BLOGS

Top 50 Important Supreme Court Judgments of 2025-2026 for CLAT PG 2027

Julie Nigam · 09 Nov 2026

Which Supreme Court judgments should a CLAT PG student revise first? Reading every judgment delivered in a year is not practical. The better method is to identify decisions that explain a constitutional principle, interpret an important statute or show how courts protect rights in real disputes.

This article presents 50 important Supreme Court judgments for CLAT PG 2027. The list is prepared mainly from the 2025 monthly judgment compilations. The cases below are arranged subject-wise so it may be feasible for students to revise and connect with legal principles. Some of the decisions are final judgments, while a few are important constitutional or procedural orders. For a broader subject wise revision list see CLATalogue's post on Important judgments of CLATPG 2027.

Cases on Constitutional law, Elections and Governance

1. Tanvi Behl v. Shrey Goel: Residence : Reservation in Postgraduate Medical Examination

The Supreme Court said that reservation in admission to post-graduate medical courses on a broad resident basis is illegal under Article 14. At this level, admissions have to be mostly on NEET merit. It further said that there may be some preference which the institution may give, but a state cannot divide its residents into a separate class in respect of all the seats in PG courses.

The case further related to the connection between the equality and the national merit and correct institutional preference.

2. Padi Kaushik Reddy v. State of Telangana : Delay by the Speaker under the Tenth Schedule

The Court had ruled that the Speaker would be the first authority to decide on disqualification of a member under the anti-defection law. But this power cannot be used as a tool to delay the decision in perpetuity. The Court directed the Speaker to conclude the proceedings within a reasonable time. It observed that the Speaker was the principal role player, but the constitutional authorities were not insulated from judicial review and accountability.

The case connects with the previous landmark judgments on the tenth schedule such as Kihoto Hollohan and Subhash Desai.

3. Bihar Electoral Roll Revision Proceedings : Fair Procedure in Voter list Revision

While dealing with the revision of electoral rolls in Bihar, the Court stressed transparency and a real opportunity for voters to file claims and objections. It directed that documents such as Aadhaar, ration cards and Electoral Photo Identity Cards be considered for identity verification.

It distinguishes the right to vote as statutory, but the procedure for preparing electoral rolls must still be fair, non-arbitrary and transparent.

4. UOI v. Future Gaming Solutions Pvt. Ltd : Taxation of Lottery Activity

The Court held that lottery distributors purchased and resold tickets as principals and were not agents providing a taxable service to the State. It also treated conducting a lottery as betting and gambling within the relevant State List entries.

Thus in this case the court revised the distinction between an agent and an independent principal, and the distribution of legislative taxing power between the Union and the States.

5. State of Assam v. Arabinda Rabha : Cancellation of a Defective Recruitment Process

The case held that selection does not create an indefeasible right to appointment. The court held that a selected person has no indefeasible right of appointment from the select list. A selection process, which is vitiated by systemic irregularities or violation of reservations or favoritism, is liable to be struck down by the State as *ab initio*. The decision still has to comply with Article 14 and the limits of judicial review.

6. Rajeeb Kalita v. UOI : Sanitation and Access to Justice

In this case the court interpreted the dignity and right to life under Article 21 to include clean, accessible and usable toilets in courts and tribunals. It ordered an allowance for the entry of persons with disability, women and transgenders inside the court premises.

It stated that in Article 21 the question was of dignity and access to justice is included not only physical survival.

7. State of U.P. v. Gaurav Kumar : Environmental Clearance and a Final District Survey Report

The Court held that mining clearance cannot be granted on the basis of only a draft District Survey Report where the law requires a final report. Environmental procedure is not a technical formality rather it helps assess the effect of mining on land, rivers, forests and communities.

Therefore, administrative and environmental authorities must follow mandatory procedural safeguards before permitting activities that may cause ecological harm.

8. Limits of Interim Constitutional Relief Waqf Amendment Bill, 2025

The Court did not stay the whole Waqf Amendment Act but stayed some provisions of it. It challenged the provisions of a complete ban for a period of five years and the power of an officer to determine whether the property is waqf property or government property. For full explanation read case brief on the Waqf Amendment Act, 2025.

Criminal Law, Arrest and Fair Trial

9. Om Prakash v. Union of India : Juvenility can be raised later

The Court held that a claim of juvenility may be considered even after the criminal case has ended and the sentence has been commuted. The accused's age must be assessed through reliable material under juvenile-justice law. The Court protected the rehabilitative purpose of the Juvenile Justice Act.

This case is important as it highlights that a legitimate claim of juvenility does not get defeated just because the trial, appeal or mercy proceedings have ended.

10. ABC v. State of Chhattisgarh: Proof of age under juvenile justice law

The Court held that school records are relevant and should not be accepted at face value where the source of entry on the record is dubious. Age, therefore, should be determined as per statutory procedure on other reliable material if need be.

Such cases show documentary evidence cannot be taken as conclusive. Its validity and origin should be questioned.

11. Vihaan Kumar v. State of Haryana: Communication of grounds of arrest

Merely telling the arrested person that he or she is under arrest or giving an arrest memo or informing a relative is not sufficient, the Court observed. The basic grounds of arrest must be communicated in the language understood by the person. It is the responsibility of the arresting agency to prove details.

The case shows that the failure to communicate the reasons for arrest breaches Articles 21 and 22(1) and may lead to the illegality of the arrest and remand. This case is very vital under the new regime of criminal procedure.

12. Satendar Kumar v. Central Bureau of Investigation: Statutory method of serving arrest notice

The Court refused to treat WhatsApp or another electronic method as a substitute for the statutory procedure for serving a notice under Section 35 of the BNSS. Courts cannot rewrite a procedural provision merely for convenience when personal liberty is involved. The point should be read with CLATalogue's Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita revision material, which explains the wider transition from the IPC framework to the new criminal laws.

Therefore it is important to note that technology may assist procedure, but it cannot replace a statutory safeguard unless the law permits it.

13. Radhika Agarwal v. UOI: Arrest under customs and GST laws

The Court upheld the relevant arrest powers but stated that arrest cannot be based on mere suspicion or used to force tax payment. The authorised officer must have legally valid reasons, supported by material, and must communicate the grounds in writing. Criminal-procedure safeguards apply where the special law does not exclude them.

Remember that special statutes may create arrest powers, but constitutional safeguards and fair procedure continue to control their exercise.

14. Amlesh Kumar v. State of Bihar: Narco-Analysis and Personal liberty

It was held that forced narco-analysis tests violate the protection against self-incrimination under Article 20(3) and the right to mental privacy under Article 21. Hence the time of a bail hearing, cannot become an occasion for an uncontrolled investigation. The court also held that a voluntary test is not an automatic right either. Selvi v. State of Karnataka is a landmark case associated with this case.

15. Annu @ Aniket through his Father v. Union of India : Preventive detention and public order

The Court distinguished ordinary law and order from public order. Preventive detention is exceptional and cannot be used merely because a person has criminal cases or may create an ordinary law and order problem. It held that the detaining authority must also deal properly with the detainee's representation.

It is important to remember that preventive detention requires a real connection with the statutory threat to public order. It cannot become a substitute for ordinary criminal prosecution.

16. Aftab v. State of Uttar Pradesh: Liberty cannot be defeated by paperwork

In this case although bail had been granted, the person remained in custody because the release document contained a technical omission. The Court called the continued detention a serious failure of justice, ordered an inquiry and directed compensation.

Therefore it is important to note that administrative or clerical errors cannot override a clear judicial order restoring personal liberty.

17. Kattavellai @ Devakar v. State of Tamil Nadu: DNA evidence and chain of custody

The Court stated that DNA evidence is useful only when the entire process is reliable. Investigators must properly collect, seal, preserve and document the samples. A scientific label cannot repair a broken chain of custody or a defective investigation.

Therefore, scientific evidence must satisfy ordinary rules of reliability, proof and continuity. The case also raised the need to consider compensation for long wrongful imprisonment.

18. Chandan Pasi v. State of Bihar: Meaningful examination under section 313 of Crpc

The Court found that the statements of several accused persons had been recorded as almost identical. It found that they were not actually recorded individually rather suggested a copy and paste approach. The court held that examination under section 313 is not a ritual. Therefore for fair trial each accused must receive a genuine opportunity to understand and answer the circumstances against them.

19. Ghanshyam Soni v. State (NCT of Delhi): Vague allegations of cruelty

The Court quashed proceedings where the allegations of matrimonial cruelty were general and did not disclose the essential ingredients of the offence. The ruling does not weaken protection against genuine domestic violence rather it prevents criminal law from continuing when a prima facie case is absent.

Remember that criminal proceedings cannot be sustained only on broad allegations. Therefore it is important that the complaint must disclose specific facts showing the ingredients of the offence.

20. Phireram v. State of Uttar Pradesh: Bail cancellation and witness protection

The Court held that witness protection and cancellation of bail are different remedies. A court cannot avoid deciding whether bail should be cancelled merely by directing the witness to seek protection under a separate scheme.

Hence a threat to witnesses may justify cancellation of bail. It highlighted that the protective measures cannot replace the court's duty to examine misuse of liberty.

Cases on Equality, Disability and Social Justice

21. Anmol v. UOI: Disability and Medical Education

The Court turned down a rigid rule that required a medical student to have both hands intact. It held that eligibility must be based on actual functional ability, assistive technology and reasonable accommodation. Further it noted that disability percentage alone cannot decide whether a person can complete a professional course or not.

This case shows a clear example of substantive equality and the reasonable-accommodation principle under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act.

22. In Re: Recruitment of Visually Impaired Persons into the Judicial Services v. Registrar General, High Court of Madhya

Pradesh

The court gave the landmark ruling stating that visual impairment does not by itself make a qualified person unsuitable for judicial service. The ruling struck down the discriminatory barriers and extra requirements placed on young candidates with disabilities. Ultimately true equality means adjusting standard rules when uniform rules create unintended barriers.

23. Rajneesh Kumar Pandey v. UOI: Inclusive Education and Special Teachers

The Supreme Court ordered States and Union Territories to identify authorized vacancies and recruit qualified special teachers for children with disabilities. To ensure execution, the court employed the doctrine of continuing mandamus to monitor ongoing compliance.

This approach reflects a broader judicial strategy where courts may issue structural directions where a constitutional right will remain ineffective without institutional implementation.

24. Ram Charan v. Sukhram: Equality for tribal women in inheritance

The Supreme court held that a woman or her legal heirs cannot be denied an equal share of inheritance merely based on gender, particularly where there was no clear legal rule requiring that discrimination. By utilising article 14 as an interpretative principle against arbitrary customary exclusion, the ruling firmly establishes that customary laws are not immune to constitutional scrutiny and cannot be invoked to perpetuate unjustified gender inequality.

25. L. Muruganantham v. State of Tamil Nadu: Rights of Prisoners with Disabilities

The Court ordered authorities to ensure dignity, safety, accessibility and reasonable accommodation for prisoners with disabilities, affirming that imprisonment does not remove the state of its duty to provide humane treatment.

This duty reinforces the constitutional principle that prisoners retain their fundamental rights, subject only to lawful restrictions, and establishes that the protections of Article 21 remain fully active within prisons.

26. Mission Accessibility v. Union of India : Accessibility in competitive examinations

The Court held that disability rights are part of Articles 14, 19 and 21. It directed the UPSC to allow reasonable changes of scribes and to plan for screen-reading software and other assistive technology.

This case highlights that formal equality is not enough when practical barriers prevent equal participation. It makes accessibility part of substantive equality.

Family Law, Women's Rights and Evidence

27. Sukhdev Singh v. Sukhbir Kaur : Maintenance in a void marriage

The Court held that a spouse of a marriage declared void may seek permanent maintenance under Section 25 of the Hindu Marriage Act even if their marriage has been declared null and void. Interim maintenance may also be available under Section 24 if the statutory conditions are met.

This decision establishes that the invalidity of a marriage does not automatically remove the party of financial protection. Though granting such maintenance remains a discretionary remedy which depends on income, conduct and circumstances.

28. Urmila Dixit v. Sunil Sharan Dixit : Protection of senior citizens

In this case a senior citizen had transferred property to her son on the understanding that he would provide care. The son failed to do so. Thus the Supreme Court restored the cancellation of the gift deed under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act. The case

highlights that a transfer linked to the promise of basic care may be cancelled when the transferee refuses or fails to provide that care.

29. Rakhi Sadhukhan v. Raja Sadhukhan : Realistic Permanent Alimony

The Court enhanced the permanent alimony award by carefully evaluating factors such as financial dependence, the material standard of living, inflation, and the necessity of long-term reasonable future security.

This ruling reinforces the principle that spousal maintenance should be realistic, practical and meaningful rather than merely symbolic. It required courts to consider the actual social and economic circumstances of the claimant.

30. Vibhor Garg v. Neha : Recorded Spousal Conversations as Evidence

The Court examined the privilege surrounding marital communications. It held that the statutory exception for legal proceedings between spouses may allow relevant recorded conversations to be admitted as evidence. While confirming that a breach of privacy does not automatically make relevant evidence inadmissible, the judgment does not create a general licence to secretly record private conversations.

Ultimately, this distinction highlights that evidentiary privilege, relevance, and privacy are interconnected yet legally distinct questions.

31. State of U.P. v. Ajmal Beg : Dowry violence and constitutional values

The Court rejected reasoning that poverty or social status makes a dowry demand unlikely, holding that a dowry-death case must be strictly assessed from the evidence and statutory ingredients rather than stereotypes regarding the financial condition of the accused family.

Consequently, this judgment reinforces that courts must approach cases of dowry violence in a manner that remains consistently aligned with equality, dignity and the protective purpose of the

law.

32. Dr. Sohail Malik v. Union of India : Cross-workplace complaints under the POSH Act

The Court treated the inquiry power under the POSH Act as procedural rather than a narrow jurisdictional restriction allowing the **Internal Complaints Committee** (ICC) at the complainant's workplace to conduct fact-finding even when the accused worked in another department. Under this framework, while the complaints ICC manages the factual investigation, the accused individual's own employer retains the ultimate authority to execute disciplinary action.

This cooperative structure exemplifies how the POSH Act should be purposely interpreted to provide effective protection, while keeping fact-finding and disciplinary authority distinct.

Property, Contract, Arbitration and Insolvency

33. State of Uttar Pradesh v. R.K. Pandey : Arbitration requires a valid agreement

The Court set aside arbitral awards based on an unproved and apparently non-existent arbitration agreement, emphasizing that a valid arbitration agreement serves as the foundational basis of jurisdiction. Consequently, an award cannot be legally enforced merely because a party failed to challenge it within the usual period when the entire proceeding itself is a nullity or is affected by fraud.

This ruling firmly establishes that true party autonomy can only begin once an arbitration agreement is substantively proven. It also confirms that fundamental jurisdictional defects cannot be cured by technical limitation rules.

34. Independent Sugar Corporation Ltd. v, Girish Sriram Juneja : Competition approval in insolvency

The Court held that when a resolution plan involves a combination that triggers Competition Commission approval, this requirement must be complied with at the stage mandated by Section 31(4) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code. This ruling emphasizes that Competition law cannot be treated as an afterthought in the insolvency proceedings. This establishes a vital connection between insolvency resolution and anit-trust regulations to ensure that mandatory statutory approvals actively safeguard market competition by being secured at the correct procedural stage.

35. Sonali Power Equipments Pvt. Ltd. v. Chairman, Maharashtra State : MSMED conciliation and limitation

The Court distinguished conciliation from adjudication under Section 18 of the MSMED Act, ruling that the expiration of a limitation period does not automatically prevent parties from participating in conciliation to reach a settlement. This critical distinction highlights that limitation rules operate differently at the conciliation stage as compared to the adjudication stage. This case shows the necessity for practitioners to always identify the precise nature of the statutory proceeding.

36. Vijaya Bank v. Prashant B. Narnaware : Service bonds and restraint of trade

The Court upheld a reasonable minimum-service bond connected with recruitment, training and the employer’s expenses. The court distinguished such a clause from a post-employment non-compete clause and ruled that it is not automatically void under Section 27 of the Contract Act.

This decision highlights the critical legal need to separate operational restrictions active during employment from absolute restraints imposed after employment ends. The purpose and proportionality of the specific clause is what ultimately dictates its validity.

37. Mrs Shailja Krishna v. Satori Global Ltd. : NCLT and incidental fraud issues

The Court held that the **National Company Law Tribunal** (NCLT) possesses the competence to examine incidental questions involving fraud, forgery, coercion and invalid corporate documents when they are directly connected with a petition alleging oppression or mismanagement.

This decision clarifies that a tribunal's jurisdiction is not automatically defeated merely because a connected dispute contains allegations of fraud. This highlights the requirement to prioritize the main statutory proceeding and the nature of the relief claimed.

38. State of Karnataka v. Taghar Vasudeva Ambrish : GST and residential hostels

The Court held that renting a residential building for long-term accommodation did not lose its residential character merely because a company stands as an intermediary between the owner and the occupants. This ruling clarifies that the tax classification under the GST regime depends entirely on the substance and real, practical use of the transaction rather than the formal identity of the contracting intermediary, making the actual nature of the premises the main factor for tax treatment.

Criminal Evidence, Property and Special Statutes

39. Pradeep Nirankarnath Sharma v. Directorate of Enforcement : Money Laundering as a Continuing offence

The Court held that the offence of money laundering may continue as long as the proceeds of crime are actively concealed, possessed, used, layered, integrated or projected as untainted property. It means that the relevant criminal conduct is not strictly confined to the date of the original predicate offence.

The distinction highlights the critical legal connection between the initial scheduled offence and the ongoing process of laundering under the PMLA. This established that money laundering operates as a continuous wrong rather than a single, isolated event.

40. Harpreet Singh Talwar @ Kabir Talwar v. State of Gujarat : Conspiracy and Absence of Direct Recovery

The Court stated that direct recovery of contraband from every accused is not always necessary to establish conspiracy or facilitation under special criminal laws. Therefore it allowed the prosecution to rely on communications, conduct, coordination and the different roles of participants. For wider criminal law understanding read article on mens rea and actus rea.

This evidentiary approach underscores that conspiracy is commonly proved through a chain of circumstances. Meaning that while the absence of physical recovery remains a relevant factor for the defence, it is not automatically decisive when establishing the collective criminal liability .

41. Kaveri Plastics v. Mahdoom Bawa Bahrudeen Noorul : Notice under Section 138 NI Act

The case concerned a cheque-dishonour notice that demanded an amount different from the cheque amount, serving as a pivotal decision for understanding the fundamental purpose of a statutory notice under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and how discrepancies affect the validity of a demand.

This legal framework requires a close examination of the cheque, the statutory notice, the amount demanded to determine whether the drawer received a real opportunity to make payment.

42. Sanjay D. Jain v. State of Maharashtra : Vague allegations against relatives

The Court quashed criminal proceedings against relatives in a matrimonial dispute where the accusations were general and failed to identify a specific criminal role. The decision does not create immunity for relatives rather , it requires courts to distinguish a specific, supported allegation from an automatic attempt to include every family member.

This limitation underscores that a High Court may actively exercise its inherent jurisdiction to prevent the abuse of criminal process whenever the complaint fails to disclose a clear, prima facie role against the accused.

Environment, Media and Institutional Accountability

43. Auroville Foundation v. Navroz Kersasp Mody : Limits of NGT jurisdiction

The Court held that the National Green Tribunal can act only when the jurisdictional conditions under the NGT Act are satisfied. A general environmental concern is not enough unless there is a substantial question relating to the environment connected with a Schedule I enactment.

This case highlights that tribunals are statutory bodies and their powers must remain within the jurisdiction granted by the parent legislation.

44. Wikimedia Foundation Inc. v. ANI Media Pvt. Ltd : Online reports and fair trial

The Court held that removal of online material about pending litigation requires a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the proceeding. It clarified that a court cannot order the deletion of content merely because the report is inconvenient, critical or embarrassing.

This dynamic sets up a crucial constitutional test, establishing that judges must carefully balance the principles of open justice and free speech under Article 19(1)(a) against an accused individual's fundamental right to a fair trial protected under Article 21.

45. M. Mahesh Reddy v. State of Karnataka : Certified films and mob pressure

The Court criticised an extra-judicial attempt to stop the screening of a certified film because of protests and demands for an apology, holding that the State must protect lawful screening and

cannot surrender the rule of law to threats of public disorder.

This directive firmly establishes that the state has an absolute constitutional duty to control unlawful obstruction of free speech, rather than allowing a veto by threatened violence or mob pressure.

46. Vishnu Vardhan @ Vishnu Pardhan v. State of Uttar Pradesh : Fraud defeats finality

The Court recalled an earlier judgment after finding that it had been obtained through fraud and suppression of material facts ruling that the doctrine of merger cannot protect a judgment secured by deception because fraud undermines the integrity of the judicial process.

Consequently, fraud practiced on the court serves as an absolute exception to ordinary rules of finality. Through this court ensured that no litigant is permitted to claim a legal advantage or benefit from a judgment procured by dishonest means.

47. Ashwinkumar Govindbhai Prajapati v. State of Gujarat : Investigating agencies and lawyers

The case raised important questions about the power of investigating agencies to summon lawyers and the protection of professional communications. The Court’s approach is useful for revising the balance between a fair investigation, legal professional privilege and the independence of the Bar.

This case highlights that a lawyer's professional role does not create immunity from every investigation, but legal privilege and the fairness of the process remain relevant safeguards.

48. All India Judges Association v. Union of India : Experience for Civil Judge recruitment

The Court restored a requirement of three years’ practice before a candidate can sit for the Civil Judge (Junior Division) examination. It recognised that practical experience may improve procedural understanding, judicial maturity and courtroom judgment.

This case is important for the independence and quality of the subordinate judiciary, and for the Court's power to issue directions concerning judicial service recruitment.

49. Jitender @ Kalla v. State (NCT of Delhi) : Designation of Senior Advocates

The Court modified the earlier system for designating Senior Advocates. It removed the Permanent Committee and required a more transparent process in which the 'Full Court' would take the final decision after the secretariat compiled the relevant information.

The case links institutional design, transparency, professional independence and the administration of the legal profession.

50. M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India : Great Indian Bustard and climate concerns

The Court revisited the complex conflict between protecting the critically endangered Great Indian Bustard and the need for electricity transmission infrastructure. The ruling illustrates how the judiciary must balance biodiversity, climate concerns, energy needs and technical expertise instead of enforcing an inflexible remedy uniformly across every location.

This approach highlights that contemporary environmental constitutionalism demands a balancing act among sustainable development, species protection, climate policy and the broader public interest.

How to Revise these 50 judgments for CLAT PG 2027

It's difficult to memorise the list in one go. Therefore divide it into seven subject groups. First revise the case name and one-line principle. Then note the constitutional Article or statute involved. After that, ask three questions firstly, what was the legal issue? Secondly what did the Court decide? and thirdly how could the rule apply to a new fact situation? Students who want a wider list can use CLATalogue's 100 Important Supreme Court Judgments for CLAT PG 2027 after completing these 50 priority cases.

Also while reading a judgment, distinguish the ratio decidendi from an observation made in passing. Check whether the decision is a final judgment, an interim order, a reference to a larger bench or a case decided on its own facts. This distinction is often more important than remembering the case title alone.

Conclusion

These 50 Supreme Court judgments provide a focused case-law revision list for CLAT PG 2027. They cover the issues most likely to appear in passage-based questions i.e. equality, personal liberty, fair procedure, disability rights, family protection, criminal evidence, arbitration, taxation, environment and institutional accountability.

The best way to use this article is to read the one-line principle first and then consult the full judgment or a detailed case brief for the cases most relevant to your syllabus. Recent decisions should be read with older landmark cases because the Supreme Court usually develops a legal principle over time rather than in isolation.

For detailed understanding of these case laws refer to the top judgments monthly list provided below.

Top Judgments of January 2025

Top Judgments of February 2025

Top Judgments of March 2025

Top Judgments of April 2025

Top Judgments of May 2025

Top Judgments of June 2025

Top Judgments of July 2025

Top Judgments of August 2025

Top Judgments of September 2025

Top Judgments of October 2025

Top Judgments of November 2025

Top Judgments of December 2025