

S. NO.	CASES
(1)	SADIQ B. HANCHINMANI v. STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS. Section 156 (3) of Crpc.
(2)	MIHIR RAJESH SHAH v. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANOTHER Article 22 of constitution and Section 47 BNSA (Section 50 Crpc).
(3)	R. RAJENDRAN v. KAMAR NISHA AND OTHERS. DNA test.
(4)	NANDKUMAR @ NANDU MANIKAL v. STATE OF GUJARAT. Section 304 of IPC. (Target for IB)
(5)	STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH v. KUSUM SAHU. Habeas corpus not allowed after bail dismissal.
(6)	ALL INDIA JUDGES ASSOCIATION v. UOI. No special quota for promotee judges.
(7)	IN RE: ASSENT, WITHHOLDING OR RESERVATION OF BILLS BY GOVERNOR AND GOVERNMENT OF INDIA (5 Judges Bench). Article 200 of constitution.
(8)	ROBERT LALCHUNGUNGA v. STATE OF BIHAR. S. 197 of Crpc.
(9)	Dr SAMADHAN v. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA. Repe u/s. 376 of IPC. A v. I - irretrievable breakdown of marriage, S. 13 of HMA.
(10)	SNIDHA MEHARA v. UOI - section 30 of Hindu succession.
(11)	MUSKAN v. ISHAAN KHAN & ORS - S. 482 of Crpc / S. 28 of BNSA.
(12)	K. S. MANJUNATH v. MOORAVIRAPPA & LRS - Section 14 of Specific Relief Act.
(13)	SURENDRA KOLI v. STATE OF U.P. - Nithari Killings, (serial killing).
(14)	

# LATEST IMPORTANT SUPREME COURT JUDGEMENTS

## NOVEMBER-2025

(1.)

**SADIQ B. HANCHINMANI VERSUS THE STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS**

Section 156(3) Crpc - once complaint discloses cognizable offence, Magistrate can direct police to register FIR. If the facts mentioned in the complaint show a cognizable offence may have been committed then Magistrate can direct registration of FIR and investigation u/s. 156(3) of Crpc now (Section 175(3) of BNSS)

(2.)

**MIHIR RAJESH SHAH VERVA STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANOTHER**

Supreme court has held that the failure to supply the written grounds of arrest to an arrestee in a language he or she understands makes the arrest and subsequent remand illegal. S. 50 Crpc (S. 47 BNSS)  
Mere oral communication or communication in a language not understood by arrestee - does not satisfy Article 22(1) of the constitution. Such failure renders the constitutional safeguards illusory and violates Article 21 personal liberty and Article 22.

**Purpose** - is to enable the arrested person to understand :-

- (i) the accusations;
- (ii) consult a lawyer;
- (iii) challenge police custody;
- (iv) Apply for bail.

(Target for IA)

(3.)

**R. RAJENDRAN VERSUS KAMAR NISHA AND OTHERS.**

The court said DNA tests cannot be ordered for -

- (i) fishing inquiries or
- (ii) for satisfying suspicion.

Can only be ordered when -

- (i) Existing evidence not enough
- (ii) Clear necessity and a balance of interests.

Forcing someone to undergo DNA testing is a serious violation of Article 21 of the constitution. (violates privacy and personal autonomy).



(4.)

NANDKUMAR @ NANDU MANIKAL MUDAJAR v. STATE OF GUJARAT.

Section 304 IPC - How intention and knowledge determine if offence is culpable homicide not amounting to murder - SC explains converted conviction of a man from murder u/s. 302 IPC to 304 Part I IPC (not culpable homicide not amounting to murder).

Held - Although accused had knowledge - that injury inflicted was likely to cause death but did not have the intention to kill the deceased [Absence of intention - reduces murder to culpable homicide.]

If there is intention to cause death an injury likely to cause death - offence falls u/s - 304 Part I.

If there is only knowledge, without intention to cause death such injury - section 304 Part II.

(5.)

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH v. KUSUM SAHU.

Held - Habeas corpus writ cannot be issued to release accused taken into custody after dismissal of bail pleas. This approach would undermine the due process of law and create dangerous precedent to bypass bail jurisprudence.

[A habeas corpus petition cannot be used as an substitute for bail proceeding].

(Target for IR)

(6.)

ALL INDIA JUDGES ASSOCIATION v. UOI.

The court held that no special quota for promote judges.

No special reservation, quota or weightage can be given.

No quota for judicial officers in District Judge Posts. Supreme court issues guidelines on seniority in Higher Judicial services.

(7.)

IN RE: ASSENT, WITHHOLDING OR RESERVATION OF BILLS BY GOVERNOR & THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. (5 Judges Bench)

Supreme court clarified - earlier 2 judge judgment wrongly imposed timelines para 260 - 261 of the Tamil Nadu Governor judgment - where timelines prescribed - erroneous.

Courts cannot create timelines for President or Governor unless the constitution itself provides.



The court made it clear that "deemnt assent" is unconstitutional. Declaring a law passed without assent would amount to the judiciary taking over executive functions which is not allowed.

Governor has following options under Article 200 of the constitution -

- (i) Assent ;
- (ii) withhold assent (but only by returning the bill to the Assembly with comments);
- (iii) Reserve the bill for the President .

No fourth option to "sit on" the bill - indefinitely .

This is necessary to maintain federalism - which is part of basic structure. Court rejected idea of "silence power" -

Governor cannot simply withhold bill without returning it to assembly. This does not exist <sup>under Article</sup> ~~Article~~ 200 of constitution .

Governor can reserve bill passed again by Assembly for President's assent .

(Target for 18)

(8.)

ROBERT LALCHUNGUNGA CHONGTHU @ RL CHONGTHU

v.  
STATE OF BIHAR

Held that a sanction under section 197 Crpc to prosecute a public servant cannot rest on vague or mechanical assertions and must reflect a clear application of mind by the authorities granting or denying sanction must be easily visible including consideration of evidence placed before it in arriving at conclusion.

Investigation cannot go endlessly; long delay in filing chargesheet can be a ground to quash proceeding.

(9.)

SAMADHAN v. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA .

The offence of rape, being of gravest kind must be invoked in cases where there exists genuine sexual violence, coercion or absence of free consent. To convert every sour relationship into an offence of rape inflicts upon accused indelible stigma and grave injustice.



The court held that if it is proved that promise was false with no intention to marry but only to exploit the woman then such consent may be considered vitiated attracting protection under section 376 of IPC

(11.)

A. V. I.

Section 13 - Divorce (Hindu Marriage Act, 1955). Irretrievable breakdown of marriage - duty of court that before concluding that a marriage has broken down irretrievably it is imperative upon family court and High court to determine which party has broken marital tie forcing other party to live separately. A finding of irretrievable breakdown is likely to have devastating effect, especially on children, unless -

➤ there is cogent evidence available which shows -  
willful desertion; or

➤ Refusal to cohabit or look after the other spouse

[Only the supreme court under Article 142 - can grant dissolution of marriage on ground of irretrievable breakdown of marriage. High court does not have this power.]

(Target for 18)

(12.)

SNIDHA MEHRA v. UNION OF INDIA.

Court urges Hindu women to make wills. Under section 15(1) of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 to take immediate steps to make a testament or will bequeathing their properties including self acquired properties in accordance with section 30 of Hindu Succession Act r/w Indian Succession Act, if they ~~will~~ are likely to fall under section 15(1).

Court mandates Pre-litigation mediation in succession of childless wives dying intestate.

(13.)

MUSKAN VERSUS ISHAAN KHAN SATANIYA AND OTHERS.

In quashing plea the court under section 483 of CrPc now 528 of BNSS cannot inquire into credibility of allegations in FIR / complaint. The court referring to precedents



such as *State of Kerala v. Bhejan Kd*, *Daxaben v. State of Gujarat* observed - under section 482 of the CrPc it is settled at the stage of quashing of FIR, the court is not required to conduct a mini trial. The court has to only consider whether 'any sufficient material' is available to proceed against the accused or not. If yes, then powers under section 482 should not be exercised.

(14)

*K.S. Manjuneth and others v. Moorasavirappa* @ since deceased by his LRs and others.

Unilateral termination of Agreement to sell invalid if contract does not allow it. While interpreting section 14 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963. A party cannot terminate a non-determinable agreement to sell except where contract itself is expressly determinable u/s. 14 of the Act. If such termination will be permitted then every suit of specific performance will be frustrated by the defendant placing an unfair burden on the plaintiff.

(Target for 10).

(15)

**SURENDRA KOLI V. STATE OF U.P.**

Nithari killings: Supreme court set aside the conviction of Surendra Koli in last remaining case related to Nithari killings. Court said it is a matter of "deep regret" that despite prolonged investigation, the identity of ~~real~~ actual perpetrator has not been established in manner that meets legal standards.

Criminal law does not permit conviction on conjecture or on a hunch. Suspicion, however grave, cannot replace 'beyond reasonable doubt'.