

BLOGS

Top 7 Supreme Court Judgments: September 2026

Shruti chauhan · 08 Oct 2026

September 2026 was one of the busiest months of the year for the Supreme Court. Over twenty working days brought a split verdict on the Election Commissioners law, new safeguards on arrest, and a sharp ruling on forcible vehicle repossession.

Recent rulings are a natural source for passage based questions in CLAT PG, especially in constitutional law and criminal law. This guide explains the most important Supreme Court judgments of September 2026 in a simple Facts, Issue and Judgment format.

Each entry ends with a short CLAT PG angle, so you know exactly how to connect the ruling to your syllabus.

1. Hari Dutta Sharma v State of U.P.

Bench: Justice P.S. Narasimha and Justice Alok Aradhe

Facts: A truck owner's financed vehicle was seized at about 1 a.m. by four unidentified persons, who broke its lock and drove it away without notice. The truck was his only source of livelihood.

Issue: Can a finance company use force to repossess a vehicle in defiance of RBI guidelines, and what remedy does the owner have?

Judgment: The Court held that the seizure violated [Article 14](#) and [Article 21](#). It directed the company to close the loan account, refund the sale proceeds of Rs 45,000 with 6 percent interest, and pay Rs 10 lakh as compensation.

The Court also found that RBI guidelines on fair practices and recovery agents had largely remained on paper. It asked the RBI to enforce them under [Section 35A](#) of the [Banking Regulation Act, 1949](#), so that they bind banks and NBFCs. Read the [LiveLaw report](#).

CLAT PG Angle: Right to livelihood under [Article 21](#) and public law compensation. Link it to Kaushal Kishore v State of U.P. (2023), on enforcing fundamental rights against non state actors.

2. Jaskaran Jeet Singh Deol v State of Punjab

Bench: Justice Ujjal Bhuyan and Justice Atul S. Chandurkar

Facts: An arrest made without supplying written grounds is illegal, and so is the remand that follows. This case dealt with what happens when the agency wants to arrest the same person again.

Issue: Can a person be re-arrested after an earlier arrest is held illegal for violating [Article 22\(1\)](#), and if so, how?

Judgment: The Court held that re-arrest needs judicial approval. The agency must first furnish written grounds and approach the jurisdictional Magistrate. It must explain why the grounds were not supplied earlier and why custody is now necessary.

The application must be approved by a superior officer. Further investigation must go to another officer, and a departmental inquiry must be initiated against the officer who made the unlawful arrest. These safeguards add to those in *Mihir Rajesh Shah v State of Maharashtra* (2026) 1 SCC 500. Read the [LiveLaw report](#).

CLAT PG Angle: [Article 22\(1\)](#) and written grounds of arrest, first stressed in *Pankaj Bansal v Union of India* (2023). The Magistrate now acts as a gatekeeper against repeat illegality.

3. 'R' v 'E' (POCSO and Custody Disputes)

Bench: Justice J.B. Pardiwala and Justice K.V. Viswanathan

Facts: A father faced allegations under the [POCSO Act, 2012](#) during a matrimonial custody dispute. A CBI investigation and a NIMHANS expert assessment found the child's allegations unreliable.

Issue: How should police and courts treat child abuse allegations raised in custody battles, without weakening the protection POCSO offers?

Judgment: The Court quashed the FIR and directed phased reintegration of the child with the father under expert supervision.

It also laid down safeguards. Where allegations are made against a parent or family member living with the child in a matrimonial dispute, registering an FIR must not automatically lead to

arrest. Before deciding on arrest, the investigating officer must obtain an independent assessment from a child and adolescent psychiatrist or clinical psychologist, in consultation with the District Child Protection Unit.

The same safeguard applies to private complaints before the Special Court. The Court clarified that these safeguards must not dilute the approach required in genuine cases.

CLAT PG Angle: Balancing child protection under the POCSO Act with the accused's right to a fair process under [Article 21](#).

4. Mulla Afroz v Union of India

Bench: Justice Dipankar Datta and Justice Sheel Nagu

Facts: The case arose from the November 2024 Sambhal violence. Afroz was arrested 54 days after the incident and later got bail. He was then detained under [Section 3](#) of the National Security Act, 1980, based solely on confessional statements of a co-accused made in police custody.

Issue: Can preventive detention rest only on a co-accused's custodial confession?

Judgment: The Court quashed the detention. It held that a confession made in police custody cannot be the sole basis for preventive detention, and that the detaining authority failed to consider relevant material. It also imposed costs of Rs 10 lakh on the Uttar Pradesh Government.

CLAT PG Angle: Preventive detention is an exceptional power under [Article 22](#). Courts can review whether the detaining authority genuinely applied its mind.

5. CBI v Anil Dixit

Bench: Justice J.B. Pardiwala and Justice K. Vinod Chandran

Facts: The accused sought several documents under [Section 91 CrPC](#), including seizure records, CBI registers and unrelayed material. The CBI objected on grounds of confidentiality, volume and non availability.

Issue: When and how can an accused access documents seized during investigation but not relied upon by the prosecution?

Judgment: The Court held that an accused can access material available with the prosecution to prepare the defence, but the stage and manner depend on the nature of the documents. The accused may inspect voluminous unrelayed material and identify the specific documents needed. Those can then be sought at the appropriate stage, including during witness examination.

The Court also clarified that [Sarla Gupta v Directorate of Enforcement](#) does not give a right to copies of all unrelayed documents at the charge stage. Read the [LiveLaw report](#).

CLAT PG Angle: Fair trial and disclosure. [Section 94](#) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is the corresponding provision for [Section 91 CrPC](#).

6. Jaya Thakur v Union of India (ECI Appointments Act, 2023)

Bench: Justice Dipankar Datta and Justice S.C. Sharma

Facts: In Anoop Baranwal v Union of India (2023), the Court directed that Election Commissioners be appointed on the advice of a committee of the Prime Minister, the Leader of Opposition and the Chief Justice of India, until Parliament made a law. The 2023 Act replaced the Chief Justice with a Union Cabinet Minister nominated by the Prime Minister. Petitioners challenge Sections 6 and 7 of the [2023 Act](#).

Issue: Does the challenge raise a substantial question of law that needs a Constitution Bench?

Judgment: The judges split. Justice Datta held that no reference was needed, since the principles were already settled in [Anoop Baranwal](#). He said the Election Commission must not only be independent, but also appear independent.

Justice Sharma held that the challenge raised a substantial question of law. Both judges nevertheless directed that the papers go to the Chief Justice for a Constitution Bench of appropriate strength. Read the [Supreme Court Observer report](#).

CLAT PG Angle: Independence of the Election Commission, and the limits of a legislative response to a judicial direction. Compare it with Madras Bar Association v Union of India (2025). Note that this ruling only decides the reference, not the Act's validity.

7. The Jantar Mantar Protest FIRs and Article 142

Bench: Three judges, led by Chief Justice Surya Kant

Facts: FIRs were registered against protestors who gathered at Jantar Mantar on 20 July over the NEET controversy.

Issue: Can the Court use [Article 142](#) to quash these FIRs together, while allowing fresh action against a specific group?

Judgment: The Court quashed the FIRs and barred registration of new ones. It permitted fresh FIRs only against 2,873 individuals whom the Delhi Police alleged had serious criminal antecedents. Read the [Supreme Court Observer report](#).

CLAT PG Angle: [Article 142](#) and "complete justice." Commentators have debated whether the order stretches this power. Compare it with *Shilpa Sailesh v Varun Sreenivasan* (2023) and *Pooja Pal v Union of India* (2026).

Conclusion

The important Supreme Court judgments of September 2026 share one theme. The Court repeatedly insisted that constitutional and statutory protections must work in practice, not remain promises on paper.

If you remember each ruling through its facts, issue and the safeguard it created, these Supreme Court judgments of September 2026 will be easy to apply in any CLAT PG 2027 passage.