



TODAY'S PAPER

EDITION 10:38 pm IST

SUPREME COURT

Supreme Court Quashes Mother-In-Law's Case Over Omnibus Cruelty Allegations

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Supreme Court has quashed criminal proceedings against a mother-in-law after finding that the allegations and investigation material did not establish the ingredients of the charged offences against her.

Justices Satish Chandra Sharma and Nongmeikapam Kotiswar Singh allowed Prabha Devi's appeal on September 8.

The bench found no specific unlawful demand or sufficiently particularised

conduct supporting cruelty under Section 498A IPC. A later assertion that she had failed to restrain her son lacked the factual foundation needed to establish cruelty or common intention.

The court also found the necessary particulars missing for wrongful restraint, hurt and intentional insult. An allegation about jewellery could not substitute for the ingredients of the different offences actually charged.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

INSIDE TODAY

MADRAS HIGH COURT

Madras High Court Orders Inquiry Into Police Handling...

PAGE 2

MADRAS HIGH COURT

Madras High Court Upholds Customs Restriction Despite...

PAGE 3

KARNATAKA HIGH COURT

Karnataka High Court Quashes Case Over...

PAGE 4

SUPREME COURT

Supreme Court Bars Unilateral Recovery of Disputed Contract Damages

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Supreme Court has set aside Chhattisgarh authorities' recovery of ₹84,17,003 from a contractor's bills under three separate road projects, holding that an alleged overpayment under earlier contracts could not be treated as an established debt.

In *M/s Awadhesh Singh Gautam v. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.* (2026 INSC 1072), decided on September 30, 2026, Justices Pamidighantam Sri Narasimha and Alok

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

TELANGANA HIGH COURT

Telangana High Court Says Boycott Cannot Block Advocates From Court

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Telangana High Court has reiterated that even an exceptional one-day abstention from court work cannot justify intimidating or obstructing an advocate who chooses to attend.

Justice Laxmi Narayana Alishetty made the observations in *Vijay Gopal's* contempt case concerning a June 2025 bar boycott and an alleged assault.

The court said the limited exception recognised in Supreme Court precedent is subject to conditions, including consultation with the appropriate judicial

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT

Allahabad High Court Rejects Belated Challenge To Arrest Grounds

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Allahabad High Court's Lucknow Bench has dismissed a challenge to an initial arrest and remand for alleged failure to communicate arrest grounds, finding that the prosecution had already advanced to trial.

Justice Manish Mathur delivered the October 1 judgment in *Moti Ram Jaat's* application under Section 528 BNSS. The petitioner challenged his August 2025 arrest and subsequent remand on Article 22(1) grounds.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3



Madras High Court Orders Inquiry Into Police Handling Of POCSO Victim

The Madras High Court has ordered an inquiry into a police officer's handling of a POCSO victim who was allowed to leave with an accused in the pending case.

Justices A. D. Jagadish Chandira and B. Murugesan issued the September 30 directions while hearing a mother's habeas corpus petition.

The woman, now an adult, appeared before the bench and said she had left voluntarily and did not wish to return to her parents. The court found that she was not illegally detained.

It nevertheless criticised the officer's decision to permit her to accompany the accused despite knowing their respective roles in the prosecution. The bench found that the situation violated conditions imposed when the accused was granted bail.

The district police superintendent was directed to inquire into the handling of the matter, take appropriate action under law and ensure the woman's safety. The investigating police were also directed to take appropriate steps concerning the bail-condition violation.

The habeas corpus petition was closed with these directions; the court did not determine guilt in the underlying POCSO trial.



MADRAS HIGH COURT

Madras High Court Upholds Customs Restriction Despite India-Nepal Transit Treaty

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Madras High Court has allowed the Union's appeal against an order releasing a watermelon-seed consignment for transit to Nepal, holding that transit arrangements do not displace applicable customs restrictions.

Justices Anita Sumanth and C. Kumarappan delivered the September 24 judgment in the dispute involving Dhanalaxmi Food.

Customs authorities had seized the consignment after finding Pakistan-origin labels on some bags. The importer relied on documents indicating other origins and argued that the goods were destined for Nepal rather than Indian consumption.

The bench held that the restriction on goods originating in or exported from Pakistan also covers transit. It rejected the argument that the India-Nepal arrangements overrode the Customs Act and security-based prohibitions.

The competing origin documents presented a factual dispute for the statutory authorities and procedures. The court did not conclusively determine the goods' country of origin.

It also declined to split the consignment merely because only some bags carried the disputed labels, and allowed the appeal against the release order.

SUPREME COURT

Supreme Court Quashes Mother-In-Law's Case Over Omnibus Cruelty Allegations

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

COURT PDF

The Patna High Court had already quashed the case against other in-laws without explaining why the mother-in-law should remain in the prosecution.

The Supreme Court's relief applies only to Prabha Devi. Proceedings against the husband were left to be decided on their own merits.

SUPREME COURT

Supreme Court Bars Unilateral Recovery of Disputed Contract Damages

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

COURT PDF

Aradhe found that the contractual clauses relied on did not authorise the deductions in the circumstances.

The technical-audit clause required an opportunity for the contractor to respond and approval from the agency's chief executive. Those safeguards had not been followed. The Court held that a disputed, unadjudicated damages claim cannot be appropriated as though it were a debt presently payable.

Allowing the appeals, it directed release of the withheld amount with 6% annual interest from September 27, 2025 until payment. It left lawful recovery proceedings open and expressly preserved the independence of pending criminal proceedings and the alleged overpayment dispute.

TELANGANA HIGH COURT

Telangana High Court Says Boycott Cannot Block Advocates From Court

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

COURT PDF

authority. No material established such consultation here. Even if the exception applied, it would not extend to coercion or physical obstruction.

The contempt case was nevertheless dismissed. The bench found insufficient material establishing individual wilful disobedience by the office-bearers collectively; the alleged assault attributed to one respondent involved disputed facts already before criminal proceedings.

The dismissal did not approve the alleged conduct. The court asked bar office-bearers to exercise restraint and ensure that protests do not prevent advocates or litigants from accessing courts.

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT

Allahabad High Court Rejects Belated Challenge To Arrest Grounds

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

COURT PDF

The court distinguished investigation-stage detention under Section 167 CrPC from later judicial custody. It reasoned that the initial arrest-ground challenge could not be raised after that stage had ended, particularly after compliance with Section 207 and framing of charges.



ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT

Allahabad High Court Rejects Belated Challenge To Arrest Grounds

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3

COURT PDF

On the record, charges had been framed and the trial was underway. The court therefore rejected the petition as belated.

The ruling addresses the procedural stage at which this particular detention challenge was brought. It does not declare that police may dispense with communicating arrest grounds when making an arrest.

KARNATAKA HIGH COURT

Karnataka High Court Quashes Case Over Body-Shaming Allegations

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Karnataka High Court has quashed a Section 509 IPC prosecution against two accused after finding that the complaint and investigation material did not disclose the offence's required ingredients.

Justice S. R. Krishna Kumar allowed Criminal Petition 4343/2026 on September 16.

The complaint alleged abusive remarks and body-shaming during a Bengaluru incident. Examining the FIR, charge sheet and witness statements, the court held that the material did not establish the statutory offence of words, gestures or acts intended to insult a woman's modesty.

The bench said the alleged comments about physical appearance, on the material in this case, were insufficient to sustain that charge.

A third accused had already obtained quashing in proceedings arising from the same incident. The court found the allegations against all three identical and applied parity as an additional basis for relief.

The proceedings were quashed insofar as the two petitioners were concerned. The order concerns the evidentiary and legal requirements of this particular Section 509 prosecution.

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

Rajasthan High Court Requires Proper Notice To POCSO Victims' Families

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Rajasthan High Court has directed police, prosecutors and legal-services authorities to ensure proper notice to POCSO victims' families when bail applications are filed.

Justice Sandeep Shah issued the September 16 order after a service notice bore an unexplained signature without the recipient's particulars or receipt date and time.

The court reiterated its earlier directions requiring written information, a documented acknowledgment and prompt transmission of the service report to the prosecutor. The process must preserve the child's anonymity and enable access to legal assistance.

The bench said deficient service was repeatedly delaying bail hearings, affecting both the victim's participation and the accused's liberty.

It directed the Director General of Police, the State's law department and Rajasthan's legal-services authority to issue compliance guidelines statewide.

In the pending applications, the prosecutor was directed to secure appropriate notice, including fresh service in the matter with the defective acknowledgment. The cases were listed after a week; this order did not decide whether bail should be granted.

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT

Allahabad High Court Orders Compensation For Unexplained Police Custody

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Allahabad High Court has awarded compensation to four petitioners after finding that missing police-station CCTV footage and inadequate custody records supported their allegations of unlawful detention.

Justices Atul Sreedharan and Divesh Chandra Samant disposed of Mahendra Gaur's habeas corpus petition on September 9. The police maintained that the petitioners had been called for questioning and released, but could not substantiate that account with reliable records.

The bench said that, when CCTV is unavailable, police must document a person's arrival and departure. Without footage

**ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT****Allahabad High Court Orders Compensation For Unexplained Police Custody**

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4

[COURT PDF](#)

or supporting release documentation, an adverse evidentiary inference was justified in this case.

The State was directed to pay ₹20,000 each to three petitioners detained for ten days and ₹5,000 to the petitioner held for two days.

The court also ordered recovery from those responsible after an inquiry and recording of its displeasure in the officer's service book.

It declined to direct action against the district police superintendent or circle officer on the material before it.

MADRAS HIGH COURT**Madras High Court Upholds Recruitment Relief For Candidate Unaware Of FIR**

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

[COURT PDF](#)

The Madras High Court has upheld relief for a police-recruitment candidate rejected for allegedly suppressing a criminal case that the authorities had not shown he knew about when applying.

Justices M. Dhandapani and N. Dilip Kumar dismissed the recruitment authorities' appeal concerning P. Manikandan on September 3.

The candidate had cleared the selection stages for sub-inspector recruitment. His application was rejected because an FIR named him, although investigation later removed him from the accused.

The bench found no material demonstrating deliberate suppression or knowledge of the case on the application date. It said the department had treated registration of the FIR as sufficient without undertaking the required inquiry into knowledge and the surrounding circumstances.

The court also warned that prolonged or unfounded criminal proceedings can deprive young people of employment opportunities that later exoneration may not restore.

The ruling upheld the earlier recruitment relief on these facts; it does not create an automatic entitlement to uniformed-service employment whenever a criminal case is pending.

BOMBAY HIGH COURT**Bombay High Court Rejects Blanket Tax Exemption For Minority Schools**

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

[COURT PDF](#)

The Bombay High Court has rejected a trust's claim to a permanent property-tax exemption merely because it runs linguistic minority educational institutions.

Justices Bharati Dangre and Manjusha Deshpande dismissed Jai Hind Sindhu Education Trust's petition against municipal tax demands in a September 29 judgment.

The bench held that an exemption under Section 132 of the Maharashtra Municipal Corporations Act requires evidence that the relevant land, building or identifiable portion is exclusively occupied and used for a public charitable purpose. Educational activity or charitable registration alone does not settle that question.

The trust must apply for each financial year, enabling the municipality to assess actual use and supporting material. Commercial activity does not receive the same exemption merely because it occurs within an educational campus.

The court found no basis to interfere with the challenged demands and vacated interim protection. It allowed the trust to seek exemptions for future years with appropriate evidence.

The result leaves room for qualifying charitable educational use, while refusing an automatic exemption based solely on minority-institution status.

KERALA HIGH COURT**Kerala High Court Orders Sabarimala Tender Safeguards For Prasadam**

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

[COURT PDF](#)

The Kerala High Court has directed the Travancore Devaswom Board to strengthen tender conditions for ingredients used in Sabarimala offerings, addressing both food quality and the temple's religious requirements.

Justices Raja Vijayaraghavan V and K. V. Jayakumar disposed of WP(C) 25645/2021 on September 29. The petition challenged procurement of jaggery carrying Halal certification labels for Aravana and other prasadam.



KERALA HIGH COURT

Kerala High Court Orders Sabarimala Tender Safeguards For Prasadam

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5

COURT PDF

The bench found that the analysis reports before it showed satisfactory quality. Testing had not revealed a substance rendering the jaggery unsuitable for prasadam.

It nevertheless said the Board should have taken greater care over symbols or declarations that could cause apprehension of conflict with temple customs. The supplier's certification had been explained as connected with exports to Middle Eastern countries.

Recording the Board's undertaking to exercise greater care, the court ordered appropriate future tender conditions to ensure conformity with prescribed quality standards and applicable religious customs.

The judgment does not record a finding that the tested jaggery was unsafe merely because its packaging carried that certification.

ORISSA HIGH COURT

Orissa High Court Acquits Juvenile After Missing Adult-Trial Assessment

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Orissa High Court has set aside a POCSO conviction because the Children's Court began an adult criminal trial without independently deciding whether that course was necessary under Section 19 of the Juvenile Justice Act.

In its September 30 judgment in CRLA 286/2020, Justice Sibio Sankar Mishra found that the Juvenile Justice Board's transfer order had been followed by framing of charges, with no intervening determination by the Children's Court.

The court explained that the Board's preliminary assessment and the Children's Court's decision are separate safeguards. The latter must consider whether to try the child as an adult or conduct an inquiry under the juvenile framework.

The appellant was about 17 at the relevant time. The court treated the omitted assessment as a fundamental jurisdictional defect and set aside the conviction and sentence, acquitting him.

The decision rested on non-compliance with juvenile protections, rather than an assessment that the allegations were insignificant.

DELHI HIGH COURT

Delhi High Court Upholds Entry Refusal Despite Valid Business Visa

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Delhi High Court has dismissed a Turkmenistan national's challenge to refusal of entry into India, holding that possession of a valid business visa does not guarantee admission.

Justice Amit Mahajan ruled on September 30 in a petition concerning the woman's return from Delhi airport on March 25. She sought written reasons and permission to enter, arguing that her husband had been admitted after travelling with her.

The authorities relied on adverse inputs, concerns about her travel pattern and unsatisfactory explanations of her business activities. After examining confidential material, the court found a factual basis for the immigration assessment.

The judgment distinguishes the issue of a visa from the immigration officer's decision at the border. It also rejected the equality challenge because the woman had not shown that the same adverse assessment applied to her husband.

The court declined to substitute its assessment for that of the competent authority in the circumstances and dismissed the writ petition.

DELHI HIGH COURT

Accused Must Be Heard Before Cognizance Under BNSS, Delhi High Court Rules

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Delhi High Court has clarified when magistrates must hear an accused before taking cognizance of a private complaint under Section 223(1) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

In a September 29 reference judgment, Justices Navin Chawla and Ravinder Dudeja held that the complainant and witnesses present must ordinarily be examined on oath first. Statutory exemptions continue to apply.

Notice to the accused follows that examination and a preliminary assessment that the complaint should not be dismissed under Section 226. A formal decision to take cognizance can be made only after the accused has received an opportunity to be heard.



DELHI HIGH COURT

Accused Must Be Heard Before Cognizance Under BNSS, Delhi High Court Rules

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6

COURT PDF

The ruling distinguishes preliminary scrutiny from cognizance itself. It protects the accused's statutory hearing while avoiding notice in complaints that fail at the initial examination stage.

The reference arose in *Dr Rita Bakshi v Seema Bajaj* and a connected petition. The court answered the procedural questions and directed that the matters return to the roster bench, subject to the Chief Justice's orders.

DELHI HIGH COURT

Article 226 Cannot Resolve Private Personal Grievances

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Delhi High Court has dismissed a writ petition seeking official action on representations arising from a former employee's dispute with a private company.

Pushpendra Singh Parmar alleged that his former employer had improperly obtained confidential emails and used them against him. He asked the court to direct office-bearers of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India to act on his representations.

Justice Amit Mahajan found that the controversy substantially concerned the petitioner's longstanding grievances against the private company. The relief sought would effectively require the writ court to adjudicate an individual dispute involving a private party.

The court said jurisdiction under Article 226 is extraordinary and cannot be invoked simply because a representation has not produced the action a litigant wants. It is not designed to provide a forum for personal disputes or collateral objectives against an adversary.

The petition was dismissed, while leaving Parmar free to pursue appropriate remedies against the company in accordance with law.

DELHI HIGH COURT

School De-Recognition Does Not Authorise Closure

BY EDITORIAL TEAM

COURT PDF

The Delhi High Court has partly allowed an appeal by teachers of Ring Midways Senior Secondary Public School, ruling that withdrawal of recognition does not itself amount to lawful closure.

The school had been de-recognised after years of financial and management disputes. A single judge later directed its management to return the school land to the lessor. The Division Bench found that direction incompatible with the Delhi School Education Act and Rules.

Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia said Rule 46 requires the managing committee to justify closure and obtain the Director of Education's prior approval after consultation with the Advisory Board. Those requirements cannot be bypassed merely because recognition has been withdrawn.

The court also noted that management remained vested in the Lieutenant Governor when the challenged handover direction was issued. It therefore set aside that direction and clarified that any closure proposal must follow the statutory process.

Directions concerning distribution of available funds and sale of movable assets toward staff salary arrears remain operative.

GUJARAT HIGH COURT

Gujarat lawyers to stay away from courts for two days over Rent Bill dispute

BY SHEIKH RAYEES

COURT PDF

The Gujarat High Court Advocates' Association (GHCAA) has decided to abstain from court proceedings for two days in protest against provisions of the Gujarat Rent Bill, 2026. The association resolved to stay away from court work on October 5 and 6 after an Extraordinary General Body meeting held at the Gujarat High Court on Monday. The meeting was chaired by GHCAA President and Senior Advocate Yatin Oza. The move comes in support of advocates practising before the City Civil Court and Small Causes Court, who have been opposing the proposed changes under the Bill. The decision also follows a resolution adopted by the Bar Council of Gujarat (BCG) backing the lawyers' protest. At the centre of the dispute is the Bill's proposal to move the adjudication of rent-related disputes away from



GUJARAT HIGH COURT

Gujarat lawyers to stay away from courts for two days over Rent Bill dispute

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

COURT PDF

courts and place it in the hands of revenue authorities. The legislation, which has cleared the Gujarat Legislative Assembly, is awaiting the Governor's approval. Under the proposed framework, officials including Deputy Collectors and Additional Collectors would be empowered to hear and decide rent disputes. Lawyers in Ahmedabad had already begun demonstrations against the proposal. Advocates at the City Civil and Small Causes Courts had earlier abstained from work and restricted access to the Bhadra court complex as part of their protest. The Bar Council of Gujarat subsequently held an extraordinary general body meeting on

October 3 and extended its support to the agitation. It called for lawyers across the State to abstain from proceedings before courts, tribunals, judicial and quasi-judicial bodies and revenue authorities from October 5 until the dispute is resolved. The Council has raised concerns over the proposed transfer of adjudicatory powers from judicial forums to administrative officials. It has argued that the move could affect lawyers and litigants while also placing an additional burden on an already stretched administrative machinery. Questions have also been raised about how evidence would be recorded and assessed in rent disputes once the matters are shifted to revenue authorities. The Bar Council has sought a meeting with Chief Minister Bhupendra Patel and the State Law Minister, seeking amendments to the legislation and restoration of rent-dispute adjudication to judicial authorities. The GHCAA's two-day abstention is intended to reinforce the demand and demonstrate solidarity with advocates appearing before the City Civil and Small Causes Courts.