

- Supreme Court held that just because a woman is unmarried that cannot be reason to deny her the right to abort a pregnancy up to the period of 24 weeks.
- In *Gautam Navlakha vs National Investigation Agency*, the Supreme Court observed that the condition of Indian jails is pathetic being overcrowded, and vulnerable to crimes like sodomy and forced homosexuality.
- In *Fathima Bushra vs State of Karnataka*, the Supreme Court has reserved its verdict in a group of appeals challenging the Karnataka High Court order that upheld the ban imposed by the Karnataka Government on hijabs worn by Muslim women students in college campus.
- In *Ashwini Upadhyay v Union of India*, the Supreme Court expressed concern about the functioning of media houses, and observed that television news channels often offer a platform for hate speech and escape scot free.
- In a recent judgment, the Madras High Court has held that the ultimate purpose of any marriage is procreation and it cannot remain limited to mere carnal pleasure.
- The Bombay High Court asked the Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation (BMC) to show under what provisions of law was it collecting fines from the general public for not wearing masks. It also stated that on sufficient proof of public interest, the Court will not intervene.
- The Delhi High Court split verdict on marital rape exception under the Indian Penal Code, 1860 is now before the Supreme Court. The Court has sought Central Government's viewpoint over this issue.
- In a progressive verdict, the Rajasthan High Court held that married daughters will also be entitled to apply for government jobs on compassionate grounds just like sons and unmarried daughters.
- In *Dr Meraj Ali & Anr vs State of UP*, the Allahabad High Court held that just like the complainants, the accused also have a right to speedy trial.

- In *RS Bhargava vs Govt. of NCT of Delhi*, the Delhi High Court allowed an unvaccinated teacher to resume duties after the member board constituted by AIIMS concluded that an allergic risk to the teacher after COVID-19 vaccination posed a greater danger to his life.
- In *xxxxx vs State of Kerala & Ors*, the Kerala High Court condemned media trials. It observed that media room discussions about legal issues are often held with utter disregard to the principles of law and the circumstances in which the Courts give their judgements.
- In *Ashwini Upadhyay v Union of India*, the Supreme Court refused to entertain a plea for a blanket ban on production, distribution and consumption of intoxicating drinks and drugs.
- In *State of UP vs Mukhtar Ansari*, the Allahabad High Court (Lucknow Bench) sentenced former BSP MLA Mukhtar Ansari to imprisonment for a term of seven years for intimidating a jailer.
- In *Meera Shukla vs Municipal Corporation, Gorakhpur*, the National Green Tribunal (NGT) ordered the state of Uttar Pradesh to pay ₹120 crores for compensating the damage caused by improper solid waste management.
- The Supreme Court allowed a modification in the Constitution of the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) to alter the mandatory three-year cooling-off period after a term as a functionary.
- In *Shri Ishwar Singh vs Land and Building Department and Anr*, the Delhi High Court condemned the 'babu' culture and termed it a sign of colonial hangover, as well as a major hurdle in the dream of making the nation a developed power.
- In *Nalin Kohli v Union of India*, the Supreme Court refused to entertain a petition for a study to collect data establishing a link between watching pornography and sexual offences.

- In *Viniyog Parivar Trust vs Union of India*, the apex court refused to hear a petition praying for directions to the Government of India to introduce an alcohol prevention policy.
- The apex court issued notice in a petition praying for prohibition on use of religious symbols by political parties.
- A writ petition has been filed in the Supreme Court praying for a writ of mandamus to bring the Women's Reservation Bill before the Parliament.
- While hearing a matter regarding the Sutlej Yamuna Link Canal (SYL) between the states of Punjab and Haryana, the apex court directed the Union Jal Shakti Ministry to organise a meeting between the Chief Ministers of the two states and make an attempt to arrive at an amicable settlement of the long-pending issue.
- The Supreme Court in a recent landmark judgment in *Anuj Garg and another v Deepak Kumar Garg* held that the husband has a duty to maintain his wife and minor child even if he has to do physical labour and he cannot avoid the responsibility by saying that he does not have a source of income.
- Senior advocate R Venkataramani has been appointed as the new Attorney General of India. He is the 16th attorney general of India and he succeeded KK Venugopal.
- In the case of *Suresh Kashinath Kamble vs the State of Maharashtra*, it was held by the Supreme Court that half of the life imprisonment under the Prevention of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) means imprisonment for 10 years.
- In another important ruling by the Delhi High Court in *Rajesh Giri vs Subhash Mittal and Ors*, it was held by the Delhi High Court that if a private temple is open to public on certain festivals does not mean that it becomes a public temple and titular rights cannot be claimed over it by the worshipper.
- In the case of *Mahboob Ali vs State of Uttarakhand*, it was held by the Uttarakhand High Court that the lax attitude of the government officials saying “chalta hai” while dealing with bail cases is the biggest hurdle in the expeditious disposal of the bail cases.

- The Supreme Court more than two years ago allowed the translocation of Cheetahs into India and it is after two years that Cheetahs from Namibia are brought in Gwalior marking the beginning of translocation of Cheetahs in India.
- In the case of The Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) vs Cricket Association of Bihar, the Supreme Court held that the cooling off period of three years between one term of the office bearer is mandatory and hence allowed modification in the rules of Board of Control of Cricket in India (BCCI)
- In the case of Anupam Ghosh and Anr vs Faiz Mohammed and Ors, it was held by the Supreme Court that it is disheartening to see that litigants have started a tendency to level allegations against the judges when the judgment is not passed in their favour.
- In the case of Sayaji Dashrath Kawade vs State of Maharashtra, it was held by the Bombay High Court that when a person is charged under the Prevention of Corruption Act, then strict charges of corruption has to be proved against him and he cannot be convicted on the ground of ethics and morals.