

BLOGS

Top 100 Important Supreme Court Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

Shruti chauhan · 14 Oct 2026

Preparing for CLAT PG 2027? Understanding important Supreme Court judgments is one of the most valuable parts of your preparation. The examination tests not just your knowledge of landmark case laws but also your ability to understand legal reasoning, identify judicial principles, interpret passages and apply the law to new situations.

Whether you are revising Constitutional Law, Criminal Law, Jurisprudence, Administrative Law or other core subjects, a strong understanding of landmark Supreme Court decisions can help you approach passage-based questions confidently.

In this Article, we have compiled **100 important Supreme Court judgments for CLAT PG 2027** with concise explanations of their key legal principles.

These judgments include foundational constitutional decisions, leading precedents from other law subjects, and important recent developments.

What you will find in this article:

- 100 important Supreme Court judgments for CLAT PG 2027
- Subject-wise landmark cases with legal principles
- Important constitutional and fundamental rights decisions
- Criminal law, family law, contract, tort and property judgments
- Environmental, corporate, labour and tax law cases
- Strategies for preparing judgment-based questions
- Frequently asked questions about CLAT PG case-law preparation

Why Are Supreme Court Judgments Important for CLAT PG 2027?

The CLAT PG examination assesses candidates' understanding of legal texts and their ability to apply legal principles.

According to the official CLAT PG 2027 syllabus, candidates may encounter extracts from court decisions, statutes and other primary legal materials. Questions can test comprehension, legal reasoning, awareness of relevant facts and issues, and application of the principles discussed.

This makes Supreme Court judgments particularly valuable.

For example, a passage based on *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* may require students to explain the basic structure doctrine. Similarly, a question concerning *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* may test privacy, proportionality and fundamental rights.

The objective should not be to memorise 100 case names alone. Instead, understand the legal issue, the Court's reasoning, the principle established, and how that principle operates in different factual situations.

1. Important Constitutional Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

Constitutional Law deserves substantial attention in CLAT PG preparation. Important areas include fundamental rights, constitutional amendments, judicial review, federalism, separation of powers, equality, privacy and individual liberties.

1. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)

Key principle: Basic Structure Doctrine

The Supreme Court held that Parliament can amend the Constitution under Article 368, but cannot destroy or alter its basic structure. This is among the most important decisions on constitutional supremacy and limitations on the amending power.

2. I.C. Golaknath v. State of Punjab (1967)

Key principle: Fundamental Rights and Constitutional Amendments

The Supreme Court held that Parliament could not amend Fundamental Rights under the then-understood constitutional framework. The position was subsequently changed by *Kesavananda Bharati*, making the relationship between these cases particularly important.

3. Shankari Prasad v. Union of India (1951)

Key principle: Parliamentary Amendment Power

The Court upheld Parliament's power to amend Fundamental Rights through constitutional amendments. This decision is useful for studying the development of Article 368 jurisprudence.

4. Minerva Mills v. Union of India (1980)

Key principle: Limited Amending Power and Constitutional Balance

The Court reaffirmed that limited amending power forms part of the basic structure. It also emphasized the constitutional importance of harmony between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles.

5. Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain (1975)

Key principle: Free and Fair Elections

The Supreme Court invalidated a constitutional amendment provision that sought to shield certain election disputes from judicial scrutiny. The judgment is important for democracy, judicial review and basic structure principles.

6. S.R. Bommai v. Union of India (1994)

Key principle: Federalism and President's Rule

The Court established important limits on the arbitrary use of Article 356 and recognized federalism and secularism as important constitutional principles.

7. Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu (1992)

Key principle: Anti-Defection Law

The Supreme Court largely upheld the Tenth Schedule while recognizing judicial review of decisions made by the Speaker under the anti-defection framework.

8. Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India (2015)

Key principle: Judicial Independence and NJAC

The Court struck down the 99th Constitutional Amendment and the National Judicial Appointments Commission framework, holding that judicial independence was part of the Constitution's basic structure.

9. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017)

Key principle: Right to Privacy

A nine-judge bench unanimously recognized privacy as a fundamental right protected by the Constitution, particularly within the guarantees of life, liberty and dignity.

10. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar) v. Union of India (2018)

Key principle: Aadhaar, Privacy and Proportionality

The Court upheld the Aadhaar framework subject to important restrictions and invalidated certain uses of Aadhaar. The decision is significant for privacy and constitutional scrutiny of identification systems.

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

Key principle: Equality, Dignity and Sexual Orientation

The Supreme Court decriminalized consensual same-sex sexual conduct between adults by reading down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code.

12. Joseph Shine v. Union of India (2018)

Key principle: Gender Equality and Personal Autonomy

The Court struck down the criminal offence of adultery under Section 497 IPC, finding it incompatible with constitutional guarantees of equality and dignity.

13. Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015)

Key principle: Freedom of Speech on the Internet

The Supreme Court invalidated Section 66A of the Information Technology Act for violating freedom of speech and expression.

14. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India (2020)

Key principle: Internet Restrictions and Proportionality

The Court emphasized that restrictions affecting freedoms exercised through the internet must satisfy constitutional requirements, including proportionality, and cannot be imposed indefinitely without appropriate review.

15. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)

Key principle: Fair, Just and Reasonable Procedure

The Court substantially expanded the interpretation of Article 21 by requiring procedures affecting personal liberty to be fair, just and reasonable.

16. A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras (1950)

Key principle: Preventive Detention and Personal Liberty

This early judgment adopted a comparatively narrow interpretation of fundamental rights. Its approach was substantially displaced by later decisions, particularly *Maneka Gandhi*.

17. ADM Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla (1976)

Key principle: Personal Liberty During Emergency

The majority's restrictive approach to judicial protection of liberty during the Emergency was later expressly overruled in *K.S. Puttaswamy*. Study this judgment as an example of constitutional doctrine that has changed.

18. Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation (1985)

Key principle: Right to Livelihood

The Supreme Court recognized livelihood as an important component of the right to life under Article 21, while also addressing the legal framework governing eviction.

19. Unni Krishnan v. State of Andhra Pradesh (1993)

Key principle: Right to Education

The Court recognized constitutional protection for education under Article 21, particularly for children. Study the judgment alongside the subsequent insertion of Article 21A and later education jurisprudence.

20. Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka (1992)

Key principle: Education and Human Dignity

The Court linked education with the constitutional right to life and dignity. Its broad approach was later qualified in *Unni Krishnan*.

21. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)

Key principle: Workplace Sexual Harassment

The Court established the Vishaka Guidelines to prevent and address workplace sexual harassment in the absence of a dedicated statute. The subsequent POSH Act, 2013, is important for understanding the current legal framework.

22. National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India (2014)

Key principle: Transgender Rights and Gender Identity

The Supreme Court recognized constitutional protection for transgender persons, including dignity, equality and recognition of gender identity.

23. Supriyo v. Union of India (2023)

Key principle: Marriage Equality and Constitutional Rights

The Constitution Bench declined to recognize a general constitutional right to same-sex marriage under the existing statutory framework. The case is important for studying judicial review, equality, institutional limits and the separation of powers.

24. Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India (2024)

Key principle: Electoral Bonds and the Right to Information

The Supreme Court struck down the electoral bonds scheme, emphasizing voters' right to information regarding political funding under Article 19(1)(a).

25. In Re: Article 370 of the Constitution (2023)

Key principle: Federalism and Constitutional Change

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutional measures that resulted in the removal of Article 370's special-status framework. The case is important for understanding federalism, constitutional procedure and the Court's treatment of Jammu and Kashmir's constitutional position.

2. Important Criminal Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

Criminal Law questions may concern arrest, bail, investigation, evidence, sentencing, procedural safeguards and criminal liability.

26. Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980)

Key principle: Rarest of Rare Doctrine

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of the death penalty while emphasizing that it should be imposed only in the rarest of rare cases.

27. Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab (1983)

Key principle: Death Penalty Sentencing

The Court elaborated factors relevant to applying the rarest of rare framework. The judgment should be studied alongside later developments in sentencing jurisprudence.

28. Mithu v. State of Punjab (1983)

Key principle: Mandatory Death Penalty

The Court struck down Section 303 IPC, which required a mandatory death sentence in specified circumstances, as unconstitutional.

29. D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal (1997)

Key principle: Arrest and Custodial Safeguards

The Court laid down safeguards intended to prevent custodial abuse and protect the rights of arrested persons.

30. Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar (2014)

Key principle: Protection Against Unnecessary Arrest

The Supreme Court emphasized statutory safeguards against routine arrest, particularly in offences punishable with imprisonment up to seven years.

31. Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh (2013)

Key principle: Registration of FIR

The Court held that registration of an FIR is mandatory when information discloses a cognizable offence, subject to recognized categories where a preliminary inquiry may be appropriate.

32. Joginder Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh (1994)

Key principle: Arrest Must Be Justified

The Court emphasized that the legal power to arrest does not automatically justify an arrest in every case.

33. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1979-1980)

Key principle: Right to Speedy Trial

Through a series of orders, the Supreme Court recognized speedy trial as an essential aspect of Article 21 and highlighted the plight of undertrial prisoners.

34. Selvi v. State of Karnataka (2010)

Key principle: Protection Against Self-Incrimination

The Court restricted involuntary use of investigative techniques such as narco-analysis, polygraph examinations and brain-mapping, emphasizing constitutional protections.

35. Nandini Satpathy v. P.L. Dani (1978)

Key principle: Right Against Self-Incrimination During Questioning

The Court recognized the importance of protecting individuals against compelled self-incriminatory responses during police interrogation.

36. Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu (2020)

Key principle: Confessions Under the NDPS Act

The Supreme Court held that officers exercising powers under Section 53 of the NDPS Act are police officers for purposes of Section 25 of the Evidence Act, with important consequences for the admissibility of confessions.

37. Prakash Singh v. Union of India (2006)

Key principle: Police Reforms

The Supreme Court issued directions aimed at improving police accountability, institutional independence and professional functioning.

38. Sakiri Vasu v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2008)

Key principle: Remedies for Failure to Investigate

The Court explained the remedies available under criminal procedure when the police fail to register or properly investigate a cognizable offence.

39. Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra (1984)

Key principle: Circumstantial Evidence

The Court explained the stringent requirements for establishing guilt through a complete chain of circumstantial evidence.

40. K.M. Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra (1961)

Key principle: Grave and Sudden Provocation

The case is important for understanding the defence of grave and sudden provocation and the distinction between murder and culpable homicide not amounting to murder.

3. Important Administrative Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

41. A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India (1969)

Key principle: Natural Justice and Administrative Decisions

The Court emphasized that principles of natural justice can apply to administrative decisions, especially where impartiality is essential.

42. State of Orissa v. Dr. Binapani Dei (1967)

Key principle: Right to Be Heard

An administrative decision affecting civil rights must ordinarily comply with natural justice, including an opportunity to be heard.

43. Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commissioner (1978)

Key principle: Administrative Orders and Stated Reasons

The Court emphasized that the validity of an administrative order generally must be evaluated on the reasons contained in the order rather than later explanations.

44. E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu (1974)

Key principle: Arbitrariness and Equality

The Court developed the relationship between arbitrariness and the equality guarantee under Article 14.

45. Ajay Hasia v. Khalid Mujib Sehravardi (1981)

Key principle: Instrumentality of the State

The Court identified factors relevant to determining whether an organization qualifies as an instrumentality or agency of the State under Article 12.

46. Tata Cellular v. Union of India (1994)

Key principle: Judicial Review of Government Contracts

The Court explained the limited scope of judicial review of administrative and contractual decisions, focusing on legality, procedural fairness and decision-making rather than the Court substituting its own commercial judgment.

47. Centre for PIL v. Union of India (2011)

Key principle: Institutional Integrity in Public Appointments

The Supreme Court emphasized institutional integrity when reviewing the appointment of the Central Vigilance Commissioner.

48. Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel (1985)

Key principle: Natural Justice and Constitutional Exceptions

The Court considered the scope of the constitutional exceptions to departmental inquiries under Article 311(2).

49. Swadeshi Cotton Mills v. Union of India (1981)

Key principle: Audi Alteram Partem

The Court emphasized the importance of giving affected parties an opportunity to be heard unless the applicable legal framework validly excludes that requirement.

50. Ranjit Thakur v. Union of India (1987)

Key principle: Proportionality and Bias

The judgment is significant for proportionality in punishment and the requirement of impartial adjudication.

4. Important Family Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

51. Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum (1985)

Key principle: Maintenance Rights

The Court held that Section 125 CrPC could provide maintenance relief to a divorced Muslim woman, giving rise to significant subsequent legislative and judicial developments.

52. Danial Latifi v. Union of India (2001)

Key principle: Fair Provision for Divorced Muslim Women

The Supreme Court upheld the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986, while interpreting its provisions to require a reasonable and fair provision for the divorced woman's future.

53. Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017)

Key principle: Instant Triple Talaq

The Supreme Court invalidated the practice of talaq-e-biddat, commonly known as instant triple talaq.

54. Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India (1995)

Key principle: Conversion and Bigamy

The Court held that conversion to Islam does not automatically dissolve an existing Hindu marriage, and a subsequent marriage may attract consequences under bigamy law.

55. Lily Thomas v. Union of India (2000)

Key principle: Religious Conversion and Marriage

The Court reaffirmed that religious conversion does not, by itself, dissolve a subsisting marriage.

56. Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M. (2018)

Key principle: Autonomy in Choosing a Spouse

The Court emphasized an adult individual's right to choose a spouse as part of personal liberty and autonomy.

57. Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2006)

Key principle: Freedom to Marry by Choice

The Supreme Court protected the right of consenting adults to marry across caste boundaries without unlawful interference.

58. Seema v. Ashwani Kumar (2006)

Key principle: Marriage Registration

The Court issued directions concerning the registration of marriages to improve legal certainty and protection of rights.

59. Githa Hariharan v. Reserve Bank of India (1999)

Key principle: Guardianship and Gender Equality

The Court interpreted statutory guardianship provisions in a manner that recognized the mother's ability to act as natural guardian in appropriate circumstances.

60. Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma (2020)

Key principle: Equal Coparcenary Rights of Daughters

The Court clarified that daughters acquire coparcenary rights by birth under the amended Hindu Succession Act, irrespective of whether their fathers were alive on the date of the 2005 amendment.

5. Important Contract Law and Tort Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

61. Fateh Chand v. Balkishan Das (1963)

Key principle: Compensation for Breach of Contract

The Court explained that compensation under Section 74 of the Indian Contract Act must be reasonable and does not automatically equal the amount specified in a penalty clause.

62. Maula Bux v. Union of India (1969)

Key principle: Forfeiture and Proof of Loss

The Court considered when actual loss must be proved to recover contractual compensation, including in cases involving forfeiture of deposits.

63. Kailash Nath Associates v. Delhi Development Authority (2015)

Key principle: Liquidated Damages and Forfeiture

The judgment clarified the application of Section 74, particularly where a party seeks forfeiture or compensation without establishing the necessary legal basis.

64. ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd. (2003)

Key principle: Public Policy and Arbitral Awards

The Court developed the public-policy basis for challenging domestic arbitral awards, including the concept of patent illegality. Students should also examine subsequent arbitration-law amendments and judicial developments.

65. Central Inland Water Transport Corporation v. Brojo Nath Ganguly (1986)

Key principle: Unconscionable Contractual Terms

The Supreme Court invalidated an unfair employment-related contractual condition and discussed unequal bargaining power and public policy.

66. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case) (1987)

Key principle: Absolute Liability

The Court developed the doctrine of absolute liability for enterprises engaged in hazardous or inherently dangerous activities.

67. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995)

Key principle: Medical Services and Consumer Protection

The Supreme Court considered the circumstances in which medical services fall within consumer-protection legislation. Study this case with the subsequent statutory framework.

68. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005)

Key principle: Criminal Medical Negligence

The Court distinguished civil negligence from the higher degree of negligence required to establish criminal liability in medical negligence cases.

69. N. Nagendra Rao & Co. v. State of Andhra Pradesh (1994)

Key principle: State Liability in Tort

The judgment is important for understanding the limits of sovereign immunity and the liability of the State for wrongful acts.

70. Municipal Corporation of Delhi v. Subhagwanti (1966)

Key principle: Res Ipsa Loquitur

The case applied the principle of *res ipsa loquitur* in a negligence claim arising from the collapse of a clock tower.

6. Important Property Law and Company Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

71. Suraj Lamp & Industries v. State of Haryana (2011)

Key principle: Transfer of Immovable Property

The Court held that transactions commonly described as GPA sales do not, by themselves, convey ownership of immovable property like a registered deed of conveyance.

72. Narandas Karsondas v. S.A. Kamtam (1977)

Key principle: Agreement to Sell and Ownership

The Court explained that a contract for the sale of immovable property does not, by itself, create an interest in or charge over that property.

73. K.T. Plantation v. State of Karnataka (2011)

Key principle: Constitutional Right to Property

The Court examined Article 300A and constitutional limitations on deprivation of property.

74. Property Owners Association v. State of Maharashtra (2024)

Key principle: Private Property and Article 39(b)

A nine-judge bench held that not all privately owned property automatically falls within the expression “material resources of the community” under Article 39(b). The decision is important for constitutional property rights and Directive Principles.

75. Vidya Devi v. State of Himachal Pradesh (2020)

Key principle: Property Cannot Be Taken Without Legal Authority

The Court reaffirmed that the State cannot deprive a person of property without complying with constitutional and legal requirements.

76. Bacha F. Guzdar v. Commissioner of Income Tax (1955)

Key principle: Company and Shareholder Are Distinct

The judgment explained that shareholders do not directly own the company's underlying assets merely because they hold shares.

77. Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Escorts Ltd. (1986)

Key principle: Corporate Personality and Shareholder Rights

The Court discussed corporate governance, the rights of shareholders and the circumstances in which courts may consider the realities behind corporate structures.

78. Swiss Ribbons v. Union of India (2019)

Key principle: Constitutional Validity of the IBC

The Supreme Court upheld significant provisions of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code and explained the objectives of the insolvency-resolution framework.

79. Innoventive Industries v. ICICI Bank (2017)

Key principle: Corporate Insolvency Resolution

The Court explained important aspects of the IBC framework for initiating corporate insolvency resolution proceedings.

80. Mobiloxx Innovations v. Kirusa Software (2017)

Key principle: Pre-existing Disputes Under the IBC

The Court clarified how an existing genuine dispute may affect an operational creditor's insolvency application.

7. Important Environmental Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

81. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Ganga Pollution Cases)

Key principle: Industrial Pollution and Environmental Protection

The Supreme Court addressed pollution caused by industries and emphasized the enforcement of environmental responsibilities.

82. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Taj Trapezium Case) (1996)

Key principle: Protection of Cultural Heritage and Environment

The Court ordered measures to reduce industrial pollution threatening the Taj Mahal and its surrounding environment.

83. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996)

Key principle: Precautionary Principle and Polluter Pays

The Court recognized the precautionary principle and polluter-pays principle as important features of Indian environmental law.

84. Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India (1996)

Key principle: Environmental Remediation

The Supreme Court addressed industrial pollution and the financial responsibility of polluting enterprises for environmental damage.

85. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar (1991)

Key principle: Pollution-Free Water and Air

The Court recognized the right to enjoy pollution-free water and air as part of the right to life under Article 21.

86. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India (2000)

Key principle: Development and Environmental Protection

The Court examined the relationship between large infrastructure projects, environmental considerations and judicial review.

87. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India (Forest Conservation Litigation)

Key principle: Forest Protection

This continuing litigation produced major directions concerning forest conservation and interpretation of forest-protection laws.

88. Lafarge Umiam Mining v. Union of India (2011)

Key principle: Environmental Clearance and Sustainable Development

The Court considered environmental decision-making and sustainable development in the context of mining-related regulatory approvals.

89. Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Rohit Prajapati (2020)

Key principle: Ex Post Facto Environmental Clearances

The Supreme Court addressed the illegality of routine retrospective environmental clearances under the applicable regulatory framework.

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

Key principle: Climate Change and Fundamental Rights

The Court recognized constitutional protection against the adverse effects of climate change under Articles 14 and 21 while considering the conservation of endangered bird species and renewable-energy infrastructure.

8. Important Labour Law, Tax Law and International Law Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

91. Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board v. A. Rajappa (1978)

Key principle: Meaning of Industry

The Court developed a broad interpretation of “industry” under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Its continuing application should be read alongside subsequent legislation and judicial developments.

92. Randhir Singh v. Union of India (1982)

Key principle: Equal Pay for Equal Work

The Court connected equal pay for equal work with constitutional equality principles, subject to legally relevant distinctions.

93. People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982)

Key principle: Forced Labour and Workers' Rights

The Court held that payment below the applicable minimum wage could constitute forced labour within the meaning of Article 23 in the circumstances considered.

94. Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India (1984)

Key principle: Bonded Labour and Public Interest Litigation

The Court addressed bonded labour, human dignity and the role of constitutional remedies in enforcing vulnerable workers' rights.

95. Steel Authority of India Ltd. v. National Union Waterfront Workers (2001)

Key principle: Contract Labour and Absorption

The Constitution Bench clarified that abolition of contract labour under the relevant statute does not automatically result in absorption of those workers as permanent employees.

96. Commissioner of Income Tax v. B.C. Srinivasa Setty (1981)

Key principle: Capital Gains and Computation

The Court examined the relationship between a capital-gains charging provision and the feasibility of computing the taxable gain.

97. McDowell & Co. Ltd. v. Commercial Tax Officer (1985)

Key principle: Tax Avoidance and Colourable Devices

The judgment is important for debates concerning legitimate tax planning, tax avoidance and colourable devices. Later decisions should be read to understand the current position.

98. Vodafone International Holdings v. Union of India (2012)

Key principle: Cross-Border Taxation

The Court considered the taxation of an offshore share transaction involving an indirect interest in Indian assets. Subsequent legislative changes are essential to understanding its present significance.

99. Gramophone Company of India Ltd. v. Birendra Bahadur Pandey (1984)

Key principle: International Law and Municipal Law

The Court discussed the relationship between customary international law and domestic law, subject to the Constitution and applicable legislation.

100. Jolly George Varghese v. Bank of Cochin (1980)

Key principle: Human Rights Treaties and Domestic Enforcement

The Court considered civil detention in debt recovery and the relevance of international human-rights principles when interpreting domestic legal safeguards.

9. How to Prepare These 100 Supreme Court Judgments for CLAT PG 2027

Reading a hundred judgments in full can be difficult if your examination is approaching. A structured revision strategy can help.

Step 1: Understand the facts and legal issues

For every case, try to answer:

1. What happened?
2. Which constitutional or statutory provision was involved?
3. What legal question did the Supreme Court consider?
4. What did the Court decide?
5. What legal principle emerged from the decision?

Step 2: Identify the ratio decidendi

The *ratio decidendi* is the legal reasoning necessary for a court's decision and is central to understanding binding precedent.

Distinguish it from observations that are not necessary to decide the case.

Step 3: Link judgments to constitutional provisions

For example:

Constitutional provision	Important judgments
Article 14	E.P. Royappa; Navtej Singh Johar
Article 19(1)(a)	Shreya Singhal; Association for Democratic Reforms (2024)
Article 21	Maneka Gandhi; K.S. Puttaswamy
Article 32	Bandhua Mukti Morcha
Article 300A	K.T. Plantation; Vidya Devi
Article 368	Kesavananda Bharati; Minerva Mills

Step 4: Compare related judgments

Some of the most important judicial principles become clearer when studied through connected decisions.

- **Basic Structure:** Shankari Prasad / Golaknath / Kesavananda Bharati/ Minerva Mills
- **Personal Liberty:** A.K. Gopalan / Maneka Gandhi / K.S. Puttaswamy
- **Privacy and Autonomy:** Puttaswamy/ Navtej Singh Johar / Supriyo
- **Arrest Safeguards:** Joginder Kumar / D.K. Basu / Arnesh Kumar
- **Property Rights:** K.T. Plantation / Vidya Devi / Property Owners Association
- **Muslim Women's Rights:** Shah Bano / Danial Latifi / Shayara Bano

Remember that later judgments do not necessarily overrule the earlier decisions listed in these sequences. Sometimes they distinguish, clarify, expand or develop their principles.

Step 5: Practise passage-based MCQs

After revising a judgment, attempt questions requiring you to:

- Identify the governing rule
- Distinguish the ratio from non-binding observations

- Apply the rule to a hypothetical factual situation
- Evaluate competing legal arguments
- Understand how later decisions have changed the law

This type of practice closely aligns with the comprehension and application skills identified in the official CLAT PG syllabus.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. Which Supreme Court judgments are most important for CLAT PG 2027?

Important foundational judgments include *Kesavananda Bharati*, *Minerva Mills*, *Maneka Gandhi*, *K.S. Puttaswamy*, *S.R. Bommai*, *Vishaka*, *Shreya Singhal*, *Navtej Singh Johar* and *D.K. Basu*. More recent constitutional decisions, including the 2024 electoral bonds ruling and *Property Owners Association*, are also worth studying.

There is no official list guaranteeing that particular judgments will appear in the examination.

2. How many judgments should I prepare for CLAT PG 2027?

There is no fixed number. This list of 100 cases offers a structured starting point, but strong preparation also requires studying legal concepts, statutory provisions, recent judgments and previous-year questions.

3. Are recent Supreme Court judgments important for CLAT PG 2027?

Yes. Recent decisions can help students understand developments in constitutional interpretation, criminal procedure, environmental regulation and other subjects. They should be studied alongside established landmark cases rather than replacing them.

[Read Top Supreme Court Judgments of September, 2026 here.](#)

[Read Top Supreme Court Judgments of August, 2026 here.](#)

[Check out all other case laws updates from here.](#)

4. Is Constitutional Law the most important subject for CLAT PG?

Constitutional Law is expressly included in the official syllabus and merits significant preparation. However, candidates should not ignore the other subjects, as the examination covers multiple areas of substantive law.

5. Should I read complete judgments or case summaries?

Start with accurate case summaries to understand the facts, issues and principles. Read important passages and full judgments where necessary to develop comprehension of judicial reasoning.

6. Can I prepare for CLAT PG 2027 using only these 100 judgments?

No. These cases form one component of preparation. Students should also study the official syllabus, statutes, subject-wise notes, previous-year papers and practice questions.

[Read all important cases from here.](#)

7. Where can I read Supreme Court judgments for free?

You can access judgments through the official Supreme Court of India website.

[Click here to get all important Supreme Court Judgments.](#)

8. How should I revise landmark judgments before the examination?

Prepare a short revision card for each case containing the case name, year, relevant statutory or constitutional provision, legal issue, holding and important subsequent developments. Test yourself through passage-based questions.

Save this article for revision, revisit important judgments regularly, and combine case-law study with previous-year questions and mock tests.

For more CLAT PG preparation resources, explore CLATatalogue's study notes, previous-year papers, case-law updates and practice materials.

You can download this Article from the download option given above and save it for revision.