SRAJURIS

WEEKLY JUDGMENT DIGEST

UPDATED THROUGH 20 OCTOBER 2026

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA | HIGH COURTS | NCLT | NCLAT

CS RAVI BHUSHAN KUMAR | FCS, LL.M., IP, M.Com.

Advocate & Insolvency Professional | Former Chairman, ICSI-Noida Chapter

Advocates | Company Secretaries | Chartered Accountants | Insolvency Professionals

www.srajuris.com

In this edition

This revised edition retains the thirteen case notes from the 16 October digest and adds five decisions covering corruption investigations, lawful dissent, digital due process, resolution plans and personal-guarantor insolvency. Coverage is selective and updated to material available on 20 October 2026 (IST).

Judgment dates and reporting dates are stated separately. The Punjab and Haryana High Court decision dated 5 October is included as a newly reported development. The tribunal decisions are substantive additions to this edition.

Reading guide

Each note sets out the issue, holding, practical application and relevant provisions. Final judgments, admission orders, interim orders and references are identified by their procedural effect.

Case index

01 The Assistant Commissioner of Central Tax, CGST Division v. Sreenivasa Rao Ravinuthala and Another

02 Sanjay Sureka @ Sanjay Kumar Sureka v. Directorate of Enforcement

03 The Secretary to Government v. Sameer Ahamed

04 M/s Dhanlaxmi Merchandise Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Others

05 Dr. B.C. Roy Engineering College & Another v. State of West Bengal & Others

06 B. Anasuyamma (Died) Through L.R. & Another v. B. Madhusudhan Reddy (Died) Through L.Rs. & Others

07 Mukesh Tyagi v. State of Rajasthan & Others

08 Sanjay Prasad v. Madhusudan Dwivedi & Others

09 Tejaram v. State of Rajasthan

10 Mahendra Kumar Mitra v. Secretary to the Government of India & Others

11 K. Ponmudy v. Assistant Director

12 State of Maharashtra v. Dhananjay Sakharam Bhosale

13 Zubair Ahmed v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) & Another

14 Arif v. Savia @ Raviya

15 Mahammed Hanif & Others v. State of Karnataka & Another

16 Haryana 24 News Network Private Limited v. Union of India & Others

17 Dickey Special Situation Investment Trust-DSSF Series 2 / Prudent ARC Limited v. Manish Agarwal & Others

18 Yes Bank Limited v. Anil Madan; Mavent Restructuring Services LLP (RP)

Supreme Court of India

01 | FINAL JUDGMENT

The Assistant Commissioner of Central Tax, CGST Division v. Sreenivasa Rao Ravinuthala and Another

Supreme Court of India · 14 October 2026
Justices S.V.N. Bhatti and N.V. Anjaria
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1049

Issue

Whether limitation for an appeal under Section 62 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code begins on pronouncement of the NCLAT order or upon receipt of its certified copy.

Limitation begins when the NCLAT pronounces the order. Time properly spent obtaining a certified copy may be excluded under Section 12(2) of the Limitation Act, but pre-application inaction is not excluded; the statutory 45-day period and maximum 15-day condonable extension remain controlling.

For practice

IBC appellate teams should diarise limitation from pronouncement and apply for the certified copy immediately. Waiting for service of the copy can make an appeal incurably late.

Provisions & reference

IBC, 2016 - Section 62; Limitation Act, 1963 - Section 12(2); strict outer limit for condonation.

Source / judgment ↗

02 | FINAL JUDGMENT / BAIL

Sanjay Sureka @ Sanjay Kumar Sureka v. Directorate of Enforcement

Supreme Court of India · 14 October 2026
Justices Aravind Kumar and Vipul M. Pancholi
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1048

Issue

Whether a five-day delay in forwarding the arrest order and supporting material to the adjudicating authority automatically invalidated an arrest under the PMLA.

A short forwarding delay does not automatically vitiate an otherwise compliant arrest when the core safeguards under Section 19 are met and the delay is reasonably explained. On the facts, bail was nevertheless granted because prolonged custody, numerous accused and a voluminous record made an early trial unlikely.

For practice

Challenges to PMLA arrest must focus on substantive Section 19 safeguards and prejudice, while bail strategy should separately develop the Article 21 case based on custody and realistic trial duration.

Provisions & reference

PMLA - Section 19(2); Article 21; prompt forwarding; prolonged incarceration and trial delay.

Source / judgment ↗

03 | FINAL JUDGMENT

The Secretary to Government v. Sameer Ahamed

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices Prashant Kumar Mishra and Shree Chandrashekhar
Diary No. 39624/2026 · 2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1059

Issue

Whether a person converting to Islam can claim backward-class status solely by carrying forward the caste or community identity held before conversion.

Pre-conversion caste status cannot simply be transposed into a different religious social order. Conversion to Islam does not, by itself, establish membership of a notified backward Muslim community; the Madras High Court's invalidation of the contrary government order was upheld.

For practice

Reservation and community-certificate decisions after conversion require proof of inclusion in the notified post-conversion class, not merely proof of the earlier caste identity.

Provisions & reference

Articles 14, 15(4) and 16(4); notified backward classes; evidentiary basis for community status after conversion.

Source / judgment ↗

04 | FINAL JUDGMENT

M/s Dhanlaxmi Merchandise Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Others

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices Aravind Kumar and Vipul M. Pancholi
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1055 · connected matter

Issue

Whether a public auction may be cancelled merely because the fresh highest bids, though above reserve price, are lower than offers made in an earlier process.

A fresh auction cannot be cancelled for the sole reason that its bids are lower than earlier offers when the highest bids exceed the reserve price. Rejection must rest on an objective and rational public-interest basis; the tender process was restored.

For practice

Public authorities retain discretion in auctions, but comparative dissatisfaction with an earlier price is not a substitute for recorded, rational reasons tied to the governing conditions.

Provisions & reference

Article 14; judicial review of tenders; reserve price; fairness, transparency and sanctity of auction process.

Source / judgment ↗

05 | FINAL JUDGMENT

Dr. B.C. Roy Engineering College & Another v. State of West Bengal & Others

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices P.S. Narasimha and Alok Aradhe
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1053

Issue

Whether a professional educational institution may increase the fee during an ongoing course.

The governing norm is that the fee is fixed for the full course before admission. A mid-course increase is permissible only in exceptional, unforeseen circumstances supported by a proper regulatory determination; an ordinary financial reworking cannot shift the burden to enrolled students.

For practice

Institutions and fee committees should build predictable course-wide fee structures. Students may challenge mid-stream increases that lack an exceptional factual foundation and regulatory justification.

Provisions & reference

Professional education; fee regulation; legitimate expectation; transparency and non-arbitrariness.

Source / judgment ↗

06 | FINAL JUDGMENT

B. Anasuyamma (Died) Through L.R. & Another v. B. Madhusudhan Reddy (Died) Through L.Rs. & Others

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices Sanjay Kumar and Sanjeev Sachdeva
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1058

Issue

Whether a family member who relinquished a property share under a binding family settlement could later transfer that same share by gift.

A party who has given up a share under an operative family settlement or compromise cannot subsequently convey that very interest. The later gift deed could not override the binding settlement, and the concurrent findings below were set aside.

For practice

Title due diligence must examine family settlements and compromise decrees before relying on a later gift deed. A donor cannot convey a better interest than the interest retained.

Provisions & reference

Family settlement; estoppel; title and conveyancing; effect of relinquishment and compromise.

Source / judgment ↗

07 | FINAL JUDGMENT

Mukesh Tyagi v. State of Rajasthan & Others

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices B.V. Nagarathna, R. Mahadevan and Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1057

Issue

Whether disciplinary proceedings against a retired judicial officer were justified for the manner in which he dealt with a bail matter.

In the peculiar facts, the disciplinary proceedings were quashed. The Court treated the counselling, warning and adverse service entry already administered as sufficient and directed release of pay and terminal benefits within three months.

For practice

Judicial-administration authorities must distinguish a correctable decisional lapse from misconduct warranting a full disciplinary process, particularly where proportionate corrective measures have already been imposed.

Provisions & reference

Judicial independence and accountability; disciplinary proportionality; service benefits after retirement.

Source / judgment ↗

08 | LARGER-BENCH REFERENCE

Sanjay Prasad v. Madhusudan Dwivedi & Others

Supreme Court of India · 15 October 2026
Justices Dipankar Datta and Sheel Nagu
2026 LiveLaw (SC) 1052

Issue

When does an order in writ or contempt-related proceedings arise from “criminal jurisdiction” so as to bar an intra-court appeal?

The Bench expressed reservations about an earlier approach that treated the criminal-law roots of a dispute as controlling. It referred the governing questions to a larger Bench, including whether certain contempt orders may amount to appealable “judgments”. The earlier precedent was not overruled.

For practice

Maintainability objections in letters patent appeals involving criminal or contempt elements remain unsettled. Practitioners should preserve both jurisdictional character and substantive-effect arguments pending the larger-Bench ruling.

Provisions & reference

Letters Patent appeals; Article 226; criminal jurisdiction; contempt; precedential discipline.

Source / judgment ↗

09 | FINAL JUDGMENT / CHARGE CHALLENGE

Tejaram v. State of Rajasthan

Supreme Court of India | 16 October 2026
Justices S.V.N. Bhatti and N.V. Anjaria
2026 INSC 1147 | SLP (Crl.) No. 11709/2025 | Reported 20 October 2026

Issue

Does Section 17A approval protect an alleged bribe demand unrelated to an official recommendation or decision?

The appeal against framing of charge was dismissed. Section 17A was inapplicable: the alleged demand for illegal gratification was unconnected with an official recommendation or decision. The pending larger-Bench reference on the provision did not prevent disposal on these facts.

For practice

Identify the precise act alleged before raising a Section 17A objection. Keep investigation approval under Section 17A distinct from prosecution sanction under Section 19; the ruling does not determine guilt at trial.

Provisions & reference

Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988: Sections 7, 17A and 19. Judgment paragraphs 5.1-6.3 and 7-11.

Source / judgment ↗

High Courts

10 | FINAL JUDGMENT

Mahendra Kumar Mitra v. Secretary to the Government of India & Others

Karnataka High Court · 12 October 2026
Chief Justice Vibhu Bakhru and Justice K.S. Hemalekha
W.P. No. 200448/2025 connected with W.P. No. 25515/2025

Issue

Constitutionality of statutory increases taking Scheduled Caste reservation from 15% to 17% and Scheduled Tribe reservation from 3% to 7%, raising aggregate reservation to 56%.

Sections 3 and 4 of the 2022 Karnataka Act were struck down. The 50% ceiling remains a binding equality rule; population share or a preference for proportional representation is not, without more, an extraordinary circumstance. Prior consultation with the National Commissions under Articles 338(9) and 338A(9) was also mandatory.

For practice

Any proposal to exceed the 50% ceiling needs evidence of truly extraordinary circumstances, not only backwardness or population data, and must satisfy the Constitution's consultation requirements.

Provisions & reference

Articles 14, 15, 16, 338(9), 338A(9), 46 and 335; Indra Sawhney; adequate versus proportionate representation.

Source / judgment ↗

11 | FINAL JUDGMENT

K. Ponmudy v. Assistant Director

Madras High Court · 13 October 2026
Chief Justice S.A. Dharmadhikari and Justice G. Arul Murugan
Crl. O.P. No. 27067/2026 · 2026 LiveLaw (Mad) 501

Issue

Whether money-laundering prosecution could continue after all accused were acquitted in the scheduled predicate offence.

The PMLA case was quashed because the predicate offence had ended in acquittal. The Enforcement Directorate retained liberty to act in accordance with law if a later appellate development revives the predicate case.

For practice

Defence teams should promptly reassess ECIR and special-court proceedings after discharge, quashing or acquittal in the scheduled offence, while accounting for any pending challenge to that result.

Provisions & reference

PMLA - scheduled offence and proceeds of crime; Vijay Madanlal Choudhary; consequences of acquittal in predicate case.

Source / judgment ↗

12 | FINAL JUDGMENT

State of Maharashtra v. Dhananjay Sakharam Bhosale

Bombay High Court · 12 October 2026
Justice Sharmila U. Deshmukh
Criminal Revision Application No. 497/2008

Issue

Whether an Additional Public Prosecutor appointed on tenure is a “public servant” liable to prosecution under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

The tenure-based Additional Public Prosecutor was not a State employee or public servant for the invoked PC Act offences. Relying on the distinction between Public/Additional Public Prosecutors and employee-status Assistant Public Prosecutors, the Court upheld discharge and dismissed the State’s revision.

For practice

Before invoking the PC Act against a law officer, investigators and courts must identify the statutory source, tenure conditions and employment relationship rather than infer public-servant status from courtroom function alone.

Provisions & reference

Prevention of Corruption Act - Sections 7, 12 and 13; CrPC - Section 227; State of U.P. v. Johri Mal.

Source / judgment ↗

13 | FINAL JUDGMENT / REMAND

Zubair Ahmed v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) & Another

Delhi High Court · 12 October 2026
Justice Madhu Jain
CRL.M.C. 2148/2025 · 2026 LiveLaw (Del) 1003

Issue

Whether a Magistrate may summon a person placed in Column No. 12 and not sent up for trial by police, and what reasons the order must contain.

A Magistrate may disagree with the investigating agency and summon a non-chargesheeted person, but must identify the supporting material and pass a speaking order. The petitioner's summons was set aside and the issue remitted for fresh consideration; the FIR and proceedings against others remained intact.

For practice

At the process stage, the defence should test whether the summoning order links record material to the individual's role. Collective allegations or reproduction of a complainant's synopsis will not show independent judicial application of mind.

Provisions & reference

CrPC - Sections 190 and 204; BNSS - corresponding Sections 210 and 227; reasoned issuance of process; no automatic vicarious criminal liability.

Source / judgment ↗

14 | INTERIM / NOTICE STAGE

Arif v. Savia @ Raviya

Delhi High Court · 12 October 2026
Justice Sanjeev Narula
CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 622/2026 · order dated 12.10.2026

Issue

Interim maintenance where the husband had a pre-existing 100% hearing and speech disability and disputed his earning capacity.

At the prima facie stage, disability alone could not extinguish obligations assumed through marriage and parenthood. Interim maintenance was reduced from ₹8,000 to ₹6,000 per month pending further hearing, with the Court expressly reserving the merits.

For practice

Maintenance submissions should address actual earning capacity, disability-related constraints and the needs of dependants together. This order is provisional and should not be cited as a final merits determination.

Provisions & reference

Family Courts Act - Section 19(4); BNSS - Sections 438, 442 and 528; interim maintenance; prima facie balancing.

Source / judgment ↗

15 | FINAL JUDGMENT / QUASHING

Mahammed Hanif & Others v. State of Karnataka & Another

Karnataka High Court | 15 October 2026
Justice H.P. Sandesh
2026:KHC:58498 | Crl.P. No. 671/2021 | Reported 19 October 2026

Issue

Can slogans describing a Supreme Court verdict as a denial of justice, without the statutory ingredients of enmity or religious insult, sustain criminal proceedings?

The High Court quashed the proceedings. On the words alleged, criticism of the judgment and a call for justice did not establish the ingredients of Sections 153A and 295A IPC. The Court applied the protection for lawful dissent and the reasonable-person test.

For practice

Place the exact words and their context before the court. Analyse each charged offence separately; disagreement with a judicial outcome does not by itself establish communal enmity or deliberate religious insult.

Provisions & reference

IPC: Sections 153A, 295A and 120B; CrPC: Section 482; Constitution: Articles 19 and 21. Cause title follows the court copy; some reports index Yaseer Arafat, petitioner no. 5.

Source / judgment ↗

16 | FINAL DISPOSAL / DIGITAL RIGHTS

Haryana 24 News Network Private Limited v. Union of India & Others

Punjab and Haryana High Court | 5 October 2026
Justice Tribhuvan Dahiya
CWP No. 30190/2026 | Newly reported 20 October 2026

Issue

What disclosure and authority safeguards apply to a police intimation to an intermediary for blocking a social-media page?

The police intimation was set aside and restoration directed. The issuing Superintendent of Police lacked the prescribed rank. Natural justice also required the affected user to receive a copy of the intimation when it was sent to the intermediary, enabling an effective challenge.

For practice

Obtain the intimation, authorisation and proof of the issuing officer’s rank. A grievance route offers little protection if the user is denied the reasons for blocking. This note concerns the Section 79(3)(b) route considered by the Court.

Provisions & reference

Information Technology Act, 2000: Section 79(3)(b); IT Rules, 2021: Rule 3; natural justice. Earlier decision included because it was reported at this update’s cut-off.

Source / judgment ↗

NCLAT

17 | FINAL JUDGMENT / RESOLUTION PLAN

Dickey Special Situation Investment Trust-DSSF Series 2 / Prudent ARC Limited v. Manish Agarwal & Others

NCLAT, Principal Bench, New Delhi | 12 October 2026
Judgment by Arun Baroka, Member (Technical)
Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) Nos. 1725 and 1706/2026

Issue

Can CoC approval save a plan that fails to demonstrate how it addresses the cause of default?

Plan rejection and liquidation were sustained because Regulation 38(3)(a) was not met. CoC commercial wisdom cannot replace mandatory plan content. A value below liquidation value was not, by itself, unlawful. The premature cap on the assignee's distribution was set aside, with rights left open.

For practice

Explain the cause of default and the concrete cure in the plan. Document dissenting-creditor protection separately from overall plan value.

Provisions & reference

IBC: Sections 30(2), 31 and 33; CIRP Regulations: Regulation 38(3)(a). Paragraphs 43-55 and 60-67.

Source / judgment ↗

NCLT

18 | ADMISSION ORDER / PERSONAL GUARANTOR

Yes Bank Limited v. Anil Madan; Mavent Restructuring Services LLP (RP)

NCLT, Principal Bench, New Delhi | 12 October 2026
President Justice Anupinder Singh Grewal and Ravindra Chaturvedi, Member (Technical)
IA No. 865/2025 in CP No. IB 839 (ND)/2024

Issue

Can a SARFAESI demand invoke a personal guarantee, and must the creditor await completion of the borrower's CIRP?

The personal insolvency application was admitted under Section 100 and a Section 101 moratorium declared. A Section 13(2) notice may invoke the guarantee where its wording demands payment from the guarantor consistently with the guarantee terms. Pending CIRP of the borrower did not bar these proceedings.

For practice

Read the guarantee, demand and service evidence together. A statutory notice's label is insufficient; its wording must establish the contractual demand.

Provisions & reference

IBC: Sections 95, 99, 100 and 101; SARFAESI Act: Section 13(2). Order paragraphs 30-41.

Source / judgment ↗

Editorial panel



CS RAVI BHUSHAN KUMAR

FCS, LL.M., IP, M.Com. | Advocate & Insolvency Professional | Former Chairman, ICSI-Noida Chapter



ADV. AKSHIKA DUBEY

Content Compiler | M: 9990339245

Using this digest

Follow the source link and read the operative paragraphs before relying on a proposition. Check subsequent orders, appeals and the statutory version applicable to the facts. A pending reference or interim direction does not carry the same effect as a final determination.

Source note

The thirteen original notes and their source links have been retained and reformatted. The five additional notes were checked against the court/tribunal text linked in each entry. This is a selected professional digest, not an exhaustive record of all decisions issued by the cut-off.

SRAJURIS

Office: D-5, 3rd Floor, Sector 10, Noida - 201301
Chamber: D-205, Karkardooma Court, East Delhi - 110032
Mobile: 9990339200 | Office: 0120-4160986
Email: sralegal2009@gmail.com
www.srajuris.com