 **K.S. Puttaswamy vs Union Of India (Aadhaar Case)**

 **Maneka Gandhi vs Union Of India (Passport Seizure)**

 **Shayara Bano vs Union Of India (Triple Talaq)**

 **Navtej Singh Johar vs Union Of India (Section 377)**

 **S.R. Bommai vs Union Of India (President's Rule)**

 **Vishaka vs State Of Rajasthan (Sexual Harassment Guidelines)**

 **Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug vs Union Of India (Euthanasia)**

 **Kesavananda Bharati vs State of Kerala (Basic Structure Doctrine)**

 **Lalita Kumari vs Govt. of U.P. (FIR Registration)**

 **State of Maharashtra vs Praful B. Desai (Tele-evidence admissibility)**

LIST OF 10 CASES THAT I NEED TO ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT

 **What are the key facts of this case?**  
→ Test your fact extraction and summarization.

 **What were the legal issues considered by the court?**  
→ See if it identifies constitutional/statutory questions.

 **What was the final decision and reasoning of the court?**  
→ Evaluates summarization + logic tracking.

 **Which laws or constitutional articles were referred to in this judgment?**  
→ Tests citation/entity grounding.

 **Summarize the judgment in simple legal language in under 200 words.**  
→ Checks end-to-end compression, clarity, and coherence.

**K.S. Puttaswamy vs Union Of India**

Query: What are the key facts of this case?

Answer: Young couples, facing issues related to marriage registration under the Special Marriage Act, 1954, hesitated to raise these issues before their marriage due to concerns about attracting unwanted attention and social pressure. The petitioners' concerns involve the right to life and liberty of a large number of people. The case specifically involves the interpretation of sections 5 and 6 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954, concerning the notice of intended marriage and its publication.

Query: What were the legal issues considered by the court?

Answer: Based solely on the provided text, the courts considered at least two legal issues:

1. \*\*The personal rights of individuals:\*\* Paragraph 38 explicitly states that the case of \*Navtej Singh Johar and others vs. Union of India\* dealt with "the personal rights of an individual." This arose in the context of considering the constitutionality of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

2. \*\*The constitutionality of Section 377 IPC:\*\* Paragraph 38 directly states that the "vires" (legal validity or force) of Section 377 IPC came under consideration in \*Navtej Singh Johar\*. This involved assessing whether the law was compatible with the Constitution.

Paragraph 121 touches upon a related argument used against the rights of same-sex couples, but it doesn't represent a separate legal issue considered by the court, but rather an argument the court \*rejected\*. The core legal issues remain the personal rights of individuals and the validity of Section 377 IPC. The

text does not offer details on any other legal issues considered by the courts mentioned.

Query: What was the final decision and reasoning of the court?

Answer: The provided text excerpts don't give the \*final decision\* of a single case. Instead, it shows the Supreme Court's reasoning in \*at least two\* cases concerning personal rights, specifically focusing on the decriminalization of homosexual acts. Let's break down what we can infer:

\*\*Reasoning and Principles:\*\*

The court's reasoning hinges on several key principles:

1. \*\*Dynamic Constitutional Interpretation:\*\* The court rejects a static interpretation of the Constitution. It recognizes that society changes rapidly, and

the Constitution must be interpreted in a way that adapts to these changes. A rigid interpretation would stifle the Constitution's spirit. This is explicitly stated in paragraph 110.

2. \*\*Transformative Constitutionalism:\*\* The court views the Constitution as a "transformative document," meaning it's meant to evolve and improve society. This aligns with the court's role as a protector of individual rights, regardless of factors like sex, choice, or sexual orientation (paragraph 110).

3. \*\*Protection of Individual Dignity and Choice:\*\* The court explicitly rejects arguments that differentiate between heterosexual and homosexual relationships based on societal norms (paragraph 121). It emphasizes the importance of respecting individual sexual orientation as a natural aspect of identity, and protecting the inherent dignity and choice associated with it. The court sees arguments based on social standardization as ignoring individual orientation and stripping individuals of their identity.

\*\*Inferred Final Decision (or Decisions):\*\*

While the excerpt doesn't state the precise final ruling of any specific case, we can strongly infer the following:

\* \*\*In \*Navtej Singh Johar\* (and the case referenced in paragraph 37, whose details are missing):\*\* The court likely struck down the relevant law (Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code) that criminalized homosexual acts, based on the principles outlined above. The mention of the \*vires\* (validity) of Section 377 being challenged strongly suggests this outcome. The court deemed the law incompatible with the fundamental rights to dignity, equality, and freedom guaranteed by the Constitution.

\* \*\*In the unnamed case referenced in paragraph 37:\*\* The excerpt lacks detail, but given the context, it likely involved a similar challenge to a law infringing on personal rights, and the court likely ruled in favor of protecting those rights using similar reasoning.

\*\*In short:\*\* The court's overall approach is one of progressive constitutional interpretation, prioritizing individual rights and dignity over outdated social norms. The specific decisions in the cases mentioned involved striking down laws that violated these principles, likely by decriminalizing homosexual acts. However, without the full text of the judgments, this is an inference based on the provided excerpts.

Query: Which laws or constitutional articles were referred to in this judgment?

Answer: The judgment explicitly refers to:

\* \*\*Section 46:\*\* This section, containing punitive consequences, is cited as the basis for interpreting other sections as mandatory.

\* \*\*Section 5, Section 6, and Section 7:\*\* These sections of the 1954 Act are central to the case, with the court questioning whether their mandatory nature remains relevant in light of changed social conditions.

\* \*\*Act of 1954:\*\* This Act is the primary subject of the interpretation.

\* \*\*Act of 1872:\*\* This Act is mentioned in the context of the evolution of the law and its comparison to the 1954 Act. While not directly applied, it provides historical context for the interpretation of the 1954 Act.

The judgment also implicitly relies on general principles of statutory interpretation, including the "golden rule" (plain meaning unless absurd results) and the principle of interpreting statutes in light of contemporary conditions (as seen in the reference to \*Satyawati Sharma v. Union of India\*). However, these

are not specific named laws or constitutional articles but rather principles of legal interpretation.

Query: ummarize the judgment in simple legal language in under 200 words.

Answer: The court addressed the mandatory nature of Sections 5, 6, and 7 of the 1954 Act, which govern marriage notice publication and objection handling. The court initially applied the "golden rule" of statutory interpretation, prioritizing the plain meaning of the text. Given Section 46's penal consequences, the publication and objection processes (Sections 6 & 7) were deemed mandatory. However, a challenge argued that evolving social conditions since 1872 and 1954 necessitate a modern interpretation, suggesting these sections might no longer be mandatory. The court acknowledged this principle, citing \*Satyawati Sharma v. Union of India\*, which supports interpreting statutes based on current conditions. The judgment's ultimate holding on the mandatory nature of Sections 5, 6, and 7, in light of this challenge, is not provided in the text.

**Maneka Gandhi vs Union Of India (2 min 47 sec)**

Query: What are the key facts of this case?

Answer: Maneka Gandhi's passport (K-869668), issued June 1, 1976, was impounded by the Government of India on July 2, 1977, under Section 10(3)(c) of the Passport Act, 1967, in the purported public interest. She received notification of this impoundment on July 4, 1977, and requested reasons for the decision on July 5, 1977. A subsequent communication from the Ministry of External Affairs was received on July 7, 1977.

Query: What were the legal issues considered by the court?

Answer: The court considered the following legal issues:

1. \*\*The nature of the Passport Authority's power to impound a passport:\*\* The court examined whether this power was quasi-judicial or administrative in nature. This involved applying the established legal tests for distinguishing between these two types of power.

2. \*\*Applicability of natural justice:\*\* The court determined whether the rules of natural justice applied to the Passport Authority's decision to impound a passport. This consideration was analyzed both under the orthodox view preceding \*A. K. Kraipak's case\* and in light of that case's precedent.

3. \*\*Impact on constitutional rights:\*\* The court assessed the impact of impounding a passport on the passport holder's constitutional right to travel abroad

and the potential for adverse civil consequences. This analysis was crucial in determining the appropriate standard of review, even if the power were considered administrative.

4. \*\*Right of appeal:\*\* The court acknowledged the existence of a right of appeal (under section 11) against the impounding order when the Passport Authority

is not the Central Government, allowing for review of the reasons given for impounding the passport.

Query: What was the final decision and reasoning of the court?

Answer: The court's final decision was to quash (invalidate) the order impounding the petitioner's passport. The reasoning centers on the government's failure to adhere to principles of natural justice and the procedures outlined in the Passports Act, 1967.

The court's logic proceeds as follows:

1. \*\*Statutory Requirement and Natural Justice:\*\* The court acknowledges an implied requirement within the Passports Act, 1967, for a hearing before impounding a passport. This is explicitly linked to the principle of natural justice, specifically the maxim \*audi alteram partem\* ("hear the other side"). This principle mandates that an individual be given an opportunity to be heard before a decision affecting their rights is made.

2. \*\*Government's Failure to Comply:\*\* The court finds that the Central Government failed to provide the petitioner with a hearing \*before\* impounding her passport. Furthermore, the government refused to provide reasons for the impoundment, even after the petitioner requested them. The court deems this withholding of reasons as a denial of a fair hearing, further violating natural justice.

3. \*\*Breach of Statutory Provision and Natural Justice:\*\* The court explicitly states that the government's actions were not only a breach of the (implied) statutory provision within the Passports Act but also a clear violation of the principle of natural justice. The lack of a hearing and the withholding of reasons are presented as interconnected failings.

4. \*\*Fatal Defect:\*\* The court identifies the government's failure to provide a hearing as a "fatal defect," meaning it renders the impoundment order invalid. This is a crucial element of the court's reasoning, highlighting the severity of the procedural error.

5. \*\*Attorney General's Statement:\*\* While the judgment doesn't explicitly rely on the Attorney General's statement, it's included to show the government's implicit acknowledgment of the procedural flaw. The statement, though not legally binding in itself, underscores the court's assessment of the situation.

In essence, the court's decision rests on the fundamental principles of natural justice and the implied procedural requirements of the Passports Act. The government's failure to provide a hearing and its refusal to disclose reasons for the impoundment constituted a violation of these principles, leading to the invalidation of the impoundment order. The court's reasoning is straightforward: procedural fairness is paramount, and its absence renders the government's action unlawful.

Final Answer:

Query: Which laws or constitutional articles were referred to in this judgment?

Answer: The judgment primarily focuses on:

\* \*\*Article 21:\*\* This article, concerning the right to life and personal liberty, is central to the court's analysis. The meaning and content of "personal

liberty" within Article 21 is the core question being addressed.

\* \*\*Article 22:\*\* This article, dealing with protection against arrest and detention, is mentioned as relevant to the context, although not the primary focus

of the legal reasoning.

\* \*\*A. K. Gopalan v. State of Madras:\*\* This case is cited as a precedent that offered interpretations of "personal liberty" under Article 21, specifically referencing the opinions of Justices Patanjali Sastri, Mukherjee, and S. R. Das. While not a specific law or article, it's a crucial legal precedent shaping the court's understanding of Article 21.

Query: Summarize the judgment in simple legal language in under 200 words.

Answer: \*\*Case Brief: Right to Go Abroad and Freedom of Speech\*\*

\*\*Facts:\*\* A petitioner argued that the right to go abroad is essential to freedom of speech and expression, thus protected under Article 19(1)(a) (likely referencing an Indian constitutional provision). The petitioner cited US Supreme Court precedents to support this claim.

\*\*Issue:\*\* Does the right to go abroad constitute a peripheral right encompassed by the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a)?

\*\*Point of Law:\*\* Article 19(1)(a) (and its interpretation). The court considered whether the right to travel abroad is intrinsically linked to and necessary for the effective exercise of freedom of speech and expression.

\*\*Analysis:\*\* The court examined the petitioner's argument, acknowledging the cited US Supreme Court precedents. However, the court's analysis (not fully provided in the context) ultimately rejected the petitioner's claim that the right to travel abroad is a \*peripheral\* right \*inherently\* derived from freedom of speech. The court likely found the connection too tenuous to establish a direct, legally protected relationship. The reasoning behind this rejection is not detailed in the provided text.

\*\*Conclusion:\*\* The court ruled against the petitioner. The right to go abroad was not deemed a necessary component of Article 19(1)(a)'s protection of freedom of speech and expression. The specific reasoning for this conclusion is missing from the provided excerpt.