BLOGS

Kasturi Lal v. State of UP: Concept of Sovereign Immunity

Khushi Malviya · 25 Mar 2025

The case of Kasturi Lal Ralia Ram Jain v. State of Uttar Pradesh is a significant case in India that deals with the concept of sovereign immunity in the context of governmental functions.

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction Facts of the Case Issues Identified in the Case Provisions Highlighted in the Case Judgement Analysis of the Judgement Conclusion

Facts of the Case

Kasturi Lal Ralia Ram Jain, a jewelry firm partner, was detained by police in Meerut, suspected of having stolen goods. The police confiscated gold and silver from him, storing it in the police storage unit. Upon his release on bail, only the silver was returned. Despite his efforts, Kasturi Lal couldn't retrieve the gold. He filed a suit seeking the return of the seized items or their value with interest. The respondent, police authorities, rejected the claim, stating they weren't responsible for the gold. They claimed the head constable, Mohammad Aamir, who had absconded with the stolen gold and cash, couldn't be effectively pursued by the police.

Issues Identified in the Case

1. Negligence of Police Officers: Were the police officers negligent in safeguarding the gold taken from Kasturi Lal?
2. Liability of Respondent: Is the respondent, representing the state, responsible for compensating the applicant for the loss resulting from the negligence of public servants?
3. Categorization of Negligence: Can the tort of negligence committed by a public servant in the execution of statutory duties be considered an exercise of sovereign powers, and is the state consequently liable?

Provisions Mentioned in the Case

1. Article 300 of the Constitution: Article 300 outlines the legal capacity of the Government of India and State Governments to sue or be sued. It specifies that legal proceedings involving the Union of India or a State can be conducted under their respective names. The provision also allows them to sue or be sued in matters concerning their affairs, akin to legal actions involving the Dominion of India, provinces, or Indian States before the enactment of the Constitution.
2. Transitional Provisions: At the commencement of the Constitution, Article 300 provides transitional rules for pending legal proceedings. If legal actions involve the Dominion of India, the Union of India is deemed substituted. Similarly, if proceedings involve a Province or an Indian State, the corresponding State is deemed substituted.

Judgement

The Supreme Court, in its ruling, determined that the actions of the police officers fell within the purview of exercising sovereign powers. While acknowledging negligence on the part of the respondent's employee, the court emphasized that the employee was merely carrying out duties intrinsic to the sovereign powers vested in law enforcement.

Specifically, the authority to apprehend individuals, conduct searches, and seize property were statutes conferred upon the police officers as sovereign powers. Consequently, the state was absolved of liability as the actions were deemed an integral part of the exercise of sovereign powers rather than an individual or departmental lapse.

This decision underscores the court's recognition of the statutory framework surrounding police functions and their classification as sovereign powers, thereby shielding the state from liability in this particular instance and upholding the concept of sovereign immunity.

Sovereign immunity is a legal doctrine that protects governments and their agencies from being sued without their consent. Under this doctrine, the government, or "sovereign," cannot commit a legal wrong and therefore cannot be held liable for civil wrongs, such as negligence, that would result in liability for private individuals or entities.

Analysis of the Judgement

Tort law in India, shaped by judicial precedents and existing as part of the uncodified common law, has witnessed the evolution of vicarious liability of the state. The origins of Article 300 can be traced back to the Government of India Act, 1858, where Section 65 established the Secretary of State in Council as a suable body corporate. This provision granted individuals and entities similar legal and equitable recourse against the Secretary of State as they had against the East India Company.

The foundational ruling on the present case's subject was made in 1861 by Chief Justice Peacock in the ***Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company v. The Secretary of State for India***. This case highlighted a crucial distinction – acts by state-employed servants exercising sovereign powers and those unrelated to such delegation. If a public servant commits a tortuous act in the discharge of duties linked to sovereign powers, no damages claim is viable. However, if the act is unrelated to delegated sovereign powers, a damages action is permissible.

This clarity was reaffirmed in Kasturilal Ralia Ram Jain v. The State Of Uttar Pradesh, where the Supreme Court followed this precedent, emphasizing that the police officers' actions were sovereign, thereby absolving the State of liability.

Conclusion

The primary legal issue in the case was whether the State could be held liable for the tortious acts committed by its employees while engaged in governmental functions. The State argued that it was immune from such liability based on the principle of sovereign immunity. The Court clarified that the State could be vicariously liable for the acts of its employees if those acts are committed in the course of their employment and in the discharge of governmental functions. The decision in the Kasturi Lal case marked a significant departure from the traditional understanding of sovereign immunity in India and paved the way for individuals to seek compensation from the government for tortious acts committed by its employees. It established that the government could be held liable for torts committed by its employees in the course of their employment, subject to certain limitations and exceptions.

Read more about Sovereign Immunity here!