

# Supreme Court Judgements:

Contents:

1. Famous judgements since India's Independence
2. Top 10 Supreme Court judgements in the last 10 years

## 1: Famous judgements since India's Independence

Case	Relevance
<b>A.K. Gopalan Case (1950)</b>	SC contended that there was no violation of Fundamental Rights enshrined in Articles 13, 19, 21 and 22 under the provisions of the Preventive Detention Act, if the detention was as per the procedure established by law. Here, the SC took a narrow view of Article 21.
<b>Romesh Thapar Case (1950)</b>	Here, the SC held that the freedom of speech and expression includes freedom of propagation of ideas that can only be ensured by circulation.
<b>Shankari Prasad Case (1951)</b>	This case dealt with the amend ability of Fundamental Rights (the First Amendment's validity was challenged). The SC contended that the Parliament's power to amend under Article 368 also includes the power to amend the Fundamental Rights guaranteed in Part III of the Constitution.
<b>Berubari Union case (1960)</b>	This case was regarding the Parliament's power to transfer the territory of Berubai to Pakistan. The Supreme Court examined Article 3 in detail and held that the Parliament cannot make laws under this article in order to execute the Nehru-Noon agreement. Hence, the 9th Amendment Act was passed to enforce the agreement.
<b>Golaknath case (1967)</b>	The questions in this case were whether amendment is a law; and whether Fundamental Rights can be amended or not. SC contended that Fundamental Rights are not

	amenable to the Parliamentary restriction as stated in Article 13, and that to amend the Fundamental rights a new Constituent Assembly would be required. Also stated that Article 368 gives the procedure to amend the Constitution but does not confer on Parliament the power to amend the Constitution.
<b>Kesavananda Bharati case (1973)</b>	This judgement defined the basic structure of the Constitution. The SC held that although no part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights, was beyond the Parliament's amending power, the "basic structure of the Constitution could not be abrogated even by a constitutional amendment." This is the basis in Indian law in which the judiciary can strike down any amendment passed by Parliament that is in conflict with the basic structure of the Constitution.
<b>Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain case (1975)</b>	The SC applied the theory of basic structure and struck down Clause(4) of article 329-A, which was inserted by the 39th Amendment in 1975 on the grounds that it was beyond the Parliament's amending power as it destroyed the Constitution's basic features.
<b>Habeas Corpus Case (1976)</b>	A much-criticised judgement of the SC, in which the majority ruling went against individual freedom and seemed to favour the state. Justice Khanna's dissent is also well-known.
<b>Maneka Gandhi case (1978)</b>	A main issue in this case was whether the right to go abroad is a part of the Right to Personal Liberty under Article 21. The SC held that it is included in the Right to Personal Liberty. The SC also ruled that the mere existence of an enabling law was not enough to restrain personal liberty. Such a law must also be "just, fair and reasonable."
<b>Minerva Mills case (1980)</b>	This case again strengthens the Basic Structure doctrine. The judgement struck down 2 changes made to the Constitution by the 42nd Amendment Act 1976, declaring them to be violative of the basic structure. The judgement makes it clear that the Constitution, and not the Parliament is supreme.
<b>Waman Rao Case (1981)</b>	The SC again reiterated the Basic Structure doctrine. It also drew a line of demarcation as April 24th, 1973 i.e., the date of the Kesavananda Bharati judgement, and held that it should not be applied retrospectively to reopen the validity of any amendment to the Constitution which took place prior to that date.
<b>Shah Bano Begum case (1985)</b>	Milestone case for Muslim women's fight for rights. The SC

	upheld the right to alimony for a Muslim woman and said that the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is applicable to all citizens irrespective of their religion. This set off a political controversy and the government of the day overturned this judgement by passing the Muslim Women (Protection on Divorce Act), 1986, according to which alimony need be given only during the iddat period (in tune with the Muslim personal law).
<b>MC Mehta and Union Of India (1986)</b>	This case dealt with 3 issues: Scope of Article 32; rule of Absolute Liability or Rylands vs Fletcher to be followed; issue of compensation. SC held that its power under Article 32 is not restricted to preventive measures, but also remedial measures when rights are violated. It also held that in the case of industries engaged in hazardous or inherently dangerous activities, Absolute Liability was to be followed. Finally, it also said that the amount of compensation must be correlated to the magnitude and capacity of the industry so that it will be a deterrent.
<b>Indra Sawhney and Union of India (1992)</b>	SC examined the scope and extent of Article 16(4), which provides for the reservation of jobs in favour of backward classes. It upheld the constitutional validity of 27% reservation for the OBCs with certain conditions (like creamy layer exclusion, no reservation in promotion, total reserved quota should not exceed 50%, etc.)
<b>S. R. Bommai case (1994)</b>	In this judgement, the SC tried to curb the blatant misuse of Article 356 (regarding the imposition of President's Rule on states).
<b>Vishaka and State of Rajasthan (1997)</b>	This case dealt with sexual harassment at the workplace. In the judgement, the SC gave a set of guidelines for employers – as well as other responsible persons or institutions – to immediately ensure the prevention of sexual harassment. These are called 'Vishaka Guidelines'. These were to be considered law until appropriate legislation was enacted.
<b>Samatha and State of Andhra Pradesh (1997)</b>	This judgement nullified all mining leases granted by the Andhra Pradesh State government in the Scheduled areas and asked it to stop all mining operations. It declared that forest land, tribal land, and government land in scheduled areas could not be leased to private companies or non-tribal for industrial operations. Such activity is only permissible to a government undertaking and tribal people.
<b>L Chandra Kumar Case (1997)</b>	The SC ruled that the power of judicial review vested in the Supreme Court and High Courts by Articles 32 (Right to

	Constitutional Remedies) and 226 respectively is a part of the basic structure of the Constitution.
<b>Lily Thomas v Union of India (2000)</b>	Here, the SC held that the second marriage of a Hindu man without divorcing the first wife, even if the man had converted to Islam, is void unless the first marriage had been dissolved according to the Hindu Marriage Act.
<b>I.R Coelho and State of Tamil Nadu 2007</b>	This judgement held that if a law is included in the 9th Schedule of the Indian Constitution, it can still be examined and confronted in court. The 9th Schedule of the Indian Constitution contains a list of acts and laws which cannot be challenged in a court of law. The Waman Rao ruling ensured that acts and laws mentioned in the IX schedule till 24 April 1973, shall not be changed or challenged, but any attempt to amend or add more acts to that schedule will suffer close inspection and examination by the judiciary system.
<b>Pedophilia case (2011)</b>	The SC restored the conviction and sentence of 6-year (RI) rigorous imprisonment imposed on 2 UK nationals who were acquitted by the Bombay High Court in a paedophilia case. The court said that “the sexual abuse of children is one of the most heinous crimes.”
<b>Aruna Shanbaug Case (2011)</b>	The SC ruled that individuals had a right to die with dignity, allowing passive euthanasia with guidelines. The need to reform India’s laws on euthanasia was triggered by the tragic case of Aruna Shanbaug who lay in a vegetative state (blind, paralysed and deaf) for 42 years.
<b>NOTA judgement (2013)</b>	This judgement introduced the NOTA (None-Of-The-Above) option for Indian voters.
<b>Lily Thomas and Union of India (2013)</b>	The SC ruled that any MLA, MLC or MP who was found guilty of a crime and given a minimum of 2 year imprisonment would cease to be a member of the House with immediate effect.
<b>Nirbhaya Case (2014)</b>	Introduction of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2013 and definition of rape under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Code of Criminal Procedures, 1973.
<b>National Legal Services Authority and Union of India (2014)</b>	This case resulted in the recognition of transgender persons as a third gender. The SC also instructed the government to treat them as minorities and expand the reservations in education, jobs, education, etc.

<b>Triple Talaq Judgement (2016)</b>	The SC outlawed the backward practice of instant 'triple talaq', which permitted Muslim men to unilaterally end their marriages by uttering the word "talaq" three times without making any provision for maintenance or alimony.
<b>Right To Privacy (2017)/ Puttuswamy Case (2017)</b>	The SC declared the right to privacy as a Fundamental Right protected under the Indian Constitution. The Bench unanimously held that "the right to privacy is protected as an intrinsic part of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 and as a part of the freedoms guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution".
<b>Repealing Section 377 (2018)</b>	The SC ruled that Section 377 was unconstitutional "in so far as it criminalises consensual sexual conduct between adults of the same sex."
<b>Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India and others (2020)</b>	The case has successfully set a standard to consider that Freedom of Speech and Expression and Freedom to Practice any Profession or carry on any Trade, Business or Occupation through medium of internet is a Fundamental Right which is guaranteed as well as protected under Article 19 of the Constitution of India.
<b>Rambabu Singh Thakur v. Sunil Arora and others (2020)</b>	It is mandatory for all political parties to publish all details regarding pending criminal cases against their chosen candidates, not only in local newspapers, but also on party websites and social media handles. Directions to ensure the asset disclosure and criminal records of candidates.
<b>Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India (2020)</b>	The three-judge bench held that the <b>virtual currencies</b> should be subject to regulation instead of blanket prohibition, under the Indian law.
<b>Laxmibai Chandragi and another v. State of Karnataka and others (2021)</b>	The Supreme Court of India made a groundbreaking judgment that upheld the right to choose a life partner as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution.
<b>Mohammad Salimullah and another v. Union of India and others (2021)</b>	This case sheds light on the complex issues surrounding the rights of refugees and non-citizens in India, particularly within the context of national security. The judgement reiterates the specific applicability of certain rights to citizens, while also underscoring the importance of due process in any action involving the life and liberty of individuals.
<b>Kerala Union of Working Journalists v. Union of India and others (2021)</b>	The case affirmed the fundamental right to life and personal liberty as per Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, highlighting that even undertrials are entitled to necessary medical care and attention. It reinforced the precedent that no individual should be deprived of their personal liberty except according to the law's due process.

	Thus, the case underlines the importance of following due process in all circumstances and recognizes the criticality of medical care for detained individuals.
<b>Barun Chandra Thakur v. Master Bholu and another (2022)</b>	<p>This case highlights the nuanced complexities in dealing with juvenile crime under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015.</p> <p>It has underscored the importance of expert involvement in assessing the juvenile’s understanding of the crime and its consequences, along with the need for comprehensive guidelines for such assessments.</p>

## 2. Top 10 Supreme Court judgements in the last 10 years

### Ayodhya Case Verdict: M. Siddiq (D) Thr Lrs v. Mahant Suresh Das & Ors (2019)

On November 9, 2019, the Supreme Court of India ruled in favor of the construction of a Ram temple in Ayodhya and the construction of a mosque on an alternative site:

- The court ruled that the land belonged to the government and ordered it to be handed over to a trust to build the Ram Janmabhoomi temple.
- The court ordered the government to provide five acres of land to the Uttar Pradesh Sunni Central Waqf Board to build a mosque.
- The court awarded the title to the deity, Shri Ram Virajman.

The verdict ended a nearly 70-year-old legal and political dispute over the site, which is claimed to be the birthplace of Lord Ram. The Babri Masjid, a 16th-century Mughal mosque, was demolished in 1992.

The Ram Mandir was officially opened on January 22, 2024, and is expected to be fully completed by December 2024.

Members of the five-judge bench that delivered the Ayodhya verdict in November 2019 (From L to R): Former Supreme Court judge Ashok Bhushan, former CJI SA Bobde, former CJI Ranjan Gogoi, CJI DY Chandrachud, and former Supreme Court Judge S Abdul Nazeer.

Which case led to the Supreme Court's ruling on the abrogation of Article 370?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India

- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India
- D) Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala

How many judges were part of the bench in the Article 370 judgment case?

- A) 3
- B) 5
- C) 7
- D) 9

## Article 370 Verdict: Supreme Court Judgment (2023)

On December 11, 2023, the Supreme Court of India in a 5-0 unanimously upheld the abrogation of Article 370 of the Constitution. The five-judge bench ruled that Article 370 was a temporary provision and that the president had the power to revoke it. The court also dismissed a batch of petitions seeking a review of the verdict.

Here are some key points from the verdict:

- The court ruled that the president has the power to abrogate Article 370 if "special circumstances warranted a special solution".
- The court said that the abrogation of Article 370 was the result of a "gradual and collaborative exercise" over the past 70 years between the Centre and the State.
- The court relied on history and a purposive reading of the constitutional text to define Article 370 as an instrument of integration.
- Justice Kaul in his concurring opinion suggested the constitution of a Truth-and-Reconciliation Commission to address human rights violations in Jammu and Kashmir.

A Constitution Bench led by Chief Justice of India (CJI) D Y Chandrachud upheld the constitutional validity of the two Presidential Orders CO (The Constitution (Application To Jammu and Kashmir) Order) 272 and 273 of August 5 and 6, 2019 respectively by which the entire Constitution of India was made applicable to J&K, and all provisions of Article 370 were declared inoperative.

Which case led to the Supreme Court's ruling on the abrogation of Article 370?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India
- D) Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala

How many judges were part of the bench in the Article 370 judgment case?

- A) 3
- B) 5
- C) 7
- D) 9

## Electoral Bonds Judgment Case: Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India (2024):

The Supreme Court of India delivered a landmark judgment on the Electoral Bonds Scheme on February 15, 2024. The five-judge Constitution Bench, led by Chief Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, unanimously struck down the scheme, declaring it unconstitutional.

Key Points of the Judgment:

- **Violation of Right to Information:** The Court held that the scheme violated the voters' right to information under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution. The anonymity of donors facilitated by the scheme was deemed to undermine transparency in political funding.
- **Restoration of Previous Legal Framework:** The judgment reinstated the legal framework that existed before the amendments introduced by the Finance Act, 2017. This included the requirement for political parties to disclose donations above ₹20,000 and the cap on corporate donations.
- **Proportionality Test:** The Court applied the proportionality test to examine whether the scheme violated the right to information of the voters and the transparency of the electoral process.

The judgment emphasized the importance of transparency in political funding to ensure free and fair elections, marking a significant step towards greater accountability in the Indian electoral system.

On February 15, in what one can call a watershed moment, the Supreme Court of India struck down the Electoral Bonds Scheme of 2017, holding the same to be unconstitutional. While pronouncing the unanimous verdict of the five-bench constitutional bench, Chief Justice of India DY Chandrachud held that anonymous electoral bonds are violative of the right to information under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution.

Which case led to the Supreme Court's ruling on the Electoral Bonds Scheme?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India
- D) Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India

How many judges were part of the bench in the Electoral Bonds judgment case?

- A) 3
- B) 5
- C) 7
- D) 9

## Section 377 IPC Case: Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018):

On September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018, the five-judge Bench partially struck down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, decriminalising same-sex relations between consenting adults. LGBT individuals are now legally allowed to engage in consensual intercourse.

In 2018, a five-judge bench of the Supreme Court of India decriminalized homosexuality by striking down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC):

- Decision: Struck down Section 377 to the extent that it criminalized consensual sexual intercourse between same-sex adults
- Rationale: The court found that Section 377 violated fundamental rights, including the right to freedom of expression, the right to life, dignity, and autonomy of personal choice, and the right to be free from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

The decriminalization of Section 377 was a significant step towards granting equal rights to the LGBTQIA+ community. The judgment also conceptualized three new concepts: transformative constitutionalism, constitutional morality, and the Right to Privacy.

- Case name: Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India
- Date: September 6, 2018
- Bench: Chief Justice Dipak Misra, Justice Rohinton Nariman, Justice DY Chandrachud, Justice Indu Malhotra, and Justice A.M. Khanwilkar

- Which case led to the decriminalization of consensual same-sex relations in India?
- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
  - B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
  - C) Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala
  - D) Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India
- Which Article of the Indian Constitution was cited as being violated by Section 377 in the Navtej Singh Johar case?
- A) Article 14
  - B) Article 19
  - C) Article 21
  - D) All of the above

## Abortion rights for unmarried women Case:

In a 2022 ruling, the Supreme Court of India ruled that unmarried women have the same right to abortion as married women.

The court's decision came in response to a case involving an unmarried woman who was 22 weeks pregnant from a consensual relationship. The court's ruling stated that any distinction between the rights of married and unmarried women based on marital status is

unconstitutional. The court also recognized that an unwanted pregnancy can have a serious negative impact on a woman's life, including her education, career, and mental well-being.

- Article 21 of the Constitution: Gives unmarried women the right to choose whether or not to bear a child
- Article 14: Violates the right to equality before law and equal protection
- Bodily autonomy: The choice to continue a pregnancy or not is deeply embedded in a woman's power over her own body
- Unplanned pregnancies: Unplanned pregnancies can profoundly impact a woman's life, throwing off her education, career, and emotional equilibrium.

The court's ruling removed the distinction between married and unmarried women, setting the limit at 24 weeks for all women. The court also stressed that the law should be aware of changes in society, such as changes in family structures. The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act (MTP) of 1971 governs the circumstances under which abortions are legally permitted in India. The 2021 Amendment Act to the MTP Act extended the gestational limit for abortions from 20 to 24 weeks for certain categories of women.

Abortion rights for unmarried women: Chief Justice Chandrachud expanded the rights of unmarried women by allowing them access to abortion under the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act up to 24 weeks, on par with married women

Which act governs abortion laws in India?

- A) Indian Penal Code
- B) Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act
- C) Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act
- D) Indian Evidence Act

Up to how many weeks of pregnancy can a woman legally obtain an abortion under the MTP Act, 1971, as amended in 2021?

- A) 12 weeks
- B) 20 weeks
- C) 24 weeks
- D) 28 weeks

Which of the following is NOT a ground for termination of pregnancy under the MTP Act?

- A) Risk to the life of the pregnant woman
- B) Severe fetal abnormalities
- C) Economic hardship
- D) Pregnancy resulting from rape

Who can perform abortions in India according to the MTP Act?

- A) Any healthcare worker
- B) Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP)
- C) Traditional birth attendants

- D) Pharmacists

Which section of the Indian Penal Code deals with the punishment for causing a miscarriage without the consent of the woman?

- A) Section 312
- B) Section 313
- C) Section 314
- D) Section 315

What is the maximum gestational age for abortion in cases of substantial risk to the woman's life or health, as per the MTP Amendment Act, 2021?

- A) 12 weeks
- B) 20 weeks
- C) 24 weeks
- D) No limit

Which Supreme Court judgment expanded the scope of abortion laws to include unmarried women?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala
- D) X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department

## Adultery Case: Joseph Shine v. Union of India (2018)

On September 27, 2018, a five-judge bench of the Supreme Court of India unanimously decriminalized adultery by striking down Section 497 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

The bench's reasoning was that the law was archaic, paternalistic, and violated a woman's dignity, autonomy, and privacy. The bench also ruled that the law infringed upon Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution.

- The Court held that the law was unconstitutional as it violated the right to equality and the right to privacy.
- Adultery was decriminalized but remained a valid ground for divorce.

Judgment Date: September 27, 2018

Bench: A five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court of India, including:

- Chief Justice Dipak Misra
- Justice A.M. Khanwilkar
- Justice R.F. Nariman
- Justice D.Y. Chandrachud
- Justice Indu Malhotra

Which case led to the decriminalization of adultery in India?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India

- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India
- D) Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala

How many judges were part of the bench in the Joseph Shine v. Union of India case?

- A) 3
- B) 5
- C) 7
- D) 9

Who was the Chief Justice of India during the Joseph Shine v. Union of India judgment?

- A) Justice N.V. Ramana
- B) Justice S.A. Bobde
- C) Justice Dipak Misra
- D) Justice Ranjan Gogoi

Which section of the Indian Penal Code was struck down in the Joseph Shine case?

- A) Section 377
- B) Section 497
- C) Section 302
- D) Section 124A

What was the primary reason for striking down Section 497 in the Joseph Shine case?

- A) It violated the right to freedom of speech
- B) It violated the right to equality and privacy
- C) It was outdated
- D) It was not enforced properly

## Sabarimala Temple Case: Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (2018)

: Supreme Court struck down in 2018 a rule that disallowed girls and women in the 10-50 age group from entering the Sabarimala temple in Kerala.

Key Points of the Judgment:

- The Supreme Court, by a 4:1 majority, ruled that the practice of excluding women of menstruating age (10-50 years) from entering the Sabarimala temple was unconstitutional.
- The Court held that the practice violated the fundamental rights to equality (Article 14), non-discrimination (Article 15), and freedom of religion (Article 25) of female worshippers.
- The lone dissenting opinion by Justice Indu Malhotra argued that issues of deep religious connotation should not be interfered with by the courts.

Judgment Date: September 28, 2018

Bench: A five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court of India, including:

- Chief Justice Dipak Misra

- Justice Rohinton Nariman
- Justice D.Y. Chandrachud
- Justice Indu Malhotra (dissenting)
- Justice A.M. Khanwilkar

Which case led to the Supreme Court's ruling on the entry of women into the Sabarimala temple?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- B) Joseph Shine v. Union of India
- C) Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala
- D) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India

How many judges were part of the bench in the Sabarimala temple case?

- A) 3
- B) 5
- C) 7
- D) 9

Who was the Chief Justice of India during the Sabarimala temple judgment?

- A) Justice N.V. Ramana
- B) Justice S.A. Bobde
- C) Justice Dipak Misra
- D) Justice Ranjan Gogoi

Which Article of the Indian Constitution was cited as being violated by the exclusion of women from the Sabarimala temple?

- A) Article 19
- B) Article 21
- C) Article 25
- D) Article 32

Who was the dissenting judge in the Sabarimala temple case?

- A) Justice Rohinton Nariman
- B) Justice D.Y. Chandrachud
- C) Justice Indu Malhotra
- D) Justice A.M. Khanwilkar

**Private Property (Case: Property Owners Association v. Government of Maharashtra ):** The constitution bench ruled that not all private property can be deemed a material resource of the community for redistribution under Article 39(b) of the Constitution.

- The Supreme Court ruled that not all private property can be deemed public resources by the government.
- The judgment provided parameters for the exercise of the eminent domain power, ensuring fair compensation for property owners.
- The Court emphasized the need to balance public interest and individual property rights

Judgment Date: November 5, 2024

Bench: A nine-judge Constitution Bench, including: Chief Justice D.Y. Chandrachud , Justice S.C. Sharma , Justice Manoj Misra , Justice Sudhanshu Dhulia , Justice Hrishikesh Roy , Justice B.V. Nagarathna, Justice J.B. Pardiwala , Justice Rajesh Bindal and Justice A.G. Masih

Which case involved the Supreme Court's ruling on private property rights in 2024?

- A) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- B) Property Owners Association v. Government of Maharashtra
- C) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India
- D) Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala

How many judges were part of the bench in the 2024 private property judgment?

- A) 5
- B) 7
- C) 9
- D) 11

Who was the Chief Justice of India during the 2024 private property judgment?

- A) Justice N.V. Ramana
- B) Justice S.A. Bobde
- C) Justice D.Y. Chandrachud
- D) Justice Ranjan Gogoi

What did the Supreme Court emphasize in its 2024 ruling on private property?

- A) Complete government control over private property
- B) Balance between public interest and individual property rights
- C) No compensation for property owners
- D) Unlimited state power to acquire private property

Which Article of the Indian Constitution was discussed in the context of private property in the 2024 judgment?

- A) Article 14
- B) Article 19
- C) Article 21
- D) Article 39 (b)

**Right to Privacy (Right to Privacy Case: Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)):** In August 2017, a nine-judge constitution bench ruled unanimously that the right to privacy is protected as an intrinsic part of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21.

Judgment: The Supreme Court unanimously declared that the right to privacy is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This landmark judgment overruled previous decisions and established privacy as intrinsic to the right to life and personal liberty.

A nine-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court of India, including: Chief Justice J.S. Khehar, Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, Justice J. Chelameswar , Justice S.A.

Bobde , Justice R.K. Agrawal , Justice Rohinton F. Nariman, Justice Abhay Manohar Sapre , Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul and Justice S. Abdul Nazeer.

Which case recognized the right to privacy as a fundamental right in India?

- A) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India
- B) K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India
- C) Golaknath v. State of Punjab
- D) Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala

How many judges were part of the bench in the K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India case?

- A) 5
- B) 7
- C) 9
- D) 11

Under which Article of the Indian Constitution was the right to privacy recognized as a fundamental right?

- A) Article 14
- B) Article 19
- C) Article 21
- D) Article 32

Who was the Chief Justice of India during the K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India judgment?

- A) Justice D.Y. Chandrachud
- B) Justice J.S. Khehar
- C) Justice S.A. Bobde
- D) Justice Ranjan Gogoi

Which of the following was NOT a part of the nine-judge bench in the K.S. Puttaswamy case?

- A) Justice J. Chelameswar
- B) Justice R.K. Agrawal
- C) Justice N.V. Ramana
- D) Justice S. Abdul Nazeer

**Delhi government vs Lieutenant Governor:** A five-judge constitution bench ruled in May 2023 that the legislature has control over bureaucrats in the administration of services, except in areas outside the legislative powers of the National Capital Territory

**2023 Supreme Court Verdict:** The Supreme Court gave the Delhi government complete control over administrative services in the NCT of Delhi, except for public order, police, and land. The Court emphasized that a democratically elected government must have the power to control its officers to ensure accountability.

**Bench:** The 2023 verdict was delivered by a five-judge Constitution Bench, including: Chief Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, Justice Krishna Murari, Justice M.R. Shah, Justice Hima Kohli and Justice P.S. Narasimha.

## Key Points of the Judgments

- **Federalism:** The Court highlighted that Indian federalism is not unitary and that expanding the Union's power over the NCT of Delhi would be contrary to the constitutional scheme.
- **Triple Chain of Accountability:** The Court stressed the importance of political, administrative, and public accountability, which would be undermined if the elected government did not have control over its officers.
- **Article 239AA:** The Constitution (69th Amendment) Act, 1991, inserted Article 239AA, giving special status to Delhi and establishing an Administrator and a Legislative Assembly. The Assembly has the power to make laws for the NCT of Delhi, except for police, public order, and land.

Union Territories (UTs) are federal territories governed directly by the Union Government of India. They are administered by a Lieutenant Governor (LG) or an Administrator appointed by the President of India. Here are some key points:

**Union Territories:** India currently has 8 Union Territories: Delhi, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu, Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh, Lakshadweep, and Puducherry.

**Governance:** The President of India appoints an LG or Administrator for each UT. The LG acts as the constitutional head of the UT, similar to the role of a Governor in a state.

**Powers and Functions:** The LG has significant powers, including the ability to reserve bills passed by the UT legislature for the President's consideration, and to act on the advice of the Council of Ministers, except in matters where they are required to act in their discretion

How many Union Territories are there in India as of 2024?

- A) 7
- B) 8
- C) 9
- D) 10

Who appoints the Lieutenant Governor of a Union Territory in India?

- A) Prime Minister
- B) President
- C) Chief Justice of India
- D) Governor

Which of the following Union Territories has its own Legislative Assembly?

- A) Chandigarh
- B) Lakshadweep
- C) Delhi
- D) Andaman and Nicobar Islands

What is the role of the Lieutenant Governor in a Union Territory?



- A) Head of the State
- B) Constitutional head acting on the advice of the Council of Ministers
- C) Chief Minister
- D) None of the above

Which Article of the Indian Constitution deals with the appointment of the Governor?

- A) Article 154
- B) Article 163
- C) Article 164
- D) Article 157