



Bihar Judicial Services Special

LATEST SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS

A rigorous compile of exactly **50 high-yield MCQs** curated for Bihar Civil Judge (Prelims & Mains). Covering critical ratios, benches, and facts from 2023 to 2026.

50 MCQs Complete Series

Ratio Decidendi Facts

Question 1: Electoral Bonds Validity

Which Constitutional provision was held to be violated by the anonymous Electoral Bonds Scheme in **ADR v. Union of India (2024)**?

A Article 14 only

B Article 19(1)(a) - Right to Know

C Article 21 only

D Article 324 of the Constitution

Answer & Ratio 1

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Article 19(1)(a)

Association for Democratic Reforms v. UOI
(2024)

5-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The Court declared the Electoral Bond Scheme unconstitutional.
- ✓ Held that voter's right to information under **Article 19(1)(a)** overrides political privacy.
- ✓ Ruled that the "curbing of black money" is not a valid ground for restriction under Article 19(2).
- ✓ Ordered SBI to immediately halt issuance and disclose complete donor/recipient details to ECI.

Question 2: Automatic Vacation of Stays

Which judgment regarding the automatic vacation of stay orders within 6 months was overruled by the 5-Judge Bench in **HCBA Allahabad v. State of UP (2024)**?

A P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement

B Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency v. CBI

C Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab

D Lalita Kumari v. State of UP

Answer & Ratio 2

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Asian Resurfacing Case

HCBA Allahabad v. State of UP (2024)

5-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Overruled *Asian Resurfacing* (2018) which mandated stay orders expire automatically in 6 months.
- ✓ Held that automatic stay vacations interfere with judicial discretion and High Court powers.
- ✓ Article 226 powers cannot be restricted by a general judicial directive of automatic expiry.
- ✓ No court can fix a pre-determined time limit on judicial orders unless dictated by specific statute.

Question 3: SC/ST Sub-classification

Which landmark 7-Judge Bench decision held that State legislatures have the power to sub-classify Scheduled Castes to target benefits?

A Indra Sawhney v. Union of India

B State of Punjab v. Davinder Singh (2024)

C M. Nagaraj v. Union of India

D E.V. Chinnaiah v. State of Andhra Pradesh

Answer & Ratio 3

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: State of Punjab v. Davinder Singh

State of Punjab v. Davinder Singh (2024)

7-Judge Bench (6:1 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The Court explicitly overruled the 5-judge decision in *E.V. Chinnaiah* (2004).
- ✓ Held that Article 341 does not prevent States from sub-classifying to address varying backwardness.
- ✓ The State must support sub-classification with solid **empirical data**.
- ✓ Clarified that States cannot exclude a caste entirely from the list or allocate 100% of seats to one sub-class.

Question 4: Bail and Right to Privacy

In **Frank Vitus v. NCB (2024)**, which bail condition was struck down as a violation of Article 21 and the right to privacy?

A Daily physical reporting to the police station

B Sharing live location on Google Maps with the Investigating Officer

C Submitting details of all relatives' accounts

D Prohibition on entering specific districts

Answer & Ratio 4

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Live Google Location Condition

Frank Vitus v. Narcotics Control Bureau (2024)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Lower Court imposed a condition that the accused must keep live location active on Google Maps.
- Held: Struck down. Imposing live location sharing amounts to constant **surveillance**.
- Surveillance condition is an impermissible curtailment of Article 21 Privacy.
- Bail conditions must assist in securing presence at trial, not turn the state into a surveillance agent.

Question 5: UAPA Grounds of Arrest

Which Supreme Court judgment extended the rule of "providing written grounds of arrest immediately" to the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA)?

A Pankaj Bansal v. Union of India

B Prabir Purkayastha v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2024)

C Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. UOI

D Umar Khalid v. State

Answer & Ratio 5

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Prabir Purkayastha Case

Prabir Purkayastha v. State (NCT of Delhi)
(2024)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Founder of NewsClick was arrested under UAPA without written grounds supplied.
- ✓ The Court ruled that written communication of arrest grounds is a non-negotiable mandate of **Article 22(1)**.
- ✓ Applied the rationale from *Pankaj Bansal* (PMLA case) to the UAPA framework.
- ✓ Failure to give written grounds results in the entire arrest being declared illegal.

Question 6: Parliamentary Privileges

In **Sita Soren v. Union of India (2024)**, the 7-Judge Bench ruled that legislative immunity under Article 105/194 does NOT protect:

A Freedom of Speech within the House

B The act of accepting bribes to cast a specific vote

C Immunity from civil arrests during session

D Publishing authorized House reports

Answer & Ratio 6

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Bribe-taking for votes

Sita Soren v. Union of India (2024)

7-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Overruled the controversial 1998 decision in *P.V. Narasimha Rao v. State*.
- ✓ Held that bribery is independent of parliamentary duties and is complete upon accepting the bribe.
- ✓ The privilege under Article 105(2) / 194(2) cannot protect criminal acts corrupting democracy.
- ✓ Prosecution under the Prevention of Corruption Act can proceed irrespective of the vote cast.

Question 7: Adultery in Armed Forces

What was the major clarification issued by the Supreme Court in 2023 regarding the strike-down of adultery in **Joseph Shine v. Union of India**?

- A** Adultery is reintroduced as a civil wrong in services
- B** Decriminalization of Section 497 IPC does not prevent disciplinary actions in Armed Forces
- C** Army Act provisions were declared fully unconstitutional
- D** Section 497 was entirely revived for general public

Answer & Ratio 7

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Armed Forces Disciplinary Action

Joseph Shine v. UOI (Clarification - 2023)

5-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Union of India sought clarification whether the 2018 judgment affected "unbecoming conduct" charges.
- ✓ Held: Decriminalizing Sec 497 did not affect Section 45/63 of the Army Act.
- ✓ The Armed Forces require distinct moral guidelines to maintain discipline and combat readiness.
- ✓ Adultery can continue to be pursued as "conduct unbecoming of an officer" in military tribunals.

Question 8: Private Property & Community Resources

In **Property Owners Association v. State of Maharashtra (2024)**, what did the 9-Judge Bench hold regarding Article 39(b) DPSPs?

- A** No private property can ever be communities' resources
- C** Whether private property qualifies under Art 39(b) depends on size, nature, and community impact

- B** All private property belongs to community automatically
- D** Article 39(b) is unconstitutional

Answer & Ratio 8

CORRECT ANSWER

Option C: Context-Dependent Status

Property Owners Association v. Maharashtra (2024)

9-Judge Bench (8:1 Majority)

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Overruled the old absolute socialist doctrine of Justice Krishna Iyer.
- Private property can be taken over only if it serves community welfare based on specific checks.
- The State cannot claim an open license to nationalize every private asset.
- Preserved the critical balance between individual economic liberties and socialist welfare aims.

Question 9: Aligarh Muslim University Status

Which landmark case did the Supreme Court overrule in **AMU v. Naresh Agarwal (2024)** to set new criteria for Minority Institutions under Article 30?

A T.M.A. Pai Foundation v. State of Karnataka

B Azeez Basha v. Union of India (1967)

C P.A. Inamdar v. State of Maharashtra

D St. Stephen's College v. University of Delhi

Answer & Ratio 9

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Azeez Basha overruled

AMU v. Naresh Agarwal (2024)

7-Judge Bench (4:3 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The 1967 *Azeez Basha* ruling held that an institution established by central statute cannot be a minority.
- ✓ Overruled: Incorporating an institution by a statute does not strip its minority character.
- ✓ The key test under **Article 30** is who **founded** the institution, not which act incorporated it.
- ✓ The historical background, sponsorship, and administrative intent are decisive factors.

Question 10: State Legislative Power on Alcohol

In **State of UP v. Lalta Prasad (2024)**, the 9-Judge Bench held that States have power over Industrial Alcohol under which 7th Schedule entry?

A Entry 8 of List II (State List)

B Entry 52 of List I (Union List)

C Entry 33 of List III (Concurrent List)

D Entry 54 of List II (State List)

Answer & Ratio 10

CORRECT ANSWER

Option A: List II Entry 8

State of UP v. Lalta Prasad (2024)

9-Judge Bench (8:1 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Overruled *Synthetics & Chemicals Ltd v. State of UP* (1989).
- ✓ Held that "intoxicating liquor" includes all raw industrial alcohols because they can be converted to potable form.
- ✓ State regulatory power over alcohol cannot be completely pre-empted by Union under List I.
- ✓ States retain full power to levy fee and regulate the raw material to check illegal diversion.

Question 11: Waqf Amendment Registration

In **In re: Waqf (Amendment) Act, 2025**, what major statutory change was upheld as constitutionally valid by the SC?

A Complete takeover of Waqf boards by government

B Mandatory registration of Waqf properties and ownership proofs

C Abolition of all state-level Waqf Boards

D Exemption of Waqf from the Right to Property laws

Answer & Ratio 11

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Mandatory Registration

In re: Waqf (Amendment) Act, 2025

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Petitioners sought a blanket stay on the implementation of the new Waqf amendments.
- ✓ The Court refused blanket stay; upheld the requirement of mandatory registration of properties.
- ✓ Declared that only the lawful owner of a property can dedicate it as Waqf.
- ✓ Prohibited declaration of public lands, archaeological monuments or tribal lands as Waqf.

Question 12: Ex Post Facto EC

In **Vanashakti v. Union of India (2025 overrule)**, the 3-Judge Bench held that the grant of ex post facto environmental clearances:

A Is completely illegal and void

B Can be granted as a matter of routine practice

C Is permissible sparingly under exceptional conditions

D Is exempted from judicial review

Answer & Ratio 12

CORRECT ANSWER

Option C: Permitted Sparingly

Vanashakti v. Union of India (2025)

3-Judge Bench (2:1 Split)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Overruled the absolute prohibition previously laid down in various rulings.
- ✓ Ex post facto clearances cannot be claimed as a right but can be given in public interest.
- ✓ Allows ongoing key infrastructure projects to comply retroactively rather than facing demolition.
- ✓ Imposed heavy environmental compensation penalties as a precondition.

Question 13: Article 370 Sovereignty

In **In Re: Article 370 of the Constitution (2023)**, what was the status of J&K's internal sovereignty after its accession?

A It retained full separate sovereignty

B It merged its sovereignty entirely with India

C It has concurrent sovereignty in legislative domains

D It became a semi-sovereign federal partner

Answer & Ratio 13

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Merged Sovereignty

In Re: Article 370 Case (2023)

5-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Upheld the validity of Presidential Orders abrogating Article 370.
- ✓ Held that Article 370 was a **temporary transition** provision.
- ✓ J&K did not retain any element of sovereignty after signing the Instrument of Accession.
- ✓ The state constitution of Jammu & Kashmir was entirely subordinate to the Constitution of India.

Question 14: Personal Autonomy & Habeas Corpus

In habeas corpus petitions involving adult consensual relationships, the Supreme Court in 2024 held that:

- A** Parents have final guardianship up to age 25
- B** Courts must physically return the partner to parent custody
- C** Personal autonomy of consenting adults cannot be overridden
- D** Consensual live-ins are illegal if parents object

Answer & Ratio 14

CORRECT ANSWER

Option C: Consenting Adult Autonomy

State of Kerala v. Consensual Partner (2024)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Habeas corpus petition was filed by parents to retrieve their daughter from her consensual relationship.
- ✓ Held: Habeas corpus is a remedy against **illegal detention**, not an instrument to enforce parental control.
- ✓ If the person is an adult, her choice of living and relationship partner is protected by Article 21.
- ✓ Courts must strictly respect and protect the free choice of major citizens.

Question 15: Same-Sex Marriage

What was the final decision of the Constitutional Bench in **Supriyo v. Union of India (2023)** regarding same-sex marriage?

A Upheld it as a Fundamental Right

B No constitutional right to marry exists; left to Parliament

C Struck down Special Marriage Act as discriminatory

D Authorized state governments to register marriages

Answer & Ratio 15

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Matter for Parliament

Supriyo v. Union of India (2023)

5-Judge Bench (3:2 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Petitioners argued Special Marriage Act must include same-sex unions.
- ✓ Held: Court cannot legislate or read words into the Special Marriage Act.
- ✓ There is no fundamental right to marry guaranteed under the Indian Constitution.
- ✓ Right to civil union can only be structured and created by the appropriate legislature (Parliament).

Question 16: Stray Dogs on Campus

In **In Re: City Hounded by Strays (2026/2025)**, the Supreme Court ruled that stray dogs can be maintained in educational campuses only if:

- A** They are sterilised in government clinics
- B** The student bodies/management accept full liability for safety and damages
- C** They are kept in locked cages during college hours
- D** They are registered under Animal Welfare Board

Answer & Ratio 16

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Management Liability

In Re: City Hounded by Strays (2026)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Universities allowed stray dogs inside, resulting in student bites.
- ✓ Held: Animal rights cannot operate in isolation from human life and safety.
- ✓ Campus authorities/students who feed or protect strays inside must accept corresponding civil and medical liability.
- ✓ Directed High Courts to monitor compliance of stray dog management orders strictly.

Question 17: Anticipatory Bail Practice

In the latest 2026 ruling, the Supreme Court termed the practice of repeatedly filing anticipatory bail petitions in short successions as:

A A legitimate pursuit of legal remedy

B An abuse of process reducing litigation to a gamble

C A compulsory procedural step

D A right guaranteed under Article 22

Answer & Ratio 17

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Abuse of Process

State of TN v. Ponnusamy (2026)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Accused kept filing anticipatory bail applications in rapid succession without any change in circumstances.
- ✓ Held: Disapproved this trend as it clogs courts and treats justice like gambling.
- ✓ Anticipatory bail is an extraordinary remedy; successive applications require fresh, substantial material change in facts.

Question 18: Environmental Clearance Exemption

In **Noble M Paikada v. Union of India (2024)**, the Supreme Court struck down a central notification because:

- A** It completely banned sand mining
- B** It exempted earth excavation for roads/pipelines from prior Environmental Clearance
- C** It allowed illegal mining in sacred forests
- D** It bypassed public hearings under EIA

Answer & Ratio 18

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Illegal Excavation Exemption

Noble M Paikada v. Union of India (2024)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The Ministry of Environment exempted unearthing soil for linear projects (highways) from any EC.
- ✓ Held: Struck down. Complete exemption without rigorous impact study violates Article 21 and Sustainable Development.
- ✓ Public participation and assessment cannot be arbitrarily waived off for private contractors.

Question 19: Right Against Climate Change

In which case did the Supreme Court explicitly recognize for the first time the "Right against adverse effects of Climate Change" under Article 21?

A M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Delhi Air)

B M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India (2024)

C Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. UOI

D Narmada Bachao Andolan v. UOI

Answer & Ratio 19

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: M.K. Ranjitsinh Case

M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India (2024)

3-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Action brought regarding preservation of the endangered Great Indian Bustard from power lines.
- Held: Right against adverse climate change is an integral element of **Article 21** (Right to Life) and Article 14.
- Citizens have a constitutional right to clean air, stable weather patterns, and green energy alternatives.

Question 20: Arbitration Modification Powers

In **Gayatri Balasamy v. ISG Novasoft (2025)**, the Constitutional Bench held that under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act, courts:

- A** Can rewrite any commercial arbitral award completely
- B** Cannot vary or modify the award but can only set aside or sever manifest computational errors
- C** Act as a full appellate court of facts
- D** Are barred from touching any award

Answer & Ratio 20

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: No award modification

Gayatri Balasamy v. ISG Novasoft (2025)

5-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Examined if court's power under Sec 34 includes modification of arbitral awards.
- ✓ Held: Section 34 does not enable court to rewrite awards or alter merits.
- ✓ Courts can only "set aside" or sever severable parts of awards.
- ✓ Recognized narrow exception only to correct obvious clerical, typographical, and computational errors.

Question 21: Article 142 and Teacher Standards

In 2025, the SC invoked its extraordinary powers under Article 142 to relax the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET) standard for:

A All private primary school teachers

B Teachers with less than 5 years of service remaining

C Minority institution teachers only

D The entire state of Bihar candidates

Answer & Ratio 21

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Under 5 Years Service Left

TET Relaxation case (2025)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Senior teachers who had served decades faced dismissal for not qualifying TET.
- ✓ Held: Dismissing teachers right before retirement on strict technical grounds is unfair.
- ✓ Used Article 142 to do complete justice, keeping in view their long experience and age factors.

Question 22: Speaker's Immunity Tenth Schedule

In **Padi Kaushik Reddy v. State of Telangana (2025)**, the Supreme Court placed guardrails on the Speaker's discretion, holding that:

- A** The Speaker's decision can never be reviewed by any court
- B** The Speaker's determinative jurisdiction on defection is justiciable
- C** The Governor has final power over Tenth Schedule disqualifications
- D** Speaker cannot disqualify if 10 MLAs defect

Answer & Ratio 22

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Speaker's Jurisdiction is Justiciable

Padi Kaushik Reddy v. State of Telangana (2025)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- The Speaker sat indefinitely on petitions seeking disqualification of turncoat MLAs.
- Held: Constitutional courts have jurisdiction to direct the Speaker to decide within a reasonable timeline.
- Speaker acts as a **quasi-judicial tribunal** under 10th Schedule; decisions are fully subject to judicial review.

Question 23: District Judge Eligibility

Regarding Article 233, what did the SC hold in 2025 regarding eligibility for direct recruitment to the post of District Judge?

A Only practicing advocates can apply

B Advocates who later entered subordinate judicial service can combine their bar practice and service years to meet the 7-year rule

C Subordinate judges are barred from District Judge posts

D Must require 10 years of Supreme Court practice

Answer & Ratio 23

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Combined Experience Allowed

Article 233 Interpretation Case (2025)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Candidates who entered judicial service after bar practice were disqualified as "not being advocates at application".
- ✓ Held: Article 233 does not exclude candidates who enter judicial services midway from eligibility.
- ✓ A combined 7 years of bar practice and judicial service qualifies for direct District Judge exams.

Question 24: Transgender Job Discrimination

The Supreme Court in October 2025 ordered compensation to be paid to a transgender woman because:

- A** She was evicted from her apartment
- B** She was denied school employment after revealing her gender identity
- C** She was refused admission in a law college
- D** She was banned from public transport usage

Answer & Ratio 24

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Denial of Employment

Transgender Discrimination case (2025)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ A qualified transgender teacher was selected, but then denied joining when her identity was disclosed.
- ✓ Held: Direct violation of Article 14, 15, and 21. Transgender persons have equal public employment rights.
- ✓ Ordered school, state, and union to pay ₹50,000 compensation each for mental agony and discrimination.

Question 25: UAPA Bail Standard

In **Syed Iftikhar Andrabi v. NIA (2026)**, the Supreme Court re-asserted which cardinal bail principle?

- A** Bail is a luxury, not a right
- B** "Bail is the rule, jail is the exception" applies even under UAPA when trial is heavily delayed
- C** UAPA courts cannot grant bail under any condition
- D** Anticipatory bail can be given under UAPA

Answer & Ratio 25

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Bail is Rule even under UAPA

Syed Iftikhar Andrabi v. NIA (2026)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- UAPA accused spent years in custody without trial starting.
- Held: Stringent statutory conditions like Sec 43D(5) cannot take away Article 21 rights.
- Extended the *K.A. Najeeb* principle. Delayed trial violates Article 21, forcing grant of bail.

Question 26: Land Acquisition Limitation

Under Section 74 of the LARR Act 2013, the Supreme Court in 2026 clarified the limitation period for appeals as:

A 30 days only with no extension

B 60 days, with a maximum condonable delay of another 60 days

C 90 days from award date

D No limitation applies to land acquisition

Answer & Ratio 26

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: 60 + 60 Days Rule

Land Acquisition Limitation Case (2026)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ High Courts had dismissed appeals filed past the statutory period.
- ✓ Held: Section 74 provides a strict statutory scheme (60 days + 60 days condonation).
- ✓ Limitation Act's general Section 5 cannot expand the condonable limit past the 120-day outer boundary.

Question 27: Waiver of Compensation

The Supreme Court in May 2026 held that a statutory right to land acquisition compensation:

- A** Can be voluntarily waived off by contract
- B** Cannot be forced to be surrendered as a condition for receiving other civic amenities
- C** Does not apply to municipal areas
- D** Is completely abolished

Answer & Ratio 27

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Compensation Non-Waiverable

Landowners Compensation Case (2026)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ A civic authority forced landowners to sign a waiver of statutory compensation to get building approvals.
- ✓ Held: State cannot use its municipal power to force surrender of constitutional rights under **Article 300A**.
- ✓ Such coercive contractual waivers are illegal and void.

Question 28: Parallel FIRs

In **Amit Katyal v. State of Haryana (2026)**, the Supreme Court declared that parallel FIRs:

A Are allowed across different states

B On the same transaction/allegation are impermissible and must be clubbed

C Do not require judicial intervention

D Are compulsory for distinct offenses

Answer & Ratio 28

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Parallel FIRs Barred

Amit Katyal v. State of Haryana (2026)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Multiple home-buyers filed different FIRs in Delhi and Haryana for same project fraud.
- Held: Repeated FIRs for same transaction/occurrence are impermissible under Section 154 CrPC / BNSS.
- Ordered the Haryana FIR to be clubbed with the prior Delhi EOW investigation.

Question 29: UP Madarsa Act Secularism

In 2024, the Supreme Court set aside the High Court ruling on the UP Board of Madarsa Education Act, holding that:

A The Act is completely unconstitutional

B The Act is constitutional as it merely regulates educational standards

C Madarasas cannot receive government funding

D Only religious education is valid

Answer & Ratio 29

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Act is Constitutional

Anjum Kadiri v. Union of India (2024)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Allahabad High Court had struck down the Madarsa Act for violating secularism.
- ✓ Held: A law cannot be struck down merely on broad claims of secularism; there must be specific provision violations.
- ✓ Secularism requires the State to proactively help minority institutions maintain modern educational standards.

Question 30: Speedy Trial Landmark

Which landmark Bihar-origin PIL case led to the constitutional recognition of the "Right to a Speedy Trial" under Article 21?

A Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1979)

B D.C. Wadhwa v. State of Bihar

C State of Bihar v. Kameshwar Singh

D People's Union for Democratic Rights v. UOI

Answer & Ratio 30

CORRECT ANSWER

Option A: Hussainara Khatoon

Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1979)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Brought to court based on a news report about thousands of Bihar undertrials rotting in jail for years.
- ✓ Held: Fundamental right to speedy trial is implicit in the Article 21 guarantee of life and liberty.
- ✓ Sparked the public interest litigation movement in India under Justice P.N. Bhagwati.

Question 31: Ordinance Raj Abuse

In **D.C. Wadhwa v. State of Bihar (1987)**, the Supreme Court struck down the re-promulgation of ordinances because:

A The Governor had no power to make ordinances

B Repeated re-promulgation of ordinances without legislative passage is a fraud on the Constitution

C Ordinances cannot touch land matters

D The Chief Minister passed them without cabinet approval

Answer & Ratio 31

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Fraud on the Constitution

D.C. Wadhwa v. State of Bihar (1987)

5-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- The State of Bihar repeatedly re-promulgated 256 ordinances for years without presenting them to the Legislature.
- Held: Power of executive to make ordinances is an emergency exception, not a substitute for standard legislature.
- Re-promulgating without legislature vote subverts democratic principles.

Question 32: Adultery Decriminalization

Which provision of the Indian Penal Code was struck down as unconstitutional in **Joseph Shine v. Union of India (2018)**?

A Section 377 (Homosexuality)

B Section 497 (Adultery)

C Section 309 (Attempt to suicide)

D Section 124A (Sedition)

Answer & Ratio 32

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Section 497 IPC

Joseph Shine v. Union of India (2018)

5-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Section 497 made only the third-party male punishable for adultery, treating women as property of husbands.
- ✓ Held: Struck down. Direct violation of Article 14 and 21. Gender discrimination has no place in constitutional framework.
- ✓ Adultery remains a valid ground for civil divorce but cannot carry criminal punishment.

Question 33: Right to Privacy

In **K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)**, the Right to Privacy was declared as a Fundamental Right under:

A Article 19 only

B Article 21 and Part III of the Constitution

C Article 300A

D Article 14 and 15 exclusively

Answer & Ratio 33

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Article 21

K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)

9-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Constitutional challenge to the Aadhaar scheme on privacy grounds.
- ✓ Held: Overruled *M.P. Sharma* (1954) and *Kharak Singh* (1962).
- ✓ Privacy is central to human dignity and is protected as an essential element of Article 21 and personal liberties.

Question 34: Euthanasia Living Will

In **Common Cause v. UOI (2018/2023)**, which right was recognized as an integral part of Article 21?

A Right to Active Euthanasia by lethal drug

B Right to die with dignity (Passive Euthanasia / Living Will)

C Right to commit suicide

D Right to refuse any medical test

Answer & Ratio 34

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Passive Euthanasia

Common Cause v. Union of India (2023 Mod)

5-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Petition sought guidelines to enable passive euthanasia for terminally ill patients.
- Held: Right to live with dignity includes right to die with dignity.
- Sanctioned "Living Wills" (Advance Medical Directives). In 2023, the Court simplified the execution process.

Question 35: Third Gender Recognition

Which landmark Supreme Court decision formally recognized transgender persons as the "Third Gender"?

A Suresh Kumar Koushal v. NAZ Foundation

B NALSA v. Union of India (2014)

C Navtej Singh Johar v. UOI

D Shabnam Hashmi v. UOI

Answer & Ratio 35

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: NALSA Judgment

National Legal Services Authority v. UOI (2014)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Petitioners sought legal identity for transgender citizens who faced harassment.
- ✓ Held: Gender identity is personal and falls under Article 14, 19, and 21.
- ✓ Affirmed transgender individuals' right to self-identify their gender as male, female, or third gender.
- ✓ Directed State to treat them as socially and educationally backward for welfare benefits.

Question 36: Triple Talaq Validity

In **Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017)**, the practice of Triple Talaq (Talaq-e-Biddat) was declared unconstitutional because:

A It was not mentioned in Quran

B It is manifestly arbitrary and violates Article 14

C It did not involve judicial mediation

D It was passed as an executive order

Answer & Ratio 36

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Manifestly Arbitrary

Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017)

5-Judge Bench (3:2 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Challenge to instantaneous, irrevocable divorce practiced under Muslim personal law.
- ✓ Held: Talaq-e-biddat allows husband to end marital tie whimsically.
- ✓ Introduced the doctrine of "**Manifest Arbitrariness**" to strike down such statutory or custom laws under Article 14.

Question 37: Section 377 IPC Reading Down

Which Supreme Court decision decriminalized consensual same-sex relations by reading down Section 377 of the IPC?

A Naz Foundation v. Govt of NCT Delhi

B Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018)

C Supriyo v. Union of India

D Joseph Shine v. UOI

Answer & Ratio 37

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Navtej Johar Case

Navtej Singh Johar v. UOI (2018)

5-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Overruled the earlier regressive judgment in *Suresh Koushal* (2013).
- Section 377 criminalized consensual adult sexual acts as "against order of nature".
- Held: Consensual adult intimacy is part of privacy, dignity and personal freedom under Article 19 & 21.

Question 38: Mineral Taxation Royalty

In **Mineral Area Development Authority (MADA) v. SAIL (2024)**, the 9-Judge Bench held that:

- A** Royalty paid on minerals is a tax
- B** Royalty is not a tax, and States have full power to levy tax on mine-bearing lands
- C** Only Union has tax power over minerals
- D** State tax on mineral rights is unconstitutional

Answer & Ratio 38

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Royalty is NOT a tax

MADA v. M/S Steel Authority of India (2024)

9-Judge Bench (8:1 Majority)

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Overruled 1989 judgment in *India Cement* which had held "royalty is a tax" (clerical mistake).
- ✓ Held: Royalty is a contractual consideration paid to the owner of mineral land.
- ✓ States have power under List II Entry 50 to tax mineral rights.
- ✓ This opens up immense taxation revenue opportunities for mineral-rich states.

Question 39: PMLA Written Grounds of Arrest

In **Pankaj Bansal v. Union of India (2023)**, the Supreme Court ruled that under Section 19 of the PMLA:

- A** Oral reading of arrest grounds is sufficient
- B** The Enforcement Directorate must provide written grounds of arrest to the accused immediately
- C** Grounds of arrest can be kept confidential till charge sheet
- D** No grounds are required under special laws

Answer & Ratio 39

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Written Grounds Mandatory

Pankaj Bansal v. Union of India (2023)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The accused challenged their arrest as they were only read out the PMLA charges orally.
- ✓ Held: To secure the constitutional safeguard of **Article 22(1)**, grounds of arrest must be physically in writing.
- ✓ Ensures the accused has a fair opportunity to consult counsel and seek bail.

Question 40: PMLA Section 45 Bail

Regarding the stringent "twin conditions" of bail under Section 45 PMLA, the SC in 2023 held that:

- A** They are completely unconstitutional
- B** They are valid but cannot justify endless incarceration without trial
- C** No court can bypass them under any condition
- D** They only apply to political figures

Answer & Ratio 40

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Limitations on Section 45

Tarun Kumar v. Enforcement Directorate
(2023)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Sec 45 PMLA requires courts to have reasonable ground that the accused is "not guilty" before granting bail.
- Held: Though strict, courts cannot use them to ignore Article 21 if trial delay is extreme.
- Prolonged detention without progress of trial violates the basic right to speedy justice.

Question 41: Free Speech and WhatsApp Status

In **Javed Ahmad Hajam v. State of Maharashtra (2024)**, critical WhatsApp status against government policy:

- A** Was held to constitute sedition under Sec 124A
- B** Was upheld as protected free speech under Article 19(1)(a)
- C** Was banned as anti-national conduct
- D** Was directed to be reviewed by IT department

Answer & Ratio 41

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Protected Free Speech

Javed Ahmad Hajam v. Maharashtra (2024)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ A Kashmiri professor was prosecuted under Sec 153A for WhatsApp status critical of abrogation of Article 370.
- ✓ Held: Quashed the criminal proceedings. Disagreement or criticism of state decisions is a fundamental right.
- ✓ Every citizen has right to voice dissent within peaceful limits; cannot be branded as generating enmity.

Question 42: Attempt vs Preparation

In the 2026 suo motu POCSO proceeding, the Supreme Court clarified that an "attempt" to commit an offense starts:

- A** Only when the actual penetration occurs
- B** Immediately after the completion of "preparation" in execution of the mens rea
- C** Only if physical injury is caused to the minor
- D** When the accused plans the act mentally

Answer & Ratio 42

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Post-Preparation Act

In Re: Order Allahabad HC (POCSO) (2026)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Allahabad High Court reduced a POCSO rape attempt charge to simple assault claiming it was merely "preparation".
- ✓ Held: Struck down. The moment the accused dragged the victim to a secluded spot, "preparation" was complete and "attempt" began.
- ✓ Restored the trial court's summon and charges under POCSO/376.

Question 43: Doctors & Consumer Protection

In the 2024 review, the Supreme Court held that services of which professional category fall under the Consumer Protection Act?

A Advocates representing in court

B Doctors providing medical services for consideration

C Both advocates and doctors

D Neither advocates nor doctors

Answer & Ratio 43

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Doctors Only

Bar Association v. Consumer Review (2024)

2-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Examined if services of lawyers and doctors are "commercial" services under Consumer Protection Act.
- Held: Advocates act as officers of Court; their legal services cannot be classified under the Act (quashed liability).
- Upheld *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha*. Doctors continue to remain liable under the CPA.

Question 44: Complete Charge-Sheet Default Bail

In **Sharif Ahmad v. State of UP (2024)**, to prevent default bail under Section 167(2), the charge-sheet:

- A** Can be a piecemeal investigation report
- B** Must be fully complete on material facts to enable Court to take cognizance
- C** Only needs to mention names of accused
- D** Can be filed post the 90-day window with leave

Answer & Ratio 44

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Materially Complete

Sharif Ahmad v. State of UP (2024)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Police filed an incomplete investigation report just to block the statutory default bail window.
- ✓ Held: Police cannot file a dummy, half-cooked charge-sheet.
- ✓ An incomplete charge sheet does not block the right of default bail under Section 167(2) CrPC / BNSS.

Question 45: Stray Dog Euthanasia

In May 2026, the Supreme Court modified previous absolute restrictions on animals, permitting euthanasia of:

A All strays in city limits

B Rabid and extremely dangerous dogs threatening human lives

C Dogs without registered owners

D Healthy dogs on public streets

Answer & Ratio 45

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Euthanasia of Rabid Dogs

Stray Dog Menace Order (2026)

2-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Appeals filed against municipal rules requiring protection even for rabid dogs.
- ✓ Held: Absolute balance must favor human life. Rabid or incurably sick dogs can be legally euthanized.
- ✓ Refused to completely withdraw general stray dog rules but allowed exceptions for extreme danger.

Question 46: Ninth Schedule Review

In **I.R. Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu (2007)**, the Supreme Court held that laws placed in the Ninth Schedule:

- A** Are completely immune to any judicial review
- B** Can be reviewed if they violate Part III rights or the Basic Structure of the Constitution
- C** Require simple parliamentary approval
- D** Are referred to the President directly

Answer & Ratio 46

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Open to Judicial Review

I.R. Coelho v. State of TN (2007)

9-Judge Bench (Unanimous)

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- Examined if Article 31B creates a complete blind spot for judicial review of Ninth Schedule laws.
- Held: Judicial review is a basic feature of the Constitution.
- All laws passed post-April 24, 1973 (Kesavananda date) placed in the Ninth Schedule are subject to basic structure tests.

Question 47: Governor sitting on Bills

In **State of Punjab v. Principal Secretary (2023)**, what did the Supreme Court hold regarding the Governor's power under Article 200?

- A** The Governor can hold bills indefinitely
- B** The Governor must return bills "as soon as possible" and cannot sit on them to veto legislation actively
- C** The Governor can reject any bill without reason
- D** Article 200 is unconstitutional

Answer & Ratio 47

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Return Bills Immediately

State of Punjab v. Principal Secy (2023)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ The State Governor withheld consent to crucial financial and policy bills passed by the assembly.
- ✓ Held: The Governor cannot stall the functioning of elected assemblies.
- ✓ If the Governor does not approve a bill, they must return it with suggestions "as soon as possible" under Article 200.

Question 48: Jail Caste Segregation

In **Sukanya Shantha v. Union of India (2024)**, the Supreme Court struck down provisions of state jail manuals because:

A They permitted private kitchens

B They institutionalized caste-based segregation of labor and cells

C They did not allow legal aid

D They allowed under-trials to mix with convicts

Answer & Ratio 48

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Caste Labor Segregation Void

Sukanya Shantha v. Union of India (2024)

3-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Various state jail manuals assigned sweeping cleaning tasks to lower castes and cooking tasks to upper castes.
- ✓ Held: Absolute violation of Article 14, 15, 17, and 21. Prisoners do not lose fundamental human rights in jail.
- ✓ Directed all states to delete references to caste from jail allocation and work manuals.

Question 49: Sedition Law Validity

Which landmark Bihar-origin case originally upheld the constitutionality of Sedition (Section 124A IPC) while narrowing down its scope?

A Shreya Singhal v. Union of India

B Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar (1962)

C Ram Nandan v. State of UP

D Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab

Answer & Ratio 49

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: Kedarnath Singh

Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar (1962)

5-Judge Bench

Case Facts & Legal Principles

- An activist made fiery speeches critical of the Bihar government and Congress party.
- Held: Upheld the section but ruled that mere critical words do not attract sedition unless they contain an ****incitement to violence**** or create a ****public disorder****.
- Remains the primary reference point in all sedition debates.

Question 50: CEC Selection Committee

In **Anoop Baranwal v. Union of India (2023)**, the Supreme Court ruled that the Chief Election Commissioner shall be appointed based on advice of a committee comprising:

A PM, Speaker of Lok Sabha, and CJI

B PM, Leader of Opposition in Lok Sabha, and Chief Justice of India

C President, Vice-President, and Chief Election Commissioner

D Union Cabinet ministers exclusively

Answer & Ratio 50

CORRECT ANSWER

Option B: PM, LoP, and CJI

Anoop Baranwal v. Union of India (2023)

5-Judge Bench

| Case Facts & Legal Principles

- ✓ Brought via PIL challenging the absolute unilateral power of the executive in appointing CEC/EC.
- ✓ Held: Democratic elections are basic structure; requires an independent mechanism of EC selection.
- ✓ Sought to remove the appointment from sole executive control by including the CJI in the process.



Preparation Concluded

BIHAR JUDICIAL SERVICES STRATEGY

You have successfully completed all 50 crucial Supreme Court and landmark MCQs. Ensure you consistently read the **Ratio Decidendi** and track changes in personal laws, environmental litigation, and constitutional benches.

Study hard, master the Bare Acts, and excel in the exam!