

Important Supreme Court Judgements, Case Summaries, Constitutional Principles

August 3, 2026 • vajiramandravi.com



Supreme Court judgements are the backbone of constitutional interpretation in India. They explain the true meaning of constitutional provisions, resolve conflicts between organs of the state, and protect citizens' rights.

Supreme Court judgements are not merely case-specific decisions; they lay down binding legal principles, doctrines, and interpretations that guide future legislation, executive action, and judicial reasoning. Concepts such as basic structure, judicial review, due process, federalism, secularism, equality, and dignity have evolved primarily through judicial pronouncements.

Important Supreme Court Judgements

The Supreme Court of India plays a vital role in interpreting the Constitution and safeguarding fundamental rights. Its landmark judgements have shaped the balance of power between the state and citizens, clarified constitutional ambiguities, and strengthened democracy.

We have listed all the Important Supreme Court Judgements for candidates to get a detailed insight into each important judgement.

A.K. Gopalan Case (1950)

This was one of the earliest constitutional cases interpreting the scope of Article 21 – Right to Life and Personal Liberty. The **Supreme Court** adopted a strict and literal interpretation of the Constitution and upheld the validity of preventive detention laws.

- Article 21 was interpreted narrowly
- “Procedure established by law” did not require fairness or reasonableness
- Fundamental Rights were treated as isolated provisions
- Later overruled by Maneka Gandhi judgement

Romesh Thapar Case (1950)

This case dealt with government restrictions on a political journal and examined the scope of free speech. The Court recognised that democracy depends on the free circulation of ideas and opinions. It significantly strengthened press freedom in the early years of the Constitution.

- Freedom of speech includes freedom of circulation
- Press recognised as essential to democracy
- Restrictions must strictly fall within constitutional grounds
- Executive censorship limited
- Strengthened liberal interpretation of Article 19

Shankari Prasad Case (1951)

The case questioned whether Parliament could amend Fundamental Rights through constitutional amendments. The Supreme Court upheld Parliament’s power, giving wide scope to legislative authority in constitutional matters.

- Parliament empowered to amend **Fundamental Rights**
- Article 368 includes both power and procedure
- Constitutional amendments not treated as ordinary law
- Article 13 not applicable to amendments
- Early preference for parliamentary supremacy

Berubari Union Case (1960)

This case concerned the transfer of Indian territory to Pakistan following an international agreement. The Supreme Court clarified that territorial integrity cannot be altered by ordinary legislation.

- Article 3 insufficient for ceding territory
- Constitutional amendment required for boundary changes
- International agreements subject to constitutional limits

- Sovereignty of territory protected
- Strengthened federal constitutional process

Golaknath Case (1967)

In a major shift, the Supreme Court restricted Parliament's amending power by protecting Fundamental Rights from alteration. This judgement placed individual liberties above legislative authority.

- Fundamental Rights declared non-amendable
- Constitutional amendments treated as law under Article 13
- Parliament's amending power curtailed
- Judiciary asserted constitutional guardianship
- Led to constitutional conflict

Kesavananda Bharati Case (1973)

This landmark judgement resolved the tension between parliamentary sovereignty and constitutional supremacy. The Court evolved the Basic Structure Doctrine to protect core constitutional principles.

- Parliament can amend Constitution but not its basic structure
- Judicial review of amendments established
- Constitution declared supreme over Parliament
- Balance between flexibility and rigidity achieved
- Cornerstone of Indian constitutional law

Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain Case (1975)

The case examined constitutional provisions that attempted to immunise election disputes from judicial scrutiny. The Court struck them down for violating democratic principles.

- Free and fair elections recognised as basic feature
- Judicial review reaffirmed
- Equality before law upheld
- Arbitrary constitutional amendments invalidated
- Strengthened democratic accountability

Habeas Corpus Case (ADM Jabalpur) (1976)

Decided during the Emergency, this case tested the limits of state power over personal liberty. The majority judgement favoured executive authority, while the dissent defended constitutional morality.

- Judicial remedy for life and liberty denied (majority view)
- State power prioritised during Emergency
- Rule of law weakened
- Justice H.R. Khanna's dissent upheld liberty

- Later regarded as a constitutional failure

Maneka Gandhi Case (1978)

This judgement marked a transformative shift in constitutional interpretation. The Court expanded the meaning of personal liberty and rejected arbitrary state action.

- Article 21 interpreted broadly
- Procedure must be just, fair, and reasonable
- Articles 14, 19, and 21 linked
- Introduced substantive due process
- Human dignity placed at the centre

Minerva Mills Case (1980)

The Supreme Court reinforced the Basic Structure Doctrine and limited Parliament's power to amend the Constitution. It emphasised constitutional harmony and balance.

- Limited amending power part of basic structure
- Balance between Fundamental Rights and DPSPs
- Parliamentary supremacy rejected
- Constitution declared supreme
- Strengthened democratic governance

Waman Rao Case (1981)

The Waman Rao case clarified the temporal application of the Basic Structure Doctrine laid down in the Kesavananda Bharati judgement. The Supreme Court sought to prevent legal uncertainty by distinguishing between constitutional amendments made before and after April 24, 1973.

- Constitutional amendments after April 1973 are subject to judicial review
- Amendments made before this date were largely protected from challenge
- Prevented retrospective invalidation of constitutional changes
- Reinforced the authority of the Kesavananda Bharati ruling
- Ensured legal certainty and constitutional continuity

Shah Bano Begum Case (1985)

This case addressed the maintenance rights of a divorced Muslim woman and highlighted the tension between personal laws and constitutional principles. The Supreme Court upheld the right to maintenance under secular law, emphasising equality and dignity. The judgement triggered widespread legal and social debate across the country.

- Maintenance granted under secular criminal law
- Gender justice and women's dignity prioritised
- Equality before law reinforced

- Personal laws made subject to constitutional values
- Sparked nationwide debate on uniform civil rights

MC Mehta v. Union of India (1986)

This landmark judgement transformed environmental jurisprudence in India by expanding state and corporate responsibility. The Supreme Court evolved the doctrine of Absolute Liability for hazardous industries, ensuring stronger protection of public health. It recognised environmental safety as an essential component of the right to life.

- Absolute Liability doctrine introduced for hazardous industries
- Victims entitled to compensation without proof of negligence
- Right to life includes a clean and healthy environment
- Corporate accountability significantly strengthened
- Environmental protection integrated into constitutional law

Indra Sawhney Case (1992)

Popularly known as the Mandal case, this judgement examined the constitutional validity of reservations for Other Backward Classes. The Supreme Court upheld affirmative action while laying down limits to maintain balance with equality. It provided a structured framework for social justice policies.

- Reservation for OBCs upheld
- Creamy layer concept introduced
- 50% ceiling imposed on total reservations
- Reservation in promotions disallowed
- Balanced equality with social justice objectives

S.R. Bommai Case (1994)

The S.R. Bommai judgement strengthened Indian federalism by restricting the arbitrary use of President's Rule. The Supreme Court subjected the exercise of Article 356 to judicial review, ensuring democratic accountability. It protected the autonomy of state governments against central overreach.

- Proclamation under Article 356 made justiciable
- Federalism recognised as a basic feature of the Constitution
- Arbitrary dismissal of state governments curtailed
- State autonomy safeguarded
- Centre-State balance constitutionally reinforced

L. Chandra Kumar Case (1997)

This case clarified the role of tribunals within India's constitutional framework. The Supreme Court reaffirmed the primacy of judicial review while allowing tribunals to function as supplementary bodies. It ensured that access to justice remains protected.

- Judicial review declared part of the basic structure
- High Courts retain supervisory jurisdiction over tribunals
- Tribunal decisions subject to scrutiny by constitutional courts
- Access to justice preserved
- Judicial hierarchy maintained

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)

In the absence of specific legislation, this judgement addressed sexual harassment at the workplace. The Supreme Court framed binding guidelines to protect women's dignity and safety. It relied on constitutional guarantees and international conventions to fill the legal vacuum.

- Vishaka Guidelines issued
- Workplace dignity and gender equality upheld
- Employer responsibility clearly defined
- International norms incorporated
- Foundation laid for later legislation

Samatha Case (1997)

This judgement protected tribal land rights in Scheduled Areas from commercial exploitation. The Supreme Court restricted mining leases to non-tribals and emphasised the state's duty to protect indigenous communities. It linked social justice with environmental protection.

- Mining leases to non-tribals declared invalid
- Tribal land and resource rights safeguarded
- Environmental concerns recognised
- State's protective responsibility emphasised
- Social justice strengthened

Lily Thomas v. Union of India (2000)

This case dealt with the misuse of religious conversion to evade personal laws related to marriage. The Supreme Court upheld the sanctity of marriage and prevented circumvention of legal obligations. It reinforced women's legal protection and equality.

- Conversion does not dissolve an existing marriage
- Second marriage during subsistence of first declared void
- Misuse of personal laws prevented
- Women's rights strengthened
- Equality principles reaffirmed

I.R. Coelho Case (2007)

The Court examined whether laws placed in the **Ninth Schedule** are immune from judicial scrutiny. It ruled that such laws cannot violate the Basic Structure of the Constitution. This judgement reinforced constitutional supremacy over legislative actions.

- Ninth Schedule laws subject to judicial review
- Basic Structure Doctrine made applicable
- Legislative immunity limited
- Judicial oversight strengthened
- Supremacy of the Constitution upheld

Aruna Shanbaug Case (2011)

This case addressed passive euthanasia and the right to die with dignity. The Supreme Court allowed withdrawal of life support under strict safeguards. It balanced ethical considerations with constitutional values.

- Passive euthanasia permitted
- Right to die with dignity recognised
- Strict procedural safeguards laid down
- Medical ethics clarified
- Article 21 expanded to include dignity in death

NOTA Judgement (2013)

This judgement strengthened electoral democracy by introducing the “None of the Above” option. It empowered voters to reject all candidates while maintaining secrecy. The ruling encouraged cleaner and more accountable elections.

- NOTA option introduced
- Voter choice and freedom enhanced
- Electoral secrecy protected
- Democratic participation strengthened
- Electoral reforms encouraged

NALSA v. Union of India (2014)

This progressive judgement recognised transgender persons as a distinct legal category. The Supreme Court affirmed their rights to equality, dignity, and self-identification. It directed the state to implement welfare and inclusion measures.

- Third gender legally recognised
- Equality and dignity upheld
- Welfare measures directed
- Reservations encouraged
- Social inclusion promoted

Right to Privacy - Puttaswamy Case (2017)

The Supreme Court unanimously declared the right to privacy as a fundamental right. It linked privacy with personal liberty, dignity, and autonomy. The judgement overruled earlier restrictive interpretations.

- Privacy recognised as a Fundamental Right
- Integral part of Article 21
- Limits placed on state surveillance
- Individual autonomy protected
- Earlier rulings overruled

Triple Talaq Judgement (2017)

This judgement struck down the practice of instant triple talaq for being arbitrary and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court prioritised gender justice and constitutional morality. It strengthened women's rights within personal laws.

- Instant triple talaq declared unconstitutional
- Equality and dignity upheld
- Arbitrary religious practices rejected
- Constitutional morality applied
- Women's rights reinforced

Section 377 Judgement (2018)

This historic ruling decriminalised consensual same-sex relations between adults. The Supreme Court affirmed personal liberty, dignity, and equality. It marked a significant advance in rights-based jurisprudence.

- Consensual same-sex acts decriminalised
- Personal autonomy recognised
- Equality and dignity affirmed
- Constitutional morality prioritised
- Progressive interpretation of fundamental rights advanced

Source: <https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/important-supreme-court-judgements/>

© Vajiram & Ravi. For personal use only.