



May, 2026



-RAJNEESH SOOD & CO.[®]
Advocates & Solicitors

FOREWORD

We are pleased to present the **third volume** of our newsletter, continuing our endeavour to keep our clients, colleagues, and readers informed of significant legal and regulatory developments.

In a legal environment shaped by evolving judicial interpretations, legislative reforms and changing commercial realities, this edition brings together noteworthy judgments, statutory updates, and practical insights from diverse areas of law.

Our objective remains not merely to report developments but to examine their practical implications for businesses, institutions, and individuals alike.

This volume reflects our commitment to thoughtful legal analysis, knowledge-sharing, and informed discourse on contemporary legal issues. We are particularly proud of our young lawyers' contributions, whose engagement in research and analysis continues to strengthen our knowledge-driven practice. This publication is the result of the dedicated efforts of our Editorial Team, whose diligence ensures clarity, relevance, and professional integrity.

We are grateful for the encouragement and positive response received from our readers. **Your feedback remains invaluable** as we continue to refine future editions. We thank you for your continued trust and support and look forward to the editions ahead.

*****Editorial Team*****

Disclaimer:

All Rights Reserved. This newsletter is for informational purposes only and reflects the authors' views. It does not constitute legal advice or solicitation. Readers should seek professional advice before acting on any information contained herein.

ABOUT US

Rajneesh Sood & Co. LLP is a full-service law firm based in New Delhi, established in 2000 by Advocate Rajneesh Sood and has been structured as a limited liability partnership since 2015. With over two decades of experience, the firm has grown into a trusted legal partner to a diverse clientele, including leading Indian and international brands.

Driven by the core principles of Ethics, Excellence, and Experience, the firm combines rigorous legal research with practical, solution-oriented advice tailored to client needs.

The firm offers a broad range of services, including corporate advisory and entity formation, secretarial compliance, taxation counsel, litigation and arbitration, human resources and labour law support, and intellectual property protection.

Known for its client-centric approach and attention to detail, *Rajneesh Sood & Co. LLP* helps clients navigate complex legal challenges with clarity, confidence, and strategic foresight.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MCA NOTIFICATIONS	6
The Companies (Registration Offices and Fees) Amendment Rules, 2026	6
The Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility), 2026	6
FEMA NOTIFICATIONS	7
RBI/2026-27/78.....	7
A.P. (DIR Series) Circular No. 09	7
Notification No. FEMA 401/2026-RB	7
PROPERTY LAW	8
SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS BURDEN OF PROOF IN GPA FRAUD ALLEGATIONS.....	8
SUPREME COURT SETS ASIDE DEMOLITION DIRECTIONS PASSED IN ABSENCE OF SHOP ALLOTTEES .8	
PRELIMINARY DECREE MAY BE EXECUTABLE WHERE RIGHTS STAND FULLY DETERMINED: SUPREME COURT	9
ARBITRATION LAW	10
LOSING PARTY CAN SEEK INTERIM RELIEF UNDER SECTION 9 — SUPREME COURT SETTLES THE DEBATE.....	10
SIMPLE INTEREST RESTORED: COURTS CANNOT REWRITE ARBITRAL AWARDS UNDER SECTION 33 10	
SUPREME COURT STRENGTHENS ENFORCEABILITY OF INCORPORATED ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS	11
COMPANY LAW	12
HOMEBUYERS’ INTERESTS PRIORITIZED IN REAL ESTATE INSOLVENCY DISPUTE.....	12
IBC CANNOT REPLACE EXECUTION PROCEEDINGS: SC	12
SUPREME COURT TIGHTENS LIMITATION PRINCIPLES UNDER IBC	13
SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS VALIDITY OF CORPORATE GUARANTEES UNDER IBC	13
TAX LAW	15
REVENUE SHARE OR PROFIT SHARE? SUPREME COURT DRAWS THE LINE.....	15
FLASH POINT ALONE CANNOT DETERMINE CUSTOMS CLASSIFICATION, RULES SUPREME COURT ..15	
LAW RELATED TO CONTRACTS	16
TECHNICAL TENDER CONDITIONS CANNOT BE EXPANDED BEYOND EXPRESS TERMS: SC	16

TENDER TERMS MUST BE CONSTRUED ACCORDING TO THEIR PLAIN LANGUAGE: SUPREME COURT	16
SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS COURT’S CONTINUING CONTROL OVER SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE DECREES	17
CIVIL LAW.....	18
RES JUDICATA APPLIES TO REPEATED ORDER VII RULE 11 CHALLENGES, HOLDS SUPREME COURT .	18
DELAYED OWNERSHIP CLAIMS CANNOT DEFEAT DECREE ENFORCEMENT: SC.....	18
SC REAFFIRMS LIMITS OF PROMISSORY ESTOPPEL AGAINST STATE POLICIES.....	19
CONSUMER LAW	20
SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES SURVIVAL OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE CLAIMS	20
FAILURE TO RE-PRESENT CHEQUES WITHIN THE VALIDITY PERIOD CONSTITUTES DEFICIENCY IN SERVICE	20
FAMILY LAW.....	22
CONSENT IN RELATIONSHIP CANNOT BE PRESUMED VITIATED: SUPREME COURT	22
DAUGHTER-IN-LAW CANNOT INSIST ON RESIDENCE IN IN-LAWS’ PROPERTY: HC.....	22
SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS PRINCIPLES GOVERNING PROOF OF WILLS.....	23
CRIMINAL LAW	24
DELHI HC BALANCES STATUTORY RIGOUR WITH SUBSTANTIVE JUSTICE	24
SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES PROCEDURE FOR SEEKING FIR REGISTRATION	24
CHEQUE BOUNCE LIABILITY SURVIVES INSOLVENCY: SUPREME COURT	25
LABOUR LAWS.....	26
PROPORTIONALITY AS A SAFEGUARD AGAINST HARSH EMPLOYMENT SANCTIONS.....	26
TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION AND THE ‘APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENT’ IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES	26
MISCELLANEOUS	28
RIGHT TO TRAUMA CARE RECOGNISED AS INTEGRAL TO ARTICLE 21	28
RES JUDICATA APPLIES TO REPEATED ORDER VII RULE 11 CHALLENGES, HOLDS SUPREME COURT .	28
SUPREME COURT RECOGNISES CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE OF MOTHER TONGUE-BASED EDUCATION	29

MCA NOTIFICATIONS

S.no.	Notification/Circular	Date of Notification	Brief
1	The Companies (Registration Offices and Fees) Amendment Rules, 2026	April 21, 2026	For DIR-3-KYC Web under Rule 12A of the Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014, if filed after the timeline, an amount of Rs. 5000 has to be paid. And if by any chance, a change has to be made, an amount of Rs. 500 must be paid for each filing. (ACCESS HERE)
2	The Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility), 2026	May 27, 2026	The Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2026 introduce the concept of Zero Coupon Zero Principal Instruments (ZCZP) issued by SEBI-registered Not-for-Profit Organizations on Social Stock Exchanges. Companies may undertake CSR activities through such instruments, subject to a cap of 10% of annual CSR expenditure. Subscribers are exempt from impact assessment requirements. NPOs must complete funded projects within three financial years and transfer any unspent amounts to Schedule VII funds upon delisting. (ACCESS HERE)

FEMA NOTIFICATIONS

S.no.	Notification/Circular	Date of Notification	Brief
1	RBI/2026-27/78 A.P. (DIR Series) Circular No. 09	06.05.2026	RBI issued FEMA (Authorised Persons) Regulations, 2026 to streamline authorisation and improve forex service delivery while easing compliance. Existing directions on money changing and remittances are amended. Franchisee arrangements are discontinued within two years. Reporting norms are revised (net worth, forex turnover). Several earlier circulars are superseded. (ACCESS HERE)
2	Notification No. FEMA 401/2026-RB	30.04.2026	The RBI's FEMA (Authorised Persons) Regulations, 2026 introduce a streamlined framework for authorising entities dealing in foreign exchange. They define eligibility, categories (AD I, II, III) and permitted activities, while mandating minimum net worth, turnover, and 'fit and proper' criteria. Applications must be made via the PRAVAAH portal. Franchisee models are phased out and replaced by Forex Correspondents. Compliance, reporting, governance, and revocation provisions are strengthened, and an appeal mechanism is provided. (ACCESS HERE)

PROPERTY LAW

SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS BURDEN OF PROOF IN GPA FRAUD ALLEGATIONS

In [*Mallika v. R. Nallathambi & Ors. \(2026\)*](#), the Supreme Court upheld dismissal of a property dispute, emphasising evidentiary burdens, adverse inference principles, and substantial compliance with Order XLI Rule 31 CPC.

The judgment reiterates that allegations of fraud, fiduciary misuse, and sham transactions must be supported by cogent foundational evidence. The Court clarified that substantial—not technical—compliance with Order XLI Rule 31 of the CPC suffices, while also reaffirming principles regarding adverse inference, mutation records, delay in asserting rights and the limited scope of second appeals under Section 100 of the CPC.

SUPREME COURT SETS ASIDE DEMOLITION DIRECTIONS PASSED IN ABSENCE OF SHOP ALLOTTEES

In [*Prem Porwal v. Jagdeesh Chandra Prajapati \(2026\)*](#), the Supreme Court set aside demolition directions issued in a PIL, emphasising the principles of natural justice, the necessary parties, and the limits of writ jurisdiction.

The judgment underscores that courts exercising PIL and writ jurisdiction cannot adjudicate disputed property title issues or issue adverse directions against unimpleaded affected parties. Reaffirming

procedural fairness, the Court held that demolition orders impacting vested commercial rights without affording occupants a hearing constitute a manifest error apparent on the record, warranting review jurisdiction.

PRELIMINARY DECREE MAY BE EXECUTABLE WHERE RIGHTS STAND FULLY DETERMINED: SUPREME COURT

In [*Jennifer Messias v. Leonard G. Lobo \(2026\)*](#), the Supreme Court reinstated execution proceedings in a partition dispute, holding that the decree substantially determined rights and was executable.

The judgment emphasizes that courts must examine the substance of a decree rather than its label as “preliminary” or “final.” Reaffirming a pragmatic approach to partition litigation, the Court held that where rights, possession, mesne profits, and the mechanism for division or sale are already determined, procedural formalities should not obstruct execution and effective enforcement of decrees.

ARBITRATION LAW

LOSING PARTY CAN SEEK INTERIM RELIEF UNDER SECTION 9 — SUPREME COURT SETTLES THE DEBATE

The Supreme Court in [*Home Care Retail Marts v. Haresh N. Sanghavi*](#) settled a long-standing conflict among High Courts, holding that unsuccessful parties in arbitration can seek interim relief under Section 9 post-award.

This landmark ruling clarifies that the term "a party" under Section 9 (interim measures by the Court) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, cannot be restricted to only the successful party post-award. An unsuccessful party retains the right to seek interim protection pending Section 34 challenge proceedings, though courts must apply a higher threshold of scrutiny to such applications.

SIMPLE INTEREST RESTORED: COURTS CANNOT REWRITE ARBITRAL AWARDS UNDER SECTION 33

The Supreme Court in [*Gujarat Water Supply Board v. Saryu Plastics*](#) upheld an arbitral award against a public board that repeatedly delayed proceedings, ruling it was estopped from later challenging the arbitrator's mandate.

This judgment reaffirms two vital principles: first, that a party which participates in arbitration without objecting to mandate extensions cannot subsequently challenge the award on that ground, as acquiescence operates as estoppel and second, that Section 33 of the

Arbitration Act permits only correction of clerical or typographical errors and cannot be used to substantively modify an award — here, switching simple interest to compound interest was held impermissible, reversing a modification that had ballooned the Board's liability from ₹30 crores to ₹144 crores.

SUPREME COURT STRENGTHENS ENFORCEABILITY OF INCORPORATED ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS

In Hirani Developers v. Nehru Nagar Samruddhi CHS Ltd., the Supreme Court held that an arbitration clause may be incorporated by reference when the parties clearly adopt all the terms of another agreement. The Supreme Court clarified the scope of Section 7(5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, holding that comprehensive incorporation clauses can validly import arbitration agreements from earlier contracts. The judgment distinguished mere reference from full incorporation and reaffirmed that clear contractual intent is sufficient to bind parties to arbitration.

COMPANY LAW

HOMEBUYERS' INTERESTS PRIORITIZED IN REAL ESTATE INSOLVENCY DISPUTE

In [*Alpha Corp Development Private Limited v. GNIDA*](#), the Supreme Court examined whether leasehold rights of subsidiary companies could form part of CIRP and balanced homebuyers' interests against GNIDA's contractual claims.

The judgment clarified that subsidiary assets cannot automatically be treated as assets of the corporate debtor during CIRP. However, authorities like GNIDA cannot obstruct resolution after remaining inactive despite knowledge of defaults and insolvency proceedings. The Court emphasised the timely submission of claims, protection of homebuyers, project-specific insolvency resolution, and accountability of public authorities.

IBC CANNOT REPLACE EXECUTION PROCEEDINGS: SC

In [*Anjani Technoplast Ltd. v. Shubh Gautam*](#), the Supreme Court held that insolvency proceedings under the IBC cannot be used as a substitute for the execution of money decrees against solvent companies.

The judgment reaffirmed that the IBC is a resolution mechanism, **not a debt-recovery tool**. The Supreme Court clarified that even a decree-holder financial creditor cannot invoke CIRP mechanically where the

debt computation is disputed, execution remedies are available, and the corporate debtor remains solvent and operational.

SUPREME COURT TIGHTENS LIMITATION PRINCIPLES UNDER IBC

In [*Shankar Khandelwal v. Omkara Asset Reconstruction Pvt. Ltd.*](#), the Supreme Court ruled that admission of claims by an IRP does not constitute an acknowledgement of debt for extending the limitation under the IBC.

The Supreme Court clarified that the limitation under Section 7 of the IBC runs from the date of NPA and cannot be revived through mere administrative admission of claims by an IRP/RP. The judgment reinforces that acknowledgement under Section 18 of the Limitation Act requires conscious admission of liability by the debtor itself.

SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS VALIDITY OF CORPORATE GUARANTEES UNDER IBC

In [*State Bank of India v. Doha Bank Q.P.S.C.*](#), the Supreme Court upheld the validity of corporate guarantees and recognised consortium lenders as financial creditors under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code.

The Supreme Court clarified that liabilities arising from corporate guarantees constitute “financial debt” under the IBC. The judgment further held that non-disclosure in financial statements, delayed production of documents or curable stamp duty defects cannot

invalidate genuine guarantees or defeat creditor claims during insolvency proceedings.



TAX LAW

REVENUE SHARE OR PROFIT SHARE? SUPREME COURT DRAWS THE LINE

In *Sanand Properties P. Ltd. v. Jt. Commr. of I.T. (2026 INSC 472)*, the Supreme Court upheld reassessment notices and ruled that a member's pre-expense AOP share constitutes taxable revenue, not exempt profit. The Court clarified that reassessment under Section 147 is not barred as a "change of opinion" where the Assessing Officer never formed any opinion on the fundamental nature of the income in the original assessment. It further held that an AOP member's share entitlement attaching to gross receipts before deduction of expenses — by virtue of overriding title — constitutes revenue in the member's hands, taxable independently, and not a share of the AOP's profit exempt under Section 86.

FLASH POINT ALONE CANNOT DETERMINE CUSTOMS CLASSIFICATION, RULES SUPREME COURT

In *Commissioner of Customs, Kandla v. M/S Reliance Industries Limited (2026 INSC 536)*, the Supreme Court settled the customs classification of n-Hexane, holding it to be a pure organic chemical compound and not a petroleum-based motor spirit. The judgement clarifies that, for customs classification, chemical identity and the HSN Explanatory Notes take precedence over physical properties, such as flash point alone. A product qualifies as a "Motor Spirit" under Chapter 27 only when all three statutory conditions are cumulatively satisfied. Separately defined chemical compounds, even with process-derived impurities, rightly fall under Chapter 29.

LAW RELATED TO CONTRACTS

TECHNICAL TENDER CONDITIONS CANNOT BE EXPANDED BEYOND EXPRESS TERMS: SC

In [RR Constructions and Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd. v. Gayatri Ventures & Ors.](#), the Supreme Court held that furnishing EMD through Fixed Deposit was permissible under tender conditions for out-of-state bidders.

The judgment reiterates that tender conditions must be interpreted strictly in accordance with their express language and that administrative authorities cannot impose additional mandatory requirements absent a clear stipulation. The Court emphasized that procedural tender conditions should not defeat qualitative competition amongst bidders, particularly where the bidder substantially complied with eligibility requirements and public interest favored wider participation.

TENDER TERMS MUST BE CONSTRUED ACCORDING TO THEIR PLAIN LANGUAGE: SUPREME COURT

In [RR Constructions and Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd. v. Gayatri Ventures & Ors. \(2026\)](#), the Supreme Court restored a bidder's eligibility after finding an erroneous interpretation of tender conditions governing earnest money deposit EMD submission.

The judgment reaffirms that tender conditions must be interpreted according to their plain language and that optional requirements cannot be converted into mandatory disqualifications. Emphasizing substance over technicality, the Court held that a valid fixed deposit

qualified as an acceptable EMD, thereby protecting fairness, competition, and certainty in public procurement processes.

SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS COURT'S CONTINUING CONTROL OVER SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE DECREES

In [Habban Shah v. Sheruddin \(2026\)](#), the Supreme Court held that a decree for specific performance became inexecutable where the decree-holder failed to deposit the balance consideration within the stipulated period.

The judgment clarifies that decrees for specific performance impose reciprocal obligations and require strict compliance with the conditions governing the payment of the sale consideration. Reaffirming the equitable nature of specific performance, the Court held that delayed deposits do not automatically extend time, and continued readiness and willingness must persist even after the decree is passed.

CIVIL LAW

RES JUDICATA APPLIES TO REPEATED ORDER VII RULE 11 CHALLENGES, HOLDS SUPREME COURT

In [B.S. Lalitha & Ors. v. B.S. Subhas & Ors. \(2026\)](#), the Supreme Court restored daughters' partition suit, clarifying the interplay between Sections 6, 8, res judicata, and Order VII Rule 11 CPC.

The judgment holds that Section 6(5) of the Hindu Succession Act is merely a saving clause protecting certain pre-2004 partitions and not a jurisdictional bar to partition suits. The Court further reaffirmed that daughters' succession rights under Section 8, accruing upon a father's intestate death, remain independent of and unaffected by the 2005 coparcenary-rights amendment, while also emphasising the binding effect of interlocutory res judicata.

DELAYED OWNERSHIP CLAIMS CANNOT DEFEAT DECREE ENFORCEMENT: SC

In [Challani Ginning and Pressing Factory v. Kamal](#), the Supreme Court rejected belated third-party objections in execution proceedings, holding that speculative ownership claims cannot frustrate decree enforcement.

The Supreme Court reaffirmed that execution proceedings cannot be endlessly obstructed through delayed and unsubstantiated third-party claims under Order XXI CPC. The judgment emphasised that courts

must prevent abuse of process, particularly where objections are raised solely to stall recovery and defeat lawful execution of decrees.

SC REAFFIRMS LIMITS OF PROMISSORY ESTOPPEL AGAINST STATE POLICIES

In [*State of Himachal Pradesh v. M/S Kundlas Loh Udyog*](#), the Supreme Court held that concessional electricity tariffs under Himachal Pradesh's Industrial Policy were intended exclusively for new industries, not expanding existing enterprises. The Supreme Court clarified that clarificatory amendments operate retrospectively where they merely explain original legislative intent. The judgment also reaffirmed the limits of promissory estoppel against the State, holding that industrial incentives cannot be expanded contrary to the policy structure, fiscal discipline, and the contemporaneous statutory framework.

CONSUMER LAW

SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES SURVIVAL OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE CLAIMS

In [*Dr. S.K. Lall through Legal Representatives v. Consumer*](#), the Supreme Court examined whether medical negligence claims survive against a deceased doctor's legal heirs during pending consumer proceedings.

The Supreme Court clarified the interplay among Section 306 of the Indian Succession Act, Order XXII of the CPC, and consumer protection law. The judgment explained when tortious claims survive against legal representatives, distinguished personal injury claims from pecuniary loss to the estate, and reaffirmed that procedural substitution depends upon survivability of the substantive right to sue.

It is noteworthy that the trend of surviving tortious liabilities, especially those of a consumer nature, is on the rise, marking a clear jurisprudential theme in India.

FAILURE TO RE-PRESENT CHEQUES WITHIN THE VALIDITY PERIOD CONSTITUTES DEFICIENCY IN SERVICE

In [*Canara Bank vs Kavita Chowdhary*](#), the Supreme Court held a bank liable for deficiency in service due to negligent delay in re-presenting cheques, which rendered them stale.

The judgment reinforces banks' duty to exercise due diligence while handling negotiable instruments and clarifies that failure to present cheques within their validity period constitutes an actionable deficiency in service under consumer law. The Court also emphasised

that compensation must remain fair, reasonable, and proportionate to the actual loss suffered.



FAMILY LAW

CONSENT IN RELATIONSHIP CANNOT BE PRESUMED VITIATED: SUPREME COURT

In [Shaileshbhai Govindbhai Makwana v. State of Maharashtra](#), the Supreme Court quashed rape proceedings, holding that a prolonged consensual relationship cannot automatically be treated as intercourse induced by a false promise of marriage. The Supreme Court reaffirmed the distinction between a “false promise to marry” and a mere “breach of promise.” The judgment clarified that where consenting adults voluntarily maintain a long-term relationship with full awareness of the circumstances, consent cannot ordinarily be held vitiated by a misconception of fact under Section 375 of the IPC.

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW CANNOT INSIST ON RESIDENCE IN IN-LAWS’ PROPERTY: HC

In *[Ratika Kalra v. GNCTD](#)*, the Delhi High Court balanced senior citizens’ property rights against a daughter-in-law’s residence rights, permitting eviction subject to the provision of reasonable alternate accommodation.

The Delhi High Court reaffirmed that rights under the DV Act and the Senior Citizens Act must be harmoniously balanced. The judgment clarified that a daughter-in-law cannot insist on residing indefinitely in in-laws’ self-acquired property where ill-treatment is established, provided reasonable alternate accommodation and maintenance are ensured.

SUPREME COURT REAFFIRMS PRINCIPLES GOVERNING PROOF OF WILLS

In *Parvathi Nairthi (Dead) & Ors. v. Laxmi Nairthy (Dead) Through LRs. & Ors.*, the Supreme Court upheld a Will's validity, reiterating settled principles governing testamentary succession and suspicious circumstances.

The judgment reinforces that exclusion of natural heirs alone does not invalidate a Will and reiterates evidentiary standards for proving testamentary documents under the Indian Evidence Act. The Court also clarified that mutation entries do not confer title and emphasised that substantial rather than technical compliance with Order XLI Rule 31 of the CPC is required.

The Supreme Court reiterated that a Will must be proved through at least one attesting witness who establishes due execution and attestation. The propounder must dispel any suspicious circumstances and demonstrate that the testator had free will and a sound mind. Registration is not mandatory, and non-registration alone does not affect the Will's validity.

CRIMINAL LAW

DELHI HC BALANCES STATUTORY RIGOUR WITH SUBSTANTIVE JUSTICE

In [*Harmeet Singh vs State of GNCT Delhi and Anr.*](#), the Delhi High Court quashed POCSO proceedings after noting that the parties had voluntarily married, were cohabiting, raising their child and that the prosecutrix opposed the prosecution.

The Delhi High Court clarified that, in exceptional cases, POCSO proceedings may be quashed to prevent re-victimisation where no de facto victim seeks prosecution. The judgment balanced legislative intent with substantive justice, emphasising the welfare of the prosecutrix and the child, voluntary conduct, the absence of coercion, and the prevention of abuse of process.

This judgment addresses a growing conflict between the strict application of the POCSO Act and consensual adolescent relationships. The Delhi High Court held that where the parties have married, have a child and the prosecutrix consistently denies any harm, continuing prosecution may itself cause injustice. The decision is significant for introducing the distinction between a de jure victim (victim in law) and a de facto victim (victim in fact), while laying down factors for quashing POCSO proceedings in exceptional cases.

SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES PROCEDURE FOR SEEKING FIR REGISTRATION

In [*Sujal Vishwas Attavar v. State of Maharashtra*](#), the Supreme Court held that writ jurisdiction cannot ordinarily be invoked for FIR

registration without exhausting statutory remedies under the BNSS. The Supreme Court reaffirmed that remedies under Sections 173(4) and 175(3) BNSS must ordinarily be exhausted before invoking Article 226 for FIR registration. The judgment emphasized judicial restraint in writ jurisdiction, discouraged bypassing statutory mechanisms, and clarified that High Courts should not routinely act as forums of first instance in criminal complaints

CHEQUE BOUNCE LIABILITY SURVIVES INSOLVENCY: SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court in [*Abhaykumar Anandkumar Bhamore & Anr. v. Ortho Relief Hospital and Research Centre & Anr.*](#) dismissed an SLP challenging directors' liability under Section 138 NI Act, even after their company entered liquidation under the IBC.

This judgment clarifies that initiation of insolvency or liquidation proceedings under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, does not extinguish the personal criminal liability of directors under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. Directors who signed dishonoured cheques cannot seek discharge merely because the company has undergone liquidation.

LABOUR LAWS

PROPORTIONALITY AS A SAFEGUARD AGAINST HARSH EMPLOYMENT SANCTIONS

The decision in [*Delhi Transport Corporation v. Bahadur Singh*](#) arose from the dismissal of a DTC employee following a two-day strike in March 1988. Bahadur Singh challenged the dismissal before the Industrial Tribunal, which upheld the finding of misconduct but found the penalty of dismissal disproportionately severe and ordered his reinstatement with modified relief.

In this case, the Delhi High Court examined whether the Tribunal and the Single Judge had rightly interfered with the employer's punishment. The Court observed that the Tribunal had provided cogent reasons for treating dismissal as excessive, particularly considering the limited duration of the strike and the surrounding circumstances.

The significance of this case lies in its reaffirmation of the principle of proportionality in labour jurisprudence. The judgment underscores that while misconduct may be established, disciplinary penalties must bear a reasonable relationship to the gravity of the offence, and courts may intervene where the punishment imposed is unduly harsh.

TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION AND THE 'APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENT' IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

The judgment in [*Rajeshwar Dayal Aggarwal v. M/s Enicar Machine \(India\)*](#) concerned a workman's challenge to a Labour Court award that dismissed his industrial dispute on the ground that the Government of NCT of Delhi was not the "appropriate Government" to refer the matter for adjudication. The workman alleged illegal termination after

decades of service and sought reinstatement with consequential benefits.

The Delhi High Court examined whether Delhi possessed territorial jurisdiction over the dispute. The Court noted that the workman had himself pleaded that he was last employed and allegedly terminated at Faridabad, Haryana. It held that the situs of employment and the place where termination takes effect are the primary determinants of the “appropriate Government” under the Industrial Disputes Act.

The significance of this decision lies in its reaffirmation that territorial jurisdiction in labour disputes depends on where the industrial dispute substantially arises, rather than the location of an employer’s head office or past business operations. The ruling underscores the importance of the situs of employment in determining the competent forum for industrial adjudication.

MISCELLANEOUS

RIGHT TO TRAUMA CARE RECOGNISED AS INTEGRAL TO ARTICLE 21

In [*Savelife Foundation v. Union of India \(2026\)*](#), the Supreme Court issued nationwide interim directions to strengthen trauma care, emergency response systems, ambulance integration, and Good Samaritan protections under Article 21.

The judgment reinforces trauma care and emergency medical access as intrinsic to the constitutional right to life. By mandating the integration of helplines, the operationalization of PM RAHAT, trauma registries, ambulance standards, and Good Samaritan grievance systems, the Court sought uniform, accountable, and technology-driven implementation of emergency healthcare across States and Union Territories.

RES JUDICATA APPLIES TO REPEATED ORDER VII RULE 11 CHALLENGES, HOLDS SUPREME COURT

In [*B.S. Lalitha & Ors. v. B.S. Subhas & Ors. \(2026\)*](#), the Supreme Court restored daughters' partition suit, clarifying the interplay between Sections 6, 8, res judicata, and Order VII Rule 11 CPC.

The judgment holds that Section 6(5) of the Hindu Succession Act is merely a saving clause protecting certain pre-2004 partitions and not a jurisdictional bar to partition suits. The Court further reaffirmed that daughters' succession rights under Section 8, accruing upon a father's intestate death, remain independent of and unaffected by the 2005

coparcenary-rights amendment, while also emphasizing the binding effect of interlocutory res judicata.

SUPREME COURT RECOGNISES CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE OF MOTHER TONGUE-BASED EDUCATION

In *Padam Mehta & Anr. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.*, the Supreme Court underscored the constitutional significance of mother-tongue-based education and directed the adoption of policy measures to promote the Rajasthani language.

The judgment affirms that meaningful access to education is intrinsically linked to language comprehension and locates mother tongue-based learning within the broader framework of constitutional rights. By directing Rajasthan to formulate a comprehensive policy for Rajasthani language education, the Court strengthened the enforceability of linguistic inclusion, educational accessibility, and constitutional commitments reflected in the RTE Act and National Education Policy, 2020.

The Fall by Albert Camus

Albert Camus' *The Fall* is a profound and unsettling exploration of guilt, conscience, and the human tendency toward self-deception. Presented as a series of conversations in an Amsterdam bar, the novel follows Jean-Baptiste Clamence, a successful Parisian lawyer whose confidence and moral certainty gradually unravel after a single moment of inaction. As Clamence reflects on his past, the narrative transforms into a searching examination of hypocrisy, judgment, regret, and the need for redemption.

What makes *The Fall* particularly compelling is its emotional depth. Beneath its philosophical inquiry lies a deeply personal story about loneliness, remorse, and the burden of living with one's own failures. Camus invites readers to confront uncomfortable questions about morality and responsibility, not in others, but in themselves. For members of the legal profession, the novel **offers a poignant reminder that judging often begins with self-examination.**

LEGAL TRIVIA

We aim to encourage staying up to date on legal developments. Participate in this quiz and the winner will receive a token of our appreciation. Submit responses to rs corporate@rsood-attorneys.co.in

1. Under the RBI's FEMA (Authorised Persons) Regulations, 2026, which model is being phased out and replaced by Forex Correspondents?
 - A. AD Category-II Model
 - B. Franchisee Model
 - C. Money Transfer Service Scheme
 - D. Offshore Banking Model
2. In Jennifer Messias v. Leonard G. Lobo (2026), a decree labelled as "preliminary" may nevertheless be executable when:
 - A. The parties consent to execution
 - B. Limitation has expired
 - C. Rights and mechanisms for division stand substantially determined
 - D. The decree is registered
3. In Hirani Developers v. Nehru Nagar Samruddhi CHS Ltd., an arbitration clause may be incorporated by reference when:
 - A. The clause is orally acknowledged
 - B. Parties merely refer to another document
 - C. Parties clearly adopt all terms of another agreement
 - D. The agreement is notarised
4. In Shankar Khandelwal v. Omkara Asset Reconstruction Pvt. Ltd., admission of a claim by an IRP/RP:
 - A. Always extends limitation

- B. Constitutes acknowledgment under Section 18 of the Limitation Act
 - C. Revives time-barred debt automatically
 - D. Does not amount to acknowledgment by the debtor
5. The Supreme Court held that an AOP member's pre-expense share attached to gross receipts constitutes:
- A. Capital receipt
 - B. Exempt profit share under Section 86
 - C. Taxable revenue in the member's hands
 - D. Agricultural income
6. In RR Constructions v. Gayatri Ventures, the Supreme Court emphasized that tender conditions should be interpreted:
- A. In favour of the authority
 - B. According to commercial convenience
 - C. Strictly according to their express language
 - D. In favour of local bidders
7. In B.S. Lalitha v. B.S. Subhas, Section 6(5) of the Hindu Succession Act was described as:
- A. A complete bar to partition suits
 - B. A jurisdictional provision
 - C. A saving clause protecting certain pre-2004 partitions
 - D. A source of coparcenary rights
8. In Dr. S.K. Lall through LRs v. Consumer, survival of a medical negligence claim against legal representatives depends primarily upon:
- A. Value of the claim
 - B. Survivability of the substantive right to sue

- C. Consent of legal heirs
- D. Registration of the complaint
9. According to *Ratika Kalra v. GNCTD*, eviction of a daughter-in-law from in-laws' self-acquired property may be permissible where:
- A. She has lived there for more than five years
- B. The property is ancestral
- C. Ill-treatment is established and reasonable alternate accommodation is provided
- D. The marriage has broken down
10. In *Harmeet Singh v. State of GNCT Delhi*, the Delhi High Court introduced a distinction between:
- A. Legal and equitable ownership
- B. Civil and criminal liability
- C. De jure victim and de facto victim
- D. Consent and acquiescence

The readers may share their responses with us over the given email, or with their contact person from our firm on their respective mobile numbers by sharing a screenshot of their answers in the following manner:

Brieforia, May, 2026 Edition

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

Mention your answers here →