



JUDGMENTS

(27 April 2026 - 02 May 2026)



- 1 Raj Kumar Bhatia v. Subhash Chander Bhatia, 2026 SC**

The Court held that the power of the High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution is limited. The High Court can only check whether the lower court or tribunal acted within its jurisdiction. It cannot act like an appellate court by re-examining evidence or reviewing factual findings.
- 2 Narayan v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026 SC**

The Court held that in cases involving non-bailable offences punishable up to seven years, bail can be granted without imposing the strict conditions mentioned under Section 480(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS).
- 3 Prosecutrix of Crime No. 27/2025 v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026 SC**

Justice B.V. Nagarathna observed that women in live-in relationships may not have the same legal protections as married women. The Court noted that if the parties had been married, the woman could have claimed rights such as maintenance or filed for bigamy, but in live-in relationships, such legal safeguards are limited, and parties take the risk of separation without legal remedies.
- 4 Ravish Singh Rana v. State of Uttarakhand & Anr, 2026 SC**

The Court held that if a couple has been in a live-in relationship for a long time, it is presumed that they did not intend to marry. Therefore, later claims that the relationship was based on a false promise of marriage are generally not acceptable.
- 5 Anand Jakkappa Pujari @ Gaddadar v. State of Karnataka, 2026 SC**

The Court held that disclosure statements made jointly by multiple accused persons are admissible under Section 27 of the Evidence Act only if each statement leads to the discovery of a distinct and relevant fact. A fact already discovered cannot be used again against another accused.
- 6 Vaibhav Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2026 SC**

The Court held that keeping an accused in jail for a long period without completing the trial violates the fundamental right to a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution.
- 7 Brinda Karat v. State of NCT of Delhi, 2026 SC & Ashwini Kumar Upadhyaya v. Union of India, 2026 SC**

The Court held that a Judicial Magistrate does not require prior sanction under Sections 196 or 197 CrPC (or corresponding BNSS provisions) before directing registration of an FIR under Section 156(3) CrPC (now Section 175(3) BNSS). The requirement of sanction applies only at the stage of taking cognizance and not at the stage of investigation.
- 8 Mohd. Yousuf v. Afaq Jahan, 2026 SC**

The Court clarified that when a Magistrate orders an investigation under Section 156(3) CrPC, it is done at the pre-cognizance stage and does not amount to taking cognizance of the offence.
- 9 State of Karnataka v. Pastor P. Raju, 2026 SC & Sakiri Vasu v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2026 SC**

The Court held that an order under Section 156(3) CrPC is not equivalent to taking cognizance under Section 190 CrPC.
- 10 Brinda Karat v. State of NCT of Delhi, Delhi HC**

The Court reiterated that registration of an FIR is mandatory when a cognizable offence is disclosed, as earlier held in Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh. The Court further held that if the police fail to register an FIR, the aggrieved person can approach the Superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) CrPC, or the Magistrate under Section 156(3) CrPC, or file a complaint under Section 200 CrPC. These remedies form a complete legal framework.
- 11 Shekhar Suman v. State of Maharashtra, 2026 Bombay HC**

The Court held that criminal law should not be used casually against artists. For an offence under Section 295A IPC, there must be deliberate and malicious intent to hurt religious sentiments, and sufficient evidence connecting the accused to such intent. In this case, the FIR against the actors was quashed.
- 12 Ravi Kant v. Central Bureau of Investigation, 2026 Uttarkhand HC**

The Court held that the constitutional requirement under Article 22(1) is satisfied if the arrested person is informed of the grounds of arrest in a meaningful manner, even through an arrest memo. There is no requirement of a separate document as long as the substance of the accusation is clearly communicated.
- 13 Kapil Agarwal v. CPIO Income Tax Officer Moradabad, 2026 Delhi HC**

The Court held that income tax details of a husband cannot be disclosed under the RTI Act in matrimonial disputes. Such personal information is protected under Section 8(1)(j) unless there is larger public interest, which was not found in this case.
- 16 Saw Timothy v. State and Another, 2026 Calcutta HC**

The Court held that once bail is granted, the accused must be released immediately. Any delay violates personal liberty and should not force the accused to approach courts repeatedly.
- 17 A.P. State Wakf Board v. Janaki Busappa, 2026 SC**

The Court held that "service inam" lands granted for religious purposes are treated as Wakf property and cannot be transferred.
- 18 Vinay Raghunath Deshmukh v. Natwarlal Shamji Gada, 2026 SC**

The Court reiterated that High Courts cannot reassess evidence under Article 227 and interfere with findings of subordinate courts unless there is a serious jurisdictional error.
- 19 Smt. Champa Devi v. Jogaram, 2026 Rajasthan HC**

The Court held that a written power of attorney cannot be revoked orally. Any revocation must also be in writing and properly communicated. The Court rejected the plaint as frivolous.
- 20 Smt. Rathna P v. Sri Chikkamanachiah S.M, 2026 Karnataka HC**

The Court held that registration of marriage under the Special Marriage Act is not mandatory for filing a divorce petition under Section 27 of the Act.
- 21 Dr. Garima Dubey v. Dr. Saurabh Anand Dubey, 2026 Allahabad HC**

The Court held that maintenance can be denied to a qualified wife who is capable of earning but deliberately chooses not to work to burden her husband financially.
- 22 MCM Worldwide Pvt. Ltd. v. Construction Industry Development Council, 2026 SC**

The Court held that a challenge to an arbitral tribunal's decision on jurisdiction can only be made after the final award, not during ongoing proceedings.
- 23 Kumari Vagisha v. Kumar Sangam, 2026 Patna HC**

The Court held that "living separately" for mutual divorce means not only physical separation but also the intention to end marital relations.
- 24 Reliance Eminent Trading Pvt. Ltd. v. Delhi Development Authority, 2026 SC**

The Court held that summary judgment can be granted when there are no disputed facts and the defence has no real chance of success.
- 25 Aseen v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2026 Allahabad HC**

The Court held that introducing new religious practices that disturb public order is not protected under Articles 25 and 26, and the State can take preventive action.
- 26 Nandi Infrastructure Corridor Enterprises Ltd. v. B. Gurappa Naidu, 2026 SC**

The Court reiterated that High Courts exercising jurisdiction under Article 227 cannot act as appellate courts. They cannot reappreciate evidence or substitute their own findings unless there is a jurisdictional error or perversity in the lower court's decision.
- 27 Challani Ginning and Pressing Factory v. Kamal, 2026 SC**

The Court held that execution proceedings cannot be delayed by raising objections at a later stage when the party had earlier knowledge and opportunity to challenge the decree.
- 28 Saw Timothy v. State and Another, 2026 Calcutta HC**

The Court held that once bail is granted, the accused must be released immediately. Any delay violates personal liberty and should not force the accused to approach courts repeatedly.
- 29 A.P. State Wakf Board v. Janaki Busappa, 2026 SC**

The Court held that "service inam" lands granted for religious purposes are treated as Wakf property and cannot be transferred.
- 30 Aseen v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2026 Allahabad HC**

The Court held that introducing new religious practices that disturb public order is not protected under Articles 25 and 26, and the State can take preventive action.