, Dr. Usha Ramanathan cautioned against providing non-lawyers the power that lawyer-judges have. She stressed that technical legal education is often about teaching some important principles to students, two of which are ‘neutrality’ and ‘impartiality’. While ‘neutrality’ is not a desirable value for a judge in present times – rather, there is a need to stand with the poor and those who are adversely impacted in society – impartiality is an important value that is imbibed through technical education in the law. The balance between impartiality and neutrality must be maintained by a judge. Therefore, one must be careful about inducting non-lawyers as judges because they might be unaware of these principles and how to apply or balance them. To this, Mr. Sethi clarified that his focus is on the importance of diversity in any institution, including the institution of justice, because the inclusion of diverse skill-sets and viewpoints would produce creative solutions.

Prof. B.B. Pande suggested that lawyers should not be treated as ‘untouchables’ in the sense being suggested. Rather, the focus should be on providing proper experiential training to lawyers and judges to enable them to deliver justice better. Prof. B.B. Pande also responded to Ms. Nair’s suggestion on customized evaluations and suggested that such a system might not be the best way forward. Experiential learning is a great tool but it is not sufficient. It must be balanced with some standardized value buckets that are prescribed and filled in by the instructor. In other words, experiential learning should be adequately supplemented by explanations on core principles by the instructor which will allow students to place the two together. Evaluations on those core principles would hence be adequate and customized evaluations are not needed.

Prof. Parameswaran agreed that any transformative approach must necessarily be collaborative. However, the problems identified by Mr. Sethi are a result of shallow understandings of what legal education means. What is in fact required is a deeper understanding of legal education and justice education, and an evaluation of the present state of affairs in law schools.

Prof. Ved Kumari responded to Mr. Sethi by suggesting that while there is no opposition to the inclusion of diversity, the conversation one should have about justice education is a micro-level rather than a macro-level conversation. The focus should be on asking what our respective law schools and what we as law teachers can do to improve justice education. Every class should talk about marginalized people. Every single course taught in law schools has the scope to be more inclusive. This depends on which topics one decides to teach and whether one talks to students only about the law and case law but also about the people who are able and those who are unable to go to the court.

Prof. Dipika Jain highlighted the deeply political nature of the justice institution. She suggested that students must be taught how both judgments and judges are political, and the assumption that the justice system behaves with a sense of neutrality and impartiality should be discarded. It is important to make our institutions more diverse and inclusive and ask some important questions, such as whether lawyers even understand the issues they are litigating, and judges even understand the issues they are adjudicating upon.

Prof. Pokhariyal identified that the point of common agreement among all present is that justice education in legal institutions needs an inclusive, multidisciplinary approach that involves diverse actors. She then thanked all participants and concluded the session.



B. Special Small Group Session: Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16

Facilitators: Ms. Jane Schukoske and Prof. Asha Bajpai



The session began with a brief background of Sustainable Development Goals in general and SDG 16 – peace, justice and strong institutions – in particular. Ms. Schukoske stressed the need to devise a parameter that the group could use in future to measure progress in terms of justice education. She then invited Prof. Asha Bajpai who supplemented by stressing the crucial role of education in achieving the rule of law. Prof. Bajpai referred to the “Education for Justice” goal under the Doha Declaration on Crime and connected it to the ideas of inclusivity, peace and justice in SDG16+. With this background, Ms. Schukoske invited participants to take part in an exercise in which they would form three small groups to discuss the following themes: peaceful societies, just societies and inclusive societies.

The goal of the exercise was to raise awareness of justice educators about SDG 16 and related SDGs, called “SDG16+”, using the chart drawn from Pathfinders’ Roadmap for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies. Pathfinders defines SDG 16+ as the following interlinked goals: SDG 1 – no poverty, 4 – quality education, 5 – gender equality, 8 – decent work and economic growth, 10 – reduced inequalities, 11 – sustainable cities and communities, 16 –peaceful, just and inclusive societies, and 17 – partnerships for the goals. The SDGs – called Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. UN member states will be reporting on their progress towards the goals in the coming years up to 2030. Justice educators should take note of the global goals and how governments are using the framework to measure national, state and local progress.

Following were the broad findings about engagement of law schools with SDG+ goals. Some law school participants had discussed SDGs regarding particular topics in seminars, clinics, and research projects, but there has not been discussion of incorporating the SDGs into the curriculum. Many SDG issues are incorporated in clinic work, but often are not discussed in the SDG framework. Some participants from civil society organizations and government offices had been involved in the SDG development or outreach. Participants had not been involved in consultations about the 2030 Vision Plan for their state/Union Territory in India, or equivalent elsewhere. Some law school clinics engage with state or district legal services authority in addressing some of the listed SDG16+ topics, but largely without reference to the SDGs per se.

The three groups came back with suggestions on how to incorporate SDG16+ themes in law school education. The Peaceful Societies group suggested that public education through paralegal training, National Human Rights Commission outreach, and short-term courses on gender, law and equality could contribute to building peaceful societies. The Just Societies group proposed the consideration of Agenda 2030 in planning law school curriculum. The Inclusive Societies group suggested that SDGs could be discussed with the faculty board, alumni on the board, and industry-academia interfaces in order to create awareness. They further suggested that courses could be linked to SDG topics. For regional collaboration, justice educators could consider topics such as migration, forced labor, and trafficking in persons, and there could be collaborative research with other bodies.



C. Panel: Learning Outcomes and Justice Education

Chairperson: Mr. Abhayraj Naik

Speakers: Dr. Usha Ramanathan, Mr. Sachin Malhan, Prof. Parameswaran, Prof. Towhidul Islam, Prof. Neha Pathakji, Prof. Dipika Jain

Mr. Abhayraj Naik began the session by outlining three ‘binaries’ that had emerged out of the sessions thus far – law v. justice, legal education v. justice education, and micro v. macro level approaches to justice education. In this backdrop, he invited Dr. Usha Ramanathan to share her views on the theme of learning outcomes and justice education.

Dr. Usha Ramanathan stated that it is not good to adopt a ‘standardized’ approach in matters of law and justice. There are parts of the Indian Constitution, such as the Fifth Schedule, which deal with marginalized communities but are not taught or discussed in law schools. Legal education is limited to a small universe of bare acts and case law. But teaching law is also about teaching how to think. Lawyers have become reactive and pragmatic rather than proactive, which makes it very difficult to change status quo. This is a result of lesser importance placed on ideas. Having views and prejudices is natural, but our law schools must also focus on teaching the art of public reasoning which involves learning to think beyond what we know about an idea. Law should be beyond just noting down some ‘points’ or ‘arguments’; the focus should instead be on learning ideas.



Mr. Sachin Malhan posed the hypothesis that presently law schools create a ritualized form of education that teaches lawyers to engage with rather than change the system. If we want lawyers to be social engineers, law schools must teach how social engineering is performed. This would involve a detailed study of how to study and understand a system, how to think about the problem and understand it deeply, how to design a solution and select the best problem solvers.

Prof. K. Parameswaran picked up from the proposition that legal education should be made inclusive and diverse. But how can that be done? The use of religion and spirituality in justice education could be immensely useful. Religion, spirituality and justice are interlinked. But rather than teaching everything about all religions, instructors must undertake the identification of universal core values across religions – oneness, unity, compassion, empathy, mutual respect, shared values, etc. – and pitch these universal values across all divisiveness. This will help students identify the vices that deserve to be discarded and incorporate other values that we deem universal and conducive to the present environment.

Prof. Towhidul Islam described the law clinic established in the University of Dhaka, Bangladesh with a view to train students in the practice and procedure of the legal profession, including on aspects such as filing procedures, drafting skills, public interest litigation, chamber and client management, and lawyering ethics etc. The clinic is not specialized in any particular field of law. Prof. Islam said that other speakers at the conclave spoke about some new ideas such as SDG+ which might be incorporated in the clinic in future. A few problems experienced in the running of the clinic were also highlighted, such as the fact that students do not feel attracted to law clinics given other commitments, and it is often tough to find instructors for the clinic courses. Prof. Islam concluded by highlighting the possibility of incorporating the clinic as part of the course curriculum in the University.

Prof. Neha Pathakji stressed the need to provide for as much scope for exploration and experimentation to law students as possible. Adverting to the elective system at NALSAR, she stated that a robust system that allows students to choose their subjects in the last two years of law school helps institutions experiment with interesting, boundary-breaking and useful courses which may be in the form of seminars or clinics. At the same time, she flagged resource and time-intensive nature of an elective system but suggested that students must be exposed to as many choices and possible and left free to make their choices. She also highlighted the importance of social science subjects in law schools in that they mark a shift from the ‘analytical’ model of education – which only trains lawyers in teaching bare acts, judgments etc. – towards a multidisciplinary system of legal education.



Prof. Dipika Jain spoke about the possibility of shifting away from market-oriented education and bringing romance and imagination back into legal education. She posed two reflections for all participants. First, she posed the possibility of clinical education getting infused with the same market-serving tendency, as is the case in the United States, and hinted at a need to avoid that possibility. Second, she suggested that clinics allow space for emancipatory pedagogy by allowing teachers and students to break hierarchies and work together on a project. She stressed the need for collective self-reflection on several aspects of transformative education: how much potential do clinics have for transforming society? How are we in a position to determine what transformation means? Who needs to be transformed? Emancipatory pedagogy allows the instructor to work with students and to equalize the relationship or negotiate that hierarchy, but how do we negotiate knowledge, power and human agency of people who are oppressed the community that we work with? Reflecting on these questions, according to Prof. Jain, would advance a vision of coherent and cohesive justice education.



In the Q&A Session, Mr. Sachin Malhan pointed out that there is a need to teach Indian thought in jurisprudence courses rather than teaching western thinkers whose thoughts developed in their own specific contexts. In response, Dr. Usha Ramanathan said that thought is not irrelevant just because it arose in a different context. We can learn to contextualize thought; we shouldn't discard it just because we are unable to immediately apply it to any particular context.

Mr. Abhayraj Naik posed a few questions about pedagogy: how does a teacher or an educator make that change from status quo happen? What are the immediate steps one can take in that respect? He adverted to Mr. Gagan Sethi's presentation that had referred to pedagogical tools that are essential to teach justice workers to navigate differences of identity while dealing with vulnerable communities. Mr. Sachin Malhan suggested that what should really be taught to students is the 'muscle' of making something happen. Prof. Parameswaran responded by suggesting that hardened positions held by students need to be gradually broken and unlearned – a process which inculcates a kind of sensitivity in the students.



D. Small Group Session Briefing: Network-Building

Facilitators: Prof. Asha Bajpai, Mr. Abhayraj Naik

This session was designed to brief and prepare participants for the final session planned on Day 2 of the conclave. The goal of the session was to explore whether all participants of the conclave can join together to build a justice education network so that they can all bring their rich experiences together and share information such as good examples of clinics, curricula, best practices, etc. Some specific questions were posed for participants' consideration. First, are the participants creating something new? If yes, what was the old? Second, are they looking to make a network of justice educators or clinical legal educators, and what is the difference between the two? Third, how should the participants respond to the political context in which they are operating (a context of repression)? How should the network respond to this context and reality? Should the approach of the network be to speak truth to power, or should it adopt a more pragmatic approach? Fourth, should the group have a hacker mentality and act with a sense of urgency in terms of achieving the identified goals? Fifth, is there even a need for a new network? Can there be meaningful exchanges and collaborations at all? Participants were encouraged to think about these questions before the small group session planned for Day 2.

E. Old Challenges and New Approaches in Justice Education



Chairperson: Prof. Asha Bajpai

Speakers: Prof. Angbeen Atif Mirza, Prof. Sri Krishna Deva Rao, Prof. Tara Prasad Sapkota, Prof. Anup Surendranath, Prof. Kalpeshkumar L Gupta, Mr. Samarth Pathak.

Prof. Angbeen Atif Mirza, who could not physically attend the session due to logistical reasons, participated through a short video presentation. She spoke of the street law clinic at Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan in which law students visit primary and secondary school students to conduct legal awareness. The clinic is inspired by the Georgetown Street Law Programme and focuses on activity-based learning, legal awareness, and legal empowerment. The limited course time of 10-15 weeks poses a challenge to the clinic as the same is not enough for the said clinic. Prof. Mirza also spoke about a legal aid clinic in which students work on legal aid cases and assist lawyers who represent deserving clients. She stressed that the future of clinical legal education lies in collaboration, given the commonalities among the problems being faced across south Asian countries.

Prof. Sri Krishna Deva Rao discussed his experience with clinical legal education. In terms of education, he highlighted how the legal aid and PIL courses were shifted to the third year from fifth year at NLU Odisha. After the third year, students are offered 6 optional clinical courses which focus on different vulnerabilities – labour rights, prison rights, child rights, land rights, right to education, and community advocacy. Prof. Rao also gave the example of a labour rights clinic at NLU Delhi at which conversations were first had with trade union leaders who told the clinic members as to which laws needed to be worked upon.



Prof. Tara Prasad Sapkota adverted to Hindu concepts of Nyaya and Dharma, Plato's idea of justice as the fundamental virtue, Aristotle's classification into distributive and remedial justice, and Rawls' enumeration of the original position as well as the classification of justice into basic liberty and socio-economic equality. Throwing light on the legal education system in Nepal, Prof. Sapkota stated that an increase in the number of law students is important to achieve an improvement in the legal education system and a consequent improvement in the justice delivery system. He concluded by recommending that SDGs must be endorsed not only as part of the legal curriculum but also in other social science curricula.

Prof. Kalpeshkumar L Gupta stressed the need for innovation and the inculcation of technology in teaching legal aid. He gave three examples to drive home the point that thinking out of the box might drive us to solutions. First, he proposed the use of case management software in pro bono clinical endeavours. Second, he suggested that the education system should be overhauled with regulation powers being taken away from the Bar Council of India and vested instead in three expert committees dedicated to curriculum, clinical legal education and legal research respectively. Third, he proposed a court management system to facilitate judges in administrative tasks. At a broader level, Prof. Gupta suggested that students are likely to view teachers who take innovative initiatives as inspiring.



Mr. Samarth Pathak spoke about the Education for Justice programme which is a key flagship program of the UNODC. In the initiative, the focus is on using education to empower young people to reduce injustice and on reducing risky behaviors among young people (because injustice or the feeling of unfairness could be a powerful motivator that spurs them to take to the world of crime). The idea is not only to sensitize students or just speak to or to give lectures but also to co-create solutions with their support. Mr. Pathak highlighted four aspects that are important in developing a culture of lawfulness and humanity: first, the idea that violence, injustice and corruption are now affecting all of us, and especially the young people; second, what the rule of law means, how these issues matter in society, and why there is a duty to question these wrongs in the right forums; third, the consequence of our inaction in this process; and fourth, that academics and diplomats around the world are coming together around the world to address these wrongs. In the Education for Justice programme, the initiatives that have been focused on are classroom tools, development of educational aids, working with teachers on engaging with young people, videos, activities, learning modules, games. The initiative also looks to provide knowledge support and mentorship to students driven programs in schools. This also includes some amount of funding. In conclusion, Mr. Pathak invited the participants to consider adopting and using the resources offered by the Education for Justice initiative to support classroom teaching.

In the Q&A Session, Prof. Sarasu sought a clarification from Mr. Pathak as to whether the E4J initiative would be able to support small student-led clinic initiatives in law schools. Mr. Samarth clarified in the affirmative, stressing that they are looking for anything that connects justice with rule of law, whether it is led by students or universities. Prof. Anup Surendranath urged everyone to question the felt need to include judges in important roles concerning legal education. He stressed that legal training for practice should be viewed separately from legal education and judges need not have a role to play in the latter. Prof. Ved Kumari agreed with Prof. Surendranath and said that educators should primarily handle the education system, while the perspectives of judges and lawyers can be considered and incorporated by educators.

Mr. Abhayraj Naik addressed Dr. Surendranath and, referring to the success of Project 39A, asked what it was that allowed that success. Mr. Sachin Malhan offered the comment that the project has imagined universities differently than just platforms for education. It has imagined universities as platforms for change owing to the access, security and legitimacy associated with a university. In response, Dr. Surendranath agreed with Mr. Malhan and emphatically stated that Project 39A is primarily a site for change and the 'education' mandate is subservient to that. To Mr. Naik's question, he said that the success of the project owes itself to shrewd thinking on part of the university that such an exercise can bring a certain reputation for promoting research. NLU Delhi as a young university has fully backed the project and given it great flexibility. More fundamentally, it is also the fact that you cannot do work on this scale with just government grants and law schools in the past have not been innovative enough to try and raise funding from other sources.

Mr. Gagan Sethi asked Mr. Samarth Pathak as to what is required to develop a positive identity of people who believe in and work for human rights, given that human rights has become the dirtiest word in India today. Mr. Pathak responded by distinguishing between two approaches to human rights activism: one is adopting an anti-government stance, and the other is to engage in dialogue rather than debate. The UN and the Education for Justice initiative focus on the latter.



F. Panel: Working with Communities and Appreciating Context



Chairperson: Prof. Sarasu Esther Thomas

Speakers: Dr. Marium Jabyn, Prof. Muhammad Ekramul Haque, Prof. Sony Kunjappan, Ms. Pooja Ashar, Ms. Bhargavi Raman, Prof. Ujjwala Sakhalkar



Dr. Marium Jabyn spoke about about human rights and vulnerable groups in Maldives, specifically women, children and migrant workers. She highlighted problems of limited government funding for legal aid (provided only to criminal cases) and geographical limitations in providing services over 1019 islands. Dr. Jabyn presented some ideas to integrate justice education into the current framework of legal education. She suggested a clinical education externship programme in which law schools can partner with civil society organizations or law firms that provide pro bono legal services. She also proposed a clinical education/teaching programme and a consultation programme respectively.

Prof. Muhammad Ekramul Haque highlighted the difference between justice education and legal education. Legal education can be purely clerical in which just laws are taught to the people, whereas justice education means that people are taught good law in a good way. It is important to ask: who is teaching law? How is s/he teaching the law? What is the teaching method? Citing the Bangladesh experience with law clinics, Prof. Haque highlighted that funding sometimes kills clinical legal education, especially when the clinic is wholly dependent on funding from a source that believes it has no obligation to continue to fund. Therefore, financial independence is extremely important for a clinic.



Ms. Pooja Ashar and Prof. Sony Kunjappan summed up some useful suggestions that had emerged thus far and made some important suggestions. The idea of self-discipline was highlighted as an important tool in justice education. It was suggested that it is wrong to assume that there are only three pillars of legal education, i.e. the students, the justice seekers and justice-doers. There are also students and their parents who are important stakeholders in the justice education process. Their viewpoints should also be elicited. Further, it is important to ensure access to legal education which includes affordability and equal opportunity. Certain innovative techniques can be employed to facilitate justice delivery. One attractive idea that may be imported from the UK is Continuous Legal Education Programme (CLEP) under which even law professors are involved in providing justice. If such a programme is made mandatory,



sustainability could be ensured. Course structures could be modified to incorporate mandatory 1-year trainings or internships with justice workers. Provision could also be made to ensure stipend to new entrants in litigation. Finally, to solve the problem of funding, the option of corporate social responsibility could be explored under which law firms are roped in to secure funding.

Ms. Bhargavi Raman focused on the methodology of human rights education as a key facet of justice education. She proposed a methodology centered around learning by doing that builds inspiration not just in students but also in teachers. Proposing that human rights education is not merely about cognitive learning but also about allowing space for subjective and emotional responses, Ms. Bhargavi stressed the importance of creating a safe space where the students can make mistakes and learn from each other. She then proceeded to conduct an interesting classroom activity where she showed two pictures to all participants and asked them to note down their first impressions about the pictures and also an instinctive description of the women in the pictures. Through the exercise, she attempted to show to the participants as to what our biases are and how much impression and judgment we make based solely on appearance. To conclude, she listed some important tools that may be used in human rights education, including games, ice breakers, introductions, debates, brainstorming, institutional business, field work and interviews, art, and sports.



Prof. Ujjwala Sakhalkar was the last speaker for the session and she spoke about how to teach integrity and ethics in law school. She raised three pertinent questions: first, should ethics, values and integrity be taught by law schools at all? Second, how should they be taught? Third, should the goal be only to teach integrity and ethics, or to inculcate values, integrity and ethics in students? While suggesting that law schools have a very profound duty to teach ethics and integrity, she also highlighted the difficulties faced by law schools in experimenting with innovative ways of teaching the same due to the rigid curriculum laid down by the UGC. There are some further questions which, in Prof. Ujjwala's view, one should ask of clinics. Is the clinic well-equipped to teach ethics to the students? Are traditional methods the only way of teaching ethics and integrity to students? In terms of the pedagogy involved, she suggested that teaching ethics must be a patient exercise. Not only must the instructor be always ethical in order to set a good example, but also should be patient with the students so as allow them to fully express their views. The instructor should then challenge their ideas, values and understandings.

In the Q&A session, a concern was raised about the lack of financial resources due to which it comes difficult to pay students a decent stipend that would help them in the profession. Ms. Pooja Ashar supported the concern and suggested that clinical legal education and training must have some sort of incentives attached to it in order to better encourage students to join that project. Next, Mr. Samarth Pathak suggested that the idea of exposing students' biases might have to be dealt with care given the possibility that sensitive issues may crop up among students which may lead to changed dynamics. At a broader level, he suggested that the emphasis in the education framework should be on building some kind of dialogue and consensus rather than winning or losing. Prof. Ved Kumari spoke about the need to learn different teaching methodologies and being aware of the diverse interests of students in that some might find a particular activity more enjoyable than others. She also challenged the stand that clinics always require funding right from the beginning of the clinic. Using examples from her experiences, she explained how clinics that work on certain kinds of projects can function without funding. Ms. Bhargavi supported Prof. Ved Kumari's suggestion that the key is to know what methods should actually be used for which subject. Further, she suggested that the future that participants of this group should ideally be looking at should entail training of teachers in each methodology at an institutional scale.



G. Small Group Session: Building a Justice Education Network in South Asia

Facilitators: Prof. Asha Bajpai, Mr. Abhiraj Naik



As part of this session, all participants were divided into groups and a questionnaire was furnished to all groups with the aim that all groups shall internally discuss possible answers to the questions. The various answers received from the participants are noted below.

Is there a need for such an alliance or network?

Answer 1: Yes. There is a need for greater collective action among the community of educators. There is also a need to mutually support each other when many of the educators are working in hostile environments. Finally, there is a need to develop a network that enables sharing of knowledge and information on best practices.

Answer 2: Yes. However, we must be cautious in our approach given that past attempts at creating similar networks have not been very encouraging. If we don't have a clarity of goal after some time, the network will fail.

Should this alliance be limited to legal academic and professionals?

Answer 1: Yes, but it should be expanded to other professionals and academics in future.

Answer 2: No, but it should be limited to 'justice professionals'. Eventually, other supportive actors such as NGOs, corporates etc. can be involved.

How can we create a common database of successful case studies and best practices?

Answer 1: A website should be created and maintained for this purpose. There could be a moderator – maybe student, maybe staff member – for the website who could be rotated. Stipend to the moderator can be explored. The idea would be to update this blog with the articles with the information but are shared among the group members.

Answer 2: There should also be a more informal communication group such as a messaging group on a messenger app. An online database along with a searchable online discovery map (with details of activities and resources of all members) should also be prepared. A database can also be maintained by collating and publishing information in the form of papers or even a book. A Core Team would need to supervise this process.

How do we appropriately credit work done by the students and educators for justice education?

Answer 1: There are two ways of crediting curriculum work. Temporary models include seminars, research papers etc. the topics for which fall within the ambit of justice education. A more permanent model could be a permanent clinic in which students are taken on board for experiential learning through projects or even internships.

Answer 2: The only way to credit it is to make justice education a part of the course curriculum.

What are the main barriers and challenges might be encountered?

Answer 1: To sustain the commitment and passion present today.

Answer 2: The lack of clarity on a goal, membership criteria and the role of each member.

Answers 3 & 4: Funding and sustainability will be a big challenge. Contra view: Funding is not necessarily a challenge. There are in fact many persons who want to fund good initiatives but simply do not find any good people who they think can deliver. NALSA schemes, university resources/funding and CSR are some avenues that could be explored.

How should the goal and purpose of this new network be articulated?

Answer 1: There must be short-term goals and long-term goals. The short-term goal, imagined over the next 2-3 years, must be to continue the vision and implementation of the GAJE network itself. There should be publications, conclaves, training, compilation of resources (including archiving of best practices from various clinics), and redesigning of curriculums to include SDG-16+. The long-term goals (over the next 5 years) should be to (1) devise a model for clinical education in South Asia in light of our specific context and challenges, (2)

ensure sustainability through financial resources (including auditing and suitable recognition of good work), and (3) overcoming regulatory challenges.

Answer 2: The goal should be to address specific, pre-decided 'issues' to ensure focus. Anything that has a botheration for justice or injustice should be considered as an issue.

Answer 3: The goal should be articulated as multiple milestones rather than a single goal. Milestone 1 could be sharing of information including on best practices, opportunities etc. Milestone 2 could be to begin conversations around joint-institutional initiatives and programmes including exchange programmes. Milestone 3 could be the execution of a network meting and creating products that can be showcased, such as an e-compendium which would be a collection of good practices in justice education in South Asia. Finally there could be milestones on collaboration among clinics.

Should this alliance or network be linked to the Global Alliance of Justice Education (GAJE)?

Yes.

Should such alliance or network be registered? What legal entity will be involved?

Answer 1: The answer should depend on several factors such as: where is the Secretariat going to be? How far will a registration enable us to cross national boundaries? Does funding have anything to do with registration? Does registration enable us to run courses through Swayam?

Answer 2: Since the network should largely only be an e-network at the moment, registration is not required for now.

What kind of funding will be required for such a network alliance or running of this alliance?

Because this should largely be an e-network at the moment, institutional funding would be enough.

Where should the Secretariat be located?

Answer 1: It should rotate every three years across different south Asian countries.

Answer 2: The location of the Secretariat could be virtual.

IV. Outcomes and Conclusions

Chairperson: Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal

Speakers: Ms. Nupur Sinha; Prof. Sitharamam Kakarala

Ms. Nupur Sinha began by emphasizing the requirement of tremendous commitment to the issues of pedagogy and making learning practice-oriented, one facet of it would be to take tough administrative decisions against students' immediate demands. Another very important point of focus should be to build and prepare more teachers who can in turn build holistic students. Faculty development programmes need to be worked on so that teachers are taught how to challenge their notions of caste, class, religion, gender etc., how to deal with young people, and how to address groups. Justice education will require commitment, shuffling of schedules, granting of exemptions, and investment of money. There is a specific need to have flexible course structures that allow students to undertake justice related projects.

Prof. (Dr.) Sitharamam Kakarala began by appealing to the participants to devise an appropriate metaphor for the word "clinic" because justice clinics do not contain elements of medicine, diagnosis etc. He highlighted two divergent views that emerged in the conference over the two days. The first, which he called the narrow view, is that clinical education should be understood as justice education. The second, which he called the expanded view and agreed with, holds that justice education must be a combination of providing – and at the same time, balancing – conceptual tools and as well as practical skills. Only a clinic model is an insufficient mode of justice education. Further, clinic courses related to justice education should be provided in the later semesters, without which students might not remember anything taught in those earlier courses. Prof. Kakarala flagged five ideas that are helpful in thinking about justice education. First, field practice is an integral part of education. Second, it is important to teach how to build networks and collaboration with communities, civil society activists, institutions and governmental departments. Third, there is a need for research and reflection as sources of understanding as well as post correction. Fourth, there must be an anthropology carried out of the various justice initiatives that have done well. Something is needed to understand these initiatives and unless we make sense of those initiatives we might not be able to learn from their mistakes. Fifth, at the same time, it is impossible to totally replicate a previous clinic model because every model is located in its own contexts and challenges. Conversations and reflections should be focused on identifying the kind of resources needed to make the interventions meaningful.

Prof. Pokhariyal agreed with Prof. Kakarala's suggestion that the words 'clinical legal education' should be replaced with an alternative phrase such as 'experiential education' which is much clearer. Mr. Sachin Malhan also agreed with Prof. Kakarala and suggested calling the initiative a 'justice service initiative' or a 'justice service center'. Prof. Ved Kumari expressed the concern that a merely symbolic change would not be enough when the present educational environment is obsessed with commercial courses. Prof. Anup Surendranath said

that there are multiple educational environments so whatever the participants devise from these discussions should be flexible enough to adapt to all those different contexts. Mr. Gagan Sethi agreed that articulation and choosing the right words is important.

Prof. Pokhariyal raised the question as to how justice education can be infused in all classes. She suggested that every course can and should have a social justice concern or issue. Training and sensitization of teachers has a bearing on the teachers' capability to identify and stress on these aspects of every course. Further, Prof. Pokhariyal suggested that institutions should aim to sensitize a few students to ensure that they join a social justice initiative rather than expecting every single student to choose that course. Prof. K. Parameswaran agreed with this suggestion and said that the best practice is to incorporate justice in every course while refraining from promotion of any kind of selfish motives or sitting on someone's head. Prof. Surendranath proposed that commercial laws not be excluded from justice education. Students may have many different reasons to opt for high paying jobs in law firms, but justice education is just as important to learn as a M&A lawyer, tax lawyer, insurance lawyer, etc. There is a certain value to teachers imbibing elements of justice education in these courses. Hence, there is a need to be careful to mainstream justice education such as by talking of gender and mainstreaming it in all subjects. Mr. Sachin Malhan agreed and suggested that there are some individuals who work in companies etc. but want to use the organization as a platform to deliver justice.

In closing comments, Mr. Abhayraj Naik identified the common theme of fighting rigidity in both Ms. Nupur Sinha's and Prof. Kakarala's presentations, such as rigidity of existing Bar Council curriculum, existing practise of legal education, existing funding constraints, etc. Prof. Asha Bajpai stressed the need to be clear on what justice education means, as also the need to ensure commitment and provide mental health interventions. Prof. Sarasu Thomas suggested that no rigid definition of justice be adopted in the hope that it will fit everyone. This group should facilitate any and every kind of justice education at the hands of individuals or institutions who want to experiment and try new ideas, however small they might be.

Prof. Purvi Pokhariyal then thanked all participants and concluded the conclave.



V. Synthesis and Steps Ahead

Discussions in the conclave spanned across a wide range of questions. While there was a consensus (more or less) on some broad points – such as the need to have an inclusive justice system, the need to train teachers in aspects of justice education, the need for institutional reform in terms of flexibility, and a sense of duty and service associated with justice delivery – discussions on other, finer aspects of justice education were not conclusive. What does justice education mean, and what is the proper role of lawyers in its achievement? How should teachers be trained, and who should conduct the training? How should institutional reforms be pushed for? How can exactly this network address these concerns? Where should its secretariat be established? Most importantly, what are the immediate measures that need to be taken by the educators who are a part of SANJE?

Strategies about new endeavours in the field of justice education should be devised only after learning from the experience of others. Insofar as SANJE's foremost aim is to advance those strategies and effectively carry them out, SANJE's next steps should depend on the strategies thus devised.

It would appear from the discussions in the conclave that the idea of knowledge sharing (about best practices etc.) was widely supported. In this light, it was suggested that the immediate next steps moving forward are three-fold. First, an event report of the conclave must be prepared and circulated with all concerned. Second, work needs to be done on a book on justice education to be published with the help of contributions from participant academics, lawyers and justice workers as well as other relevant individuals. These two steps would help bring memories of the event back in the minds of participants, and also send out the message that the enthusiasm and energy in respect of the goal of justice education has not vanished. Finally, a conversation must be started over e-mail (at least) about the plans that can immediately be executed, including the preparation of a website and appointment of a moderator to manage it, collection of material (best practices, opportunities etc.) for the website, planning in respect of setting up of the Secretariat, and organization of webinars or online meetings among those enthusiastic to take the conversation forward on some of the more specific aspects.



ANNEXURE I: FINAL SCHEDULE

Day 1, Friday, 8th November

8.45 AM: Bus Pickup from Hotel to ILNU

09.30 AM - 11.00 AM: Inaugural Ceremony

9.30 AM - 10.30 AM: Introduction and Welcome Speeches

10.30 AM - 11.00 AM: Keynote Address: B.B. Pande

11.15 AM - 11.30 AM: Group Photo & Tea

11.30 AM - 1 PM: Panel 1 - Reforming Legal Education to Focus on Justice

Chair & Respondent: Purvi Pokhariyal

Panelists:

- I. Ved Kumari, Issues of Justice in Legal Education
- II. Rejitha Nair, Law Teaching as an Empowering Process: Reflections on What, Why and How of Justice Education
- III. Harsh Mahaseth, The Importance of Clinical Legal Education in Nepal
- IV. Ekakshra Mahajan, A 360 Degree Overhaul of Indian Legal Education
- V. Gagan Sethi, Envisioning Sustainable Models for Empowerment of the Poor

1PM- 2PM:Lunch

2 PM - 3.15 PM: Special Small Group Session on SDG 16

Facilitators: JES and Asha Bajpai

3.15 - 3.30 PM: Tea/Coffee Break

3.30 PM - 5 PM: Panel 2 - Learning Outcomes and Justice Education

Panelists:

- I. Usha Ramanathan, Experimenting with Ideas of Law and Justice
- II. Sachin Malhan, Educating Changemaking Lawyers
- III. K. Parameswaran, Role of Universal Values in Justice Education & Changing Constitutional Dimensions: Religion and Spirituality
- IV. Md. Towhidul Islam, Dhaka University Law Clinic: Accomplishments and Disenchantments in Designing and Assessing Learning Outcomes for Justice Education
- V. Neha Pathakji, Approaches to Justice Education: Reformed Academic Program at NALSAR
- VI. Dipika Jain, Transformative Education: Can Emancipatory Pedagogy Play a Role?

5.00 PM - 5.15 PM: Tea Break

5.15 PM – 6.15 PM: Building A Justice Education Network in South Asia: Introduction and Small Group

Discussions

Facilitators: Asha Bajpai and Abhayraj Naik

6.30 PM: Bus Pickup from ILNU to Hotel

7.30 PM: Bus Pickup from Hotel to Dinner Venue (Gordhan Thaal, Ground Floor, Sapath Complex, Opp. Rajpath Club, Sarkhej - Gandhinagar Hwy, Bodakdev, Ahmedabad, Gujarat 380052)

8 PM onwards - Conclave Dinner

9.00 PM - Bus from Dinner Venue to Hotel

06.00 AM: Departure from Hotel for Ahmedabad Heritage Walk (Optional Activity)

06.00 AM - 08.00 AM: Ahmedabad Heritage Walk

9.15: Bus Pickup from Hotel to ILNU

10.00 AM - 11.30 AM: Panel 3 - Old Challenges and New Approaches in Justice Education

Chair & Respondent: Asha Bajpai

Panelists:

- I. Srikrishna Deva Rao, Taking Socially Relevant Legal Education More Seriously
- II. Tara Sapkota, The Future of Justice Education in South Asia: Nepalese Context
- III. Anup Surendranath, Death Penalty Litigation, Prison Legal Aid and Interdisciplinary Research: Criminal Justice Interventions at Project 39A, National Law University, Delhi
- IV. Kalpeshkumar L Gupta, Proposal for a Legal Education Bill, 2019
- V. Samarth Pathak, Education for Justice: A UNODC Initiative

11.45 AM - 1.15 PM: Panel 4 - Working with Communities and Appreciating Context

Chair & Respondent: Sarasu Esther Thomas

Panelists:

- I. Marium Jabyn, The Future of Justice Education: Advancing Human Rights of Vulnerable Groups through Clinical Legal Education
- II. Muhammad Ekramul Haque, Legal Education in Bangladesh: Problems and Prospects
- III. Pooja Ashar & Sony Kunjappan, Reinventing Legal Education in India: Infusing 'Applied Law Techniques' towards Better Justice Delivery
- IV. Bhargavi Raman, Best Practices and Methodologies for Human Rights Education in India
- V. Ujjwala Sakhalkar, Teaching Ethics and Integrity in Law Schools

1.15 PM - 2.15 PM: Lunch

2.15 PM - 3.15 PM: Building A Justice Education Network in South Asia: Small Group Presentations and Roadmap

Facilitators: Asha Bajpai and Abhayraj Naik

3.15 PM - 3.30 PM: Tea

3.30 PM – 5.00 PM: Synthesis and Steps Ahead

Facilitators: Abhayraj Naik, Asha Bajpai, Sarasu Esther Thomas, Purvi Pokhariyal

Presenters:

- I. Nupur Sinha, Educating for Social Justice: Scope, Possibilities and Challenges
- II. Sitharamam Kakarala, Justice Education in India: Myth and Reality
- III. Questions, Comments and Feedback from Around the Table
- IV. Wrap Up and Final Comments by the Core Organizers

5.00 PM – 5.30 PM: High Tea

ANNEXURE II: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS WITH CONTACT DETAILS

S. No.	Name of the Panelist Members	Email/Websites for Profile
1.	Abhayraj Naik (Azim Premji University, Bengaluru)	abhayrajnaik@gmail.com
2.	Asha Bajpai (Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai)	bajpaiasha@gmail.com
3.	Purvi Pokhariyal (Institute of Law, Nirma University)	director.il@nirmauni.ac.in
4.	Sarasu Esther Thomas (National Law School of India University, Bengaluru)	sarasu@nls.ac.in
5.	Angbeen Mirza (Via video recorded message) (Shaikh Ahmad Hassan School of Law, Lahore University of Management Sciences)	angbeen@gmail.com
6.	Anup Surendranath (National Law University, Delhi)	anup.surendranath@nludelhi.ac.in
7.	B. B. Pande (National Law University, Delhi)	bb.pande@nludelhi.ac.in
8.	Bhargavi Raman	bhargavi.raman@gmail.com
9.	Prof Dipika Jain (Jindal Global Law School)	djain@jgu.edu.in
10.	Ekakshra Mahajan (Advocate, Supreme Court of India & Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh)	ekakshramahajan@gmail.com
11.	Gagan Sethi (Centre for Social Justice)	gaganssethi@gmail.com
12.	Harsh Mahaseth (O. P. Jindal Global University)	e0431293@u.nus.edu

S. No.	Name of the Panelist Members	Email/Websites for Profile
13.	K. Parameswaran (Gujarat National Law University)	kparameswaran@gnlu.ac .in
14.	Kalpesh Kumar (Parul University, Vadodara)	kalpeshkumar.gupta90541@paruluniversity.ac.in
15.	Marium Jabyn (Secretary General of the Bar Council of the Maldives)	mjabyn@gmail.com
16.	Muhammad Ekramul Haque (University of Dhaka, Bangladesh)	ekram.haque@du.ac.bd
17.	Pooja Ashar (Research Scholar in Social Management with Central University of Gujarat)	pkashar1190@gmail.com
18.	Md Towhidul Islam (University of Dhaka, Bangladesh)	towhid@du.ac.bd
19.	Neha Pathakji (NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad)	nehapathakji@gmail.com nehapathakji@nalsar.ac.in
20.	Jane Schukoske	jschukoske@gmail.com
21.	Nupur (Managing Trustee- Centre for Social Justice)	socjust@gmail.com
22.	S. Shanthakumar (Director, Gujarat National Law University)	vc@gnlu.ac.in
23.	Sachin Malhan (Co-founder Agami)	sachin@humlab.in
24.	Samarth Pathak (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Regional Office for South Asia)	samarth.pathak@un.org

S. No.	Name of the Panelist Members	Email/Websites for Profile
25.	Sitharamam Kakarala (Azim Premji University, Bengaluru)	sitharamam.kakarala@apu.edu.in
26.	Sony Kunjappan (Centre for Studies in Social Management, School of Social Sciences, Central University of Gujarat)	sonycug@gmail.com
27.	Tara Parasad Sapkota (Senior Advocate in Supreme Court of Nepal)	tps.ilfc@gmail.com
28.	Ujjwala Sakhalkar Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University) New Law College ,Pune	ujjwalaSakhalkar@yahoo.co.in
29.	Usha Ramanathan	urushar@gmail.com
30.	Ved Kumari, (University of Delhi)	vedkumari@gmail.com

ANNEXURE III: LIST OF ORGANISING TEAM MEMBERS AND VOLUNTEERS

Faculty Coordinator List

<u>Dr. Tarkesh Molia</u>	<u>Associate Professor of Law, ILNU</u>	<u>Tarkesh.molia@nirmauni.ac.in</u>
<u>Arpit Sharma</u>	<u>Assistant Professor of Law, ILNU</u>	<u>Arpit.sharma@nirmauni.ac.in</u>
Alaukik Shrivastava	Assistant Professor of Law, ILNU	Alaukik.shrivastava@nirmauni.ac.in

Student Coordinator List

Toshit Godara	Pass Out Batch- 2020	15bal089@nirmauni.ac.in
Prakul Khera	Vth Year	16bal040@nirmauni.ac.in
Kushagra Bhatia	IInd Year	19bal085@nirmauni.ac.in
Ankita	Vth Year	16bal126@nirmauni.ac.in
Niharika Shetty	IInd Year	19bal089@nirmauni.ac.in
Srishty Bajaj	IInd Year	19bb1056@nirmauni.ac.in
Nancy Patel	IInd Year	19bb1094@nirmauni.ac.in
Adesh Shinde	IVth Year	17bal061@nirmauni.ac.in
Yash Kumar Singh	IIIInd Year	18bal139@nirmauni.ac.in
Ashutosh Joshi	IIIInd Year	18bal090@nirmauni.ac.in
Amber Singh	Vth Year	16bb1005@nirmauni.ac.in
Samarth Katare	IIIInd Year	18bb1040@nirmauni.ac.in
Avijit Singh	IIIInd Year	18bb1007@nirmauni.ac.in