

**Rajasthan
High Court**

**Previous Year Paper
Translator (English To
Hindi) 2017**



Test Prime

ALL EXAMS,
ONE SUBSCRIPTION



70,000+
Mock Tests



Personalised
Report Card



Unlimited
Re-Attempt



600+
Exam Covered



Previous Year
Papers



500%
Refund



ATTEMPT FREE MOCK NOW

Written Test For The Post of Translator – 2017**Paper – I****(English to Hindi Translation)**

Duration : Two Hours

Maximum Marks : 100

Note – Attempt all three questions.**Question No. 1 – Translate the following into Hindi. (40 Marks)**

Edmund Burke stated as early as 1777: "Among a people generally corrupt, liberty cannot long exist." In 1778, he observed: "An arbitrary system indeed must always be a corrupt one. There never was a man who thought he had no law but his own will, who did not soon find that he had no end but his own profit."

According to Francis Beaumont (1584-1616) corruption is a tree, whose branches are of an unmeasurable length, they spread everywhere, and the dew that drops from thence, hath infected some chairs and stools of authority.

In the Encyclopaedia of Democracy by Seymour Martin Lipset, in the Chapter, "Corruption", it is stated that corruption is an abuse of public resources for private gain. It is known that bribes open the way for access to the State for those who are willing to pay and can afford to pay. The situation leaves non-corrupt citizen with the belief that one counts only if one has the right personal contact with those who hold power and also allow persons with money power to get things done to their advantage through back door.

In the present case, as we are concerned with alleged motivated, arbitrary and high-handed actions of a Minister, it would be worthwhile to point out what role has been assigned in a parliamentary democracy to a Minister.

The head of the State (President or Governor in our country, as the case may be) calls upon the leader of the political party that commands majority to form government and appoints him as Prime/Chief Minister; and on later's advice appoints other Ministers. Business of the Government gets allocated and is run as per business rules framed, which in our Constitution has been dealt by Article 166(3). The executive power of the Government is distributed

department-wise and one Minister is made the head of that department. That Minister becomes responsible for the actions, acts and policies of his department. He becomes principally accountable and answerable to the people. His powers and duties are regulated by the law of the land. The legal and moral responsibility or liability for the acts or omissions rest solely on the Minister.

Having noted the philosophy, sociology and etymology of corruption, as well as the essence of a parliamentary democracy, let it broadly be seen what had happened in the present case. For this purpose it would be enough to note some of the prima facie conclusions arrived at by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) who was required by this Court to inquire into the matter (which has come to be known as Housing Scam) by order dated 14.2.1996.

Question No. 2 – Translate the following into Hindi. (40 Marks)

Notwithstanding my great respect for learned Brother Shah's wisdom and erudition, I am unable to agree that some of the appellants i.e. A-1, A-3 and A-5 deserve to be acquitted. My reasons with which brother Agrawal also agrees, are as follows:

The present appeals relate to Special Case No.6/1994 which was one of the 32 cases filed by the Central Bureau of Investigation (in short the 'CBI') under the provisions of the Special Court (Trial of offences relating to Transactions in Securities) Act, 1992 (in short "the Special Court Act").

Before constitution of the Court under the Special Court Act, several enquiries were made in relation to securities scam which allegedly broke out in May 1992 in various types of transactions relating to government securities. The basic allegation was that these transactions were made in active connivance with the officials of banks, financial institutions and shareholders. One Committee known as Jankiraman Committee was appointed by Reserve Bank of India (hereinafter referred to as the "RBI") under the chairmanship of one Shri R. Jankiraman, the then Deputy Governor of RBI. The Committee submitted its report between May 1992 and April 1993. The first report in point of time was submitted by the Committee in May 1992 and it was indicated that the amount involved was estimated to be about rupees 4,300 crores. The Government first promulgated an Ordinance which was replaced by the Special Court Act on 8th August, 1992.

When the matter was brought to the notice of both Houses of Parliament, a Joint Parliamentary Committee (in short "JPC") was appointed to enquire into the irregularities.

The prosecution version was that there were five transactions conducted between January 1991 to May 1991 involving Rs.43,96,65,000 purportedly as ready-forward deals. The securities involved were units of Unit Trust of India (in short "UTI"). Two stages were involved in the transactions; the first sale and purchase and the second reversal thereof. The bankers involved were United Commercial Bank, Hamam Street Branch, Bombay, Canara Bank, Sansad Marg, New Delhi, Bank of America, Bombay Branch and New Delhi Branch, ANZ Grindlays Bank, Sansad Marg, New Delhi and ANZ Grindlays Bank, Bombay Branch. The Government company involved was Maruti Udyog Ltd. (in short "MUL").

The reports of Janakiraman Committee and the JPC were placed before the Trial Court and were exhibited as Exts. 237(1) and 237(2).

The basic allegation was that as a result of criminal conspiracy surplus funds of MUL had been deposited in Canara Bank, New Delhi and were diverted to the account of A-5 Harshad with Grindlays Bank, Delhi and finally to UCO Bank, Bombay. It was the prosecution's case that there was no authority of accused-1 Pramod and accused-2 Ambuj Jain to deal with A-5 Harshad and though he was the full beneficiary and he had been directly benefited from the transaction, a picture was presented as if he had nothing to do in the matter. Such illegal transactions were done with the aid and assistance and direct involvement of A-3 (Deosthali) and A-4 (Popli).

Question No. 3 – Translate the following into Hindi. (20 Marks)

The study of law is not merely the gaining of knowledge about the laws of one's country. It is a liberal education, a discipline of the mind. Law teaches us precision, lucidity of expression, the value of words, and, more than anything else, how to shift the wheat from the chaff, how to discard the irrelevancies that surround a subject, and how to get at the root of the matter. It is because of this that a trained lawyer will make a success of any department with which he is entrusted. It is not our professional pride that makes me say so – the mettle of the lawyer has been tested and proved in a thousand positions of responsibility of national and international importance.
