

Legal Current Affairs (From June 1 to June 15, 2025)

1. Scolding of a student is not an abatement of suicide (Thangavel vs. The State)

Background

- A school teacher (Thangavel) scolded a class 10 student in front of her classmates.
- The girl later died by suicide.
- The parents filed a complaint, saying the teacher's scolding and humiliation led to her death.
- The police filed a case under Section 306 IPC (abetment of suicide).

Court's Judgment

The Madras High Court said:

1. Scolding a student by a teacher alone does not mean abetment. Teachers are expected to correct students whenever they do anything wrong. A one-time scolding by the teacher even if it is harsh does not prove teacher's intention to instigate suicide.
2. No mens rea (criminal intention) : The teacher didn't encourage, provoke, or assist in suicide of student. There was no targeted harassment or cruelty shown by the teacher.
3. Students are expected to follow discipline in the school. School life includes corrections and discipline. Sensitive reactions like attempt to suicide by the student cannot be blamed entirely on the teacher when there is no such intention on behalf of the teacher.

The court quashed the FIR and said:

"Mere scolding of a student, even if it caused embarrassment, cannot be treated as abetment of suicide under Section 306 IPC."

Legal Provisions Involved:

Section 108 of BNS- "Abatement to Suicide"

"If any person commits suicide, whoever abets the commission of such suicide, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine."

2. Fake Judge Impersonation Case

- A lawyer was booked for falsely claiming to be a judicial magistrate when he was stopped by Chandigarh Traffic police.
- A video of this incident was recorded by the police and circulated on social media. When this video went viral the Lawyer alleged that: Recording the video is a violation of his Right to Privacy and Personal Liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. He also said it is a breach of Rule 3(1)(d) of the IT Rules, 2021 and he demanded the removal of the video.
- He was charged under sections 170 (impersonating a public servant), 186 (obstructing public servants), and 419 (cheating by personation) of the IPC. Additionally, he also tampered with his license plate and violated traffic signals.
- The Punjab & Haryana Bar Council issued a show-cause notice to that lawyer under Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961 questioning why his license shouldn't be suspended or revoked due to his alleged professional misconduct.

Legal Provisions Involved:

Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961- Punishment of advocates for misconduct

If a State Bar Council believes that an advocate has been guilty of professional or other misconduct, it shall refer the case to its disciplinary committee for disposal. The committee will then fix a date for a hearing and issue a show cause notice to the advocate involved.

Section 170 of IPC deals with impersonating a public servant, section 186 deals with obstructing public servants and section 419 of IPC deals with cheating by personation.

3. Savarkar Defamation Case (Satyaki Savarkar v. Rahul Gandhi)

Case in detail:

- In March 2023, during a speech in London, Rahul Gandhi alleged that VD Savarkar had written about beating up a Muslim man alongside friends and taking “pleasure” in it.
- Satyaki Savarkar, great-grandnephew of VD Sarvarkar filed a criminal defamation complaint in a Pune court under Section 500 of the IPC, claiming Gandhi’s statement was false and malicious.
- In January 2025, the court granted Rahul Gandhi a bail on a rupees 25,000 surety and granted him permanent exemption from physically appearing in court, citing his position as Leader of Opposition, his Z+ security cover, and potential law and order concerns. The trial was also converted from a summary trial to a summons trial to allow detailed cross-examination and historical evidence.
- Satyaki Savarkar, great grandchild of Vir Savarkar he petitioned to cancel Gandhi’s bail bond and alleged that Gandhi was delaying court’s proceedings, this petition was rejected

by the court on June 1, 2025, with the court stating no conditions had been breached and referencing precedent under Section 439(2) of the CrPC.

- Gandhi's request for disclosure of Satyaki's maternal lineage (allegedly linked to Nathuram Godse) was also dismissed on similar grounds of irrelevance.
- Gandhi later filed a cross-defamation suit against Satyaki, accusing him of perjury and misleading the court by filing frivolous bail cancellation pleas.
- As of now, the trial is ongoing and Rahul Gandhi remains on bail with permanent exemption and he need not to appear in the court personally. His plea has been recorded, and the trial is proceeding under the more rigorous summons format.

Legal Provisions involved

Section 500 of IPC deals with Punishment for defamation.

Whoever defames another person shall be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years or with fine or with both.

4. Transgender Couple Legally Acknowledged as 'Parents' on Child's Birth Records

- In a landmark judgement by the Kerala High Court by Justice Ziyad Rahman A.A., allowed Zahhad (a trans man who gave birth in February 2023) and Ziya Paval (a trans woman) — “India's first transgender biological parents legally acknowledged as 'Parents' in their child's birth certificate changed from “mother” and “father” to a gender-neutral term, “parents.”
- The original birth certificate issued by Kozhikode Corporation, had listed Zahhad as “mother (transgender)” and Ziya as “father (transgender).”
- The couple petitioned the High Court, arguing that this designation could cause many complications for their child in school, official documentation and while interacting socially.
- Justice Rahman said that “the law cannot remain static and it has to evolve with the changes in society and the lifestyle of members of the Society,” and used principles from the Supreme Court's NALSA judgment and the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act 2019.
- He focused that removing gendered labels from the certificate would not violate provisions of any law and that courts must grant “exceptional remedies” in such rare, socially evolving cases.
- The High Court directed the Kozhikode Corporation to issue the revised certificate within 2 months to the parents, effectively making this a major step forward for transgender rights and the recognition of diverse family structures in India.

Legal Provisions involved

NALSA v. Union of India (2014)

Supreme Court precedent affirming self-identification of gender and dignity for transgender persons played a foundational role in shaping the High Court's approach.

Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 – Section 4(2)

Grants transgender persons the explicit right to be legally recognized according to their self-identified gender. The Court used this to emphasize statutory support for the couple's identities.

5. RCB IPL Stampede Case at Chinnaswamy Stadium

- On June 4, 2025, an estimated 250,000 fans exceeded the M. Chinnaswamy Stadium's capacity gathered for RCB's IPL victory celebration causing a tragic stampede at the entrance of the stadium that led to 11 deaths and injury to 56 to 75 persons.
- Bengaluru police filed an FIR under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, naming RCB, DNA Entertainment, and the KSCA on charges ranging from culpable homicide and grievous hurt to unlawful assembly and endangering public safety. Four officials including RCB's marketing head, Nikhil Sosale were arrested and remanded to police custody.
- The Karnataka government suspended police officials for their failures and appointed a judicial commission headed by former Justice Michael D'Cunha to investigate the crowd-control failures that led to the stampede. RCB also pledged to give Rupees 1 million to every deceased person and launched the RCB Cares fund with the state promising to cover all medical costs of the injured.

Legal Provisions involved (BNS)

Section 105 – Culpable homicide not amounting to murder: Applied where deaths occurred due to alleged negligence or lack of reasonable safety measures during the stampede.

Section 115 – Voluntarily causing hurt (with or without use of dangerous weapons): Imposed considering injuries to the public amid crowd-control breakdowns.

Section 118 – Grievous hurt by dangerous means: Used to address serious injuries caused in the chaotic conditions.

Section 121&142 – Unlawful assembly: Allegations that led to the stampede stemmed from uncontrolled gatherings without proper permissions.

Section 125(1) and (2) – Endangering life or personal safety by negligent acts: Core to negligence charges against organizers.

6. PIL for Poor Implementation of Domestic Violence Act

- An NGO, The Women of India filed a Public Interest Litigation in the Supreme Court highlighting persistent gaps in implementation of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA).
- NGO highlighted that, nearly two decades after the law's enactment there are many states and Union Territories failed to: Appoint dedicated Protection Officers in every district, establish sufficient, one-Stop Centres and shelter homes and publicise essential service providers and helpline details.
- In May 2025, a Supreme Court bench led by Justices B.V. Nagarathna and S.C. Sharma acknowledged these structural deficiencies affirming that domestic violence cases were being treated like regular family matters, not the emergency they were meant to address. The Court emphasized that PWDVA's intent is to offer swift relief and protection, not cumbersome procedures.
- The Court directed the Union Ministry of Women & Child Development to hold a meeting with state governments, Protection Officers, NCW, NHRC and other stakeholders to assess: Status and staffing of protection officers, resources and functionality of One-Stop Centres and shelters. There is a need for a career structure and training framework for POs and better public awareness efforts under Section 11 of the Act.
- States were also instructed to file status reports and compliance updates, and the Centre to propose guidelines by the next hearing in December 2025.

Crux of the Judgment:

The Supreme Court held that domestic violence cases under PWDVA must be treated as urgent social matters and not delayed like standard family court matters. It emphasized that infrastructure, manpower, and awareness are critical for the law to serve its purpose of swift relief and protection.

7. Plea against Bombay High Court order allowing sacrifice at a Protected Monument during Bakrid & Urs

- The Division Bench of the Bombay High allowed animal sacrifices on the occasion of Bakri Eid (June 7) and the Urs festival (June 8–12) at a Dargah in Vishalgad Fort, Kolhapur. But the sacrifice must take place in a closed and private area not in a public or open area of the premises.
- A petition was filed in Supreme Court to challenge the Bombay High Court's order, citing that Vishalgad Fort is a protected monument under the Maharashtra Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Rules, 1962, which prohibits cooking and slaughter of animals within monument premises.

Legal Provisions involved

Maharashtra Ancient Monuments Rules, 1962 which deals with “Prohibition of certain acts within monuments”

Rule 8(c) prohibits cooking or consuming food within a protected monument unless explicitly allowed by the Director/Archaeological Officer.

Rule 8(g)(i) bans bringing any animal into the monument area unless it's for maintenance purposes.

8. Accused's Right To Voluntarily Undergo Narco-Analysis Test

On 9 June 2025, Supreme Court allowed the State's appeal against a Patna High Court order (9 November 2023) that had directed that narco-analysis tests be conducted on all accused and witnesses during a bail hearing.

The Supreme Court held that:

- Involuntary narco-analysis is unconstitutional – A narco analysis test which is not voluntary violates Articles 20(3) (Protection against self-incrimination) and 21 (Right to life and personal liberty), reaffirming *Selvi v. State of Karnataka* (2010) case, where involuntary tests were considered a violation of fundamental rights under Indian Constitution.
- Conducting such tests during a bail proceeding is inappropriate as bail hearings are governed by parameters like the nature of the offense, period of custody of the accused, and evidence against the accused – not an investigative inquiry. The Patna High Court overstepped its jurisdiction by entertaining the investigative directives at the bail stage.

Voluntary narco-analysis is permissible, but only under certain limited conditions:

- With prior permission of the court at the appropriate stage of trial typically when the accused is leading evidence under Section 233 CrPC.
- Subject to strict Selvi-derived safeguards: informed and recorded consent before a magistrate is required and that must be conducted by a qualified agency and in the presence of a lawyer and medical oversight.
- There is no absolute right for an accused to insist on narco-analysis; the court must weigh the totality of circumstances including voluntariness, timing, and procedural conditions before granting an application.
- Even when a narco test is voluntary, the test report is not independently admissible as evidence. Only derivative disclosures and factual revelations leading to fresh evidence are admissible under Section 27 of the Evidence Act, and must be corroborated.

- In conclusion, the Supreme Court set aside the Patna High Court's order permitting involuntary narco-analysis at the bail stage, reaffirmed constitutional protections, clarified that voluntary narco-analysis may proceed—with consent and safeguards, and limited to

the trial stage and emphasized that its evidentiary value lies solely in derivative findings under Section 27.

9. POCSO Case against Judge (Sandeep vs. Maharashtra)

A suspended judicial officer was charged under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act and Indian Penal Code (IPC) for sexually abusing his minor daughter between May 2014 and 2018. The accused rejected the charges by claiming that they were a counterblast amid matrimonial disputes and filed a Special Leave Petition (SLP) in the Supreme Court to quash the proceedings.

Court's Observations

- **“Shocking allegations of incest”**: The Bench highlighted the gravity of sexual abuse allegations involving a minor and her father, stating it was unfit for preliminary quashing.
- **Victim trauma**: The Court noted, “She must have been scarred for life,” emphasizing the need for a full trial.
- The proceedings will now continue in a special POCSO court, with directions for expedited trial.
- The case is a landmark reference, underscoring that even judicial officers can be held accountable under POCSO law, and serious allegations especially involving incest must undergo full scrutiny through trial.

Legal Provisions involved

Indian Penal Code (IPC)

Section 354 which deals with “Assault or criminal force to outraging a woman’s modesty.”

Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012— Section 7: Sexual Assault (Punishes any physical contact with sexual intent toward a child.) & Section 8: Punishment for Sexual Assault.

10. Right to file an appeal against conviction is a Constitutional Right

- In *Nagarajan v. State of Tamil Nadu*, a Supreme Court Bench held that the right to file an appeal against conviction is not merely a statutory privilege under Section 374, CrPC, but also a fundamental constitutional right guaranteed by Article 21.

- The Court stressed that this “invaluable” right allows an accused to challenge not only the conviction and sentence but also any procedural or substantive flaws in the trial court’s judgment.
- The Bench warned that High Courts should not dismiss appeals on the ground of delay without first scrutinizing the reasons provided by the appellant; a delay, if reasonably explained, cannot be treated as fatal.
- Moreover, the Court clarified that in cases where only the accused has appealed, the High Court cannot on its own motion enhance the conviction or impose a harsher sentence, upholding the principle of reformation in previous. This ruling reinforces that the appellate process is integral to the accused’s right to life and personal liberty, ensuring procedural fairness and limiting judicial overreach.

11. Parole and Furlough granted to Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh

On numerous occasions between 2020 and 2025, Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh who is serving a 20-year prison term for rape and life sentences for murder was granted multiple paroles and furloughs by the Haryana government.

Legal Provisions involved

- Under the Haryana Good Conduct Act, 1988 the law makes a clear distinction of the words: Parole is conditional and discretionary, granted for specific reasons such as family emergencies or significant events (e.g., weddings, death etc) and requires approval from the Divisional Commissioner.
- Furlough is considered a matter of right, aimed at the inmate’s rehabilitation, typically up to 21 days per year, with prerequisites like good behavior and a minimum duration of incarceration.

