Cassie

WEDNESDAY
5 AUGUST 2026

DAILY

Court Digest

The day's most significant judgments from India's courts.

IN TODAY'S DIGEST

- **S.146 MVA | Uniform four-layer insurance for all vehicle occupants : SC**
- **S.12A CCA | Continuing IP infringement qualifies as urgent interim relief : Delhi HC**
- **S.149(1)(b) IT Act | Six-year cap bars AY 2015-16 reassessment, Rs 20 cr deleted : ITAT**

28	6	19	3
JUDGMENTS IN ALL	SUPREME COURT	HIGH COURTS	TRIBUNALS

Swipe to read all 28 judgments >>>

Inside this digest

28 judgments reported in full on cassie.in

SUPREME COURT

Mandatory insurance compliance and uniform occupant coverage 4
Power to recall witness limited to court clarification 5
Environmental compensation under SWM Rules 2026 must follow eight court-set factors 6
Ratification by competent authority renders an unauthorised resignation acceptance irrevocable 7
Section 12, Probation Act does not bar dismissal of a convicted public servant 18
Subvention scheme lapses on day it is struck down; admissions after 2002-03 carry no claim 18

HIGH COURTS

Pre-2015 unilateral appointments valid if agreement names or authorises appointment 9
Section 12A bar lifted where continuing IP infringement demands urgent interim relief: Delhi HC 10
Cable-TV music in hotel rooms requires a separate licence; operator's licence does not suffice 11
Insurer liable despite driver's fake licence unless owner's wilful breach is proved 12
Suit for possession over void documents governed by twelve-year limitation 13
Investment intent and long hold: flat sales are capital gains, not trade 14
Notice of refusal triggers limitation for specific performance 15
Blacklisting without a show-cause notice is void 18
Omission to Put Incriminating Evidence Is Curable Irregularity 19
Non-compliance does not bar back wages and tribunal jurisdiction 19
Auction purchaser not liable for prior electricity dues under Clause 6.10(a), Supply Code 2015 19
Presumption Not Automatic, Conviction Overturned 20
Gross negligence precludes condonation of delay 20
Extension of investigation order not appealable 20
Impugned dismissal orders set aside, leave to defend granted 21
Charge-sheet must be issued by proper DA 21
Deception must exist at transaction inception 21
Premature committal applications rejected 22
Permissive licensee cannot claim adverse possession; limitation runs from hostile occupation 22

TRIBUNALS

Finance Act 2021 amends s 149 prospectively; s 148 notice beyond the six-year limit is invalid 17
Pre-2016 mining royalty outside service tax; extended limitation unavailable on interpretation 22
Reliance on wrong advice condones delay; revised encashment ceiling applied 23

Supreme Court

4 judgments in this edition

KEEP SWIPING >>>

Traffic & Motor Vehicle Law
Motor Insurance Claims (Own, Second and Third-party)

SUPREME COURT

Mandatory insurance compliance and uniform occupant coverage

The dispute. Heirs of T. Ramu, killed in a 1996 road collision, claimed under a comprehensive motor policy. The MACT dismissed the claim; the Telangana HC awarded Rs 10,00,500 at 7.5% in 2024. National Insurance challenged the award and the proposed four-layer occupant structure. National Insurance appealed; the Supreme Court framed two questions: insurer liability under the comprehensive policy and the need for uniform occupant cover.

The reasoning. Section 146 mandates third-party cover; a comprehensive policy covers occupants per the 2009 IRDA circular. The Court adopted the four-layer structure and ordered ANPR enforcement.

> *Regarding the specific compensation claim, the Court reaffirmed the principle that under a comprehensive policy, the insurer is liable for occupants, including passengers, as per the IRDA circular of 16.11.2009.*
>
> FROM THE JUDGMENT

For your practice. Policies must adopt the four-layer IRDA structure; new registrations need four-year or six-year cover. ANPR e-challans apply.

The order. Appeal dismissed; award of Rs 10,00,500 at 7.5% stands. ANPR e-challans ordered with progressive fines. Cover: 4 years (cars), 6 (two-wheelers). Responses 14 Aug; affidavits 18 Aug 2026.

§ Section 146, Motor Vehicles Act, 1988

NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED VS SMT. THUNGALA DHANA LAXMI

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION
Supreme Court of India	04.08.2026	C.A. No.-014369-014369 - 2025	2026 INSC 793

BENCH
Sanjay Karol, Prashant Kumar Mishra

Judgment

SUPREME COURT

Power to recall witness limited to court clarification

The dispute. Plaintiffs in a land dispute sought to recall their witness PW-1, reopen evidence, and produce municipal documents, after evidence had closed and final arguments had begun. The suit, filed in 2010 over plots in Ghatkesar village, was already subject to a 1990 injunction in the defendants' favour. The trial court allowed the recall in 2022; the High Court in 2023 permitted cross-examination of PW-1, which the defendant challenged in three civil appeals.

The reasoning. Order XVIII Rule 17 is a discretionary court tool to resolve the court's own doubts, not a party right to fill evidentiary gaps. Evidence closed is evidence closed; absence of prejudice is no ground for recall. Parties cannot cross-examine a recalled witness.

For your practice. A Rule 17 application must identify a specific court doubt. Once evidence closes, it cannot be used to fill gaps or add documents. Absence of prejudice alone will not suffice.

The order. The High Court's order of 15 September 2023 is set aside and all three civil appeals are allowed. Applications for recall of PW-1, reopening of evidence, and cross-examination are void. The Rs 20,000 cost order is also struck down.

§ Order XVIII, Rule 17, Code of Civil Procedure, 1908

K. BHARATHAMMA VS BANDARU SAKKU BAI

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION
Supreme Court of India	04.08.2026	C.A. No.-010031-010033 - 2026	2026 INSC 795

BENCH

N.V. Anjaria, S.V.N. Bhatti

Tort and Personal Injury
Environmental Pollution & Public Nuisance (Noise, Smell, etc.)

SUPREME COURT

Environmental compensation under SWM Rules 2026 must follow eight court-set factors

The dispute. Amravati Municipal Corporation sought directions to operationalise the Central Implementation Committee under the SWM Rules, 2026 and compel the Ministry to issue binding guidelines for environmental compensation under Rule 17(2). The respondent argued existing mechanisms sufficed. Civil appeals from 2020 and 2022 were before the Supreme Court; the Court directed the Ministry to frame guidelines and continue monitoring.

The reasoning. Rule 17(2) mandates compensation guidelines; the principle is restitutionary, not punitive. Eight factors govern: liability runs until full restoration, imminent harm counts, quantum reflects financial capacity, and orders must be reasoned.

For your practice. Rule 17 compensation follows the eight-factor matrix. Financial capacity, proportionality and full restoration are all mandatory considerations.

The order. The Ministry must formulate detailed guidelines under Rule 17(2) and file an affidavit on progress. The Central Implementation Committee has a one-year tenure, extendable thereafter. Appeals listed 29 September 2026.

§ Rule 17, Solid Waste Management Rules, 2026

AMRAVATI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION VS GANESH DADARAO ANASANE

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION
Supreme Court of India	04.08.2026	C.A. No.-004020 - 2020	2026 INSC 796

BENCH
Pamidighantam Sri Narasimha, Alok Aradhe

Work & Employment Issues
Unfair Dismissal / Termination

SUPREME COURT

Ratification by competent authority renders an unauthorised resignation acceptance irrevocable

The dispute. B.S. Rawat, Assistant Registrar at Delhi Technological University, resigned on 19 May 2016. The acting Vice-Chancellor accepted it on 25 May 2016 and issued no-dues certificates. Rawat claimed the Board of Management alone held authority under the DTU Act and sought to withdraw his resignation. The single judge reinstated Rawat with 9% back wages; the Division Bench upheld reinstatement but denied wages; both sides appealed.

The reasoning. Section 23(2)(ix) vests resignation acceptance in the Board alone. The Vice-Chancellor's acceptance was ultra vires but the Board's ratification on 26 September 2016 related back to 25 May 2016, extinguishing Rawat's purported withdrawal as a legal nullity.

For your practice. Verify the statutory acceptance authority before advising on withdrawal. Ratification back-dates the acceptance, barring reinstatement claims regardless of subsequent conduct.

The order. CA 9308/2024 allowed: the High Court's reinstatement order set aside, writ petition dismissed. CA 9309/2024 dismissed: denial of back wages stands. SLP 625-626/2021 dismissed: Kerala High Court decision affirmed. No costs.

§ **Section 23(2)(ix), Delhi Technological University Act, 2009**

DELHI TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY VS B.S. RAWAT

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION
Supreme Court of India	04.08.2026	C.A. No.-009308-009308 - 2024	2026 INSC 797

BENCH
Pamidighantam Sri Narasimha, Alok Aradhe

High Courts

7 judgments in this edition

KEEP SWIPING >>>

Contracts & Business Disputes
Arbitration Agreements, Proceedings & Enforcement

BOMBAY HC

Pre-2015 unilateral appointments valid if agreement names or authorises appointment

The dispute. Paisalo Digital Ltd. sought to execute arbitral awards from pre-2015 commercial contracts. The clauses either named an arbitrator, authorised one party to appoint, or were silent. Respondents resisted, arguing pre-2015 unilateral appointments were void under the 2015 amendment. The Execution Court framed two questions on appointment validity and the executing court's power without a prior challenge; Bombay HC took them up.

The reasoning. Named arbitrator or authorised appointment: valid (consent exists). Silent agreement: void ab initio. The 2015 amendment is prospective from the Section 21 notice date; Bhadra applies only to post-amendment proceedings. An unchallenged award is enforceable.

For your practice. Pre-2015 clauses naming or authorising an arbitrator are safe in execution. Silent clauses remain the only vulnerability. Challenge the appointment in time; delay is a waiver.

The order. Unilateral pre-2015 appointments not void where clause names the arbitrator or authorises one party. Silent agreements: appointment void ab initio. Execution permitted; respondents' challenge rejected.

§ Section 12(5), Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996

S E INVESTMENTS LTD (NOW KNOWN AS PAISALO DIGITAL LIMITED) Vs MAPLE COMPOSITE CONTAIERS LIMITED (Through its directors)

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	BENCH
Bombay High Court	04.08.2026	IA/2009/2026	Jitendra Jain

Contracts & Business Disputes
Mediation Agreements, Proceedings & Enforcement

DELHI HC

Section 12A bar lifted where continuing IP infringement demands urgent interim relief: Delhi HC

The dispute. Asian Hotels North Ltd. (AHNL) issued Rs 300 crore NCDs secured on Hyatt Regency Delhi. DBS Bank, security trustee for Exclusive Capital, retained the title deeds. AHNL argued the debt was settled, a No-Dues Certificate issued, and the charge extinguished. AHNL applied for Section 12A exemption from pre-institution mediation; Exclusive Capital contended mediation was mandatory.

The reasoning. Section 12A excepts suits contemplating urgent interim relief, tested on prima facie case, irreparable injury and balance of convenience from the plaintiff's standpoint. Continuing infringement creates a fresh cause of action with each act, satisfying urgency.

For your practice. Plead continuing infringement and exhibit any prior failed mediation. Cash security matching the full claim addresses the defendant's interest and supports the urgency exemption.

The order. Section 12A exemption granted. DBS Bank to release the title deeds within one week of proof of deposit. AHNL to deposit Rs 1,59,66,05,228 with the Registrar General within four weeks, held in an FDR pending judgment.

§ Section 12A, Commercial Courts Act, 2015

ASIAN HOTELS NORTH LIMITED vs EXCLUSIVE CAPITAL LIMITED & ors.

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION	BENCH
Delhi High Court	03.08.2026	CS(COMM)-376/2026	2026:DHC:6264	Vikas Mahajan

Intellectual Property (IP) Law
Copyrights Registration, Objections and Infringement

CALCUTTA HC

Cable-TV music in hotel rooms requires a separate licence; operator's licence does not suffice

The dispute. IPRS alleged Hotel Appolo broadcast its members' music in guest rooms via cable TV without a licence. The cable operator had an IPRS licence, but the hotel had not obtained one separately. The society sent notices, the hotel refused, and IPRS sued for an injunction and Rs 9 lakh damages. The District Judge, Darjeeling, refused the interim injunction on 20 September 2024; IPRS appealed to the Calcutta High Court.

The reasoning. Section 2(ff) captures cable transmission to hotel rooms as 'communication to the public'. A cable operator's licence runs only to the operator, not to hotels that relay the signal to guests. Each hotel must hold its own licence from the copyright owner.

For your practice. A hotel's cable subscription does not clear its copyright liability. Each property with cable-TV needs a direct IPRS licence. Address downstream licensing in cable agreements.

The order. The appeal was allowed. The court set aside the District Judge's order of 20 September 2024 and granted a permanent injunction restraining Hotel Appolo from communicating any IPRS works without a valid licence. No costs.

§ Section 2(ff), Copyright Act, 1957

The Indian Performing Right Society Limited v. Hotel Appolo & ors.

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	BENCH
Calcutta High Court	04.08.2026	FMA/322/2025	Debangsu Basak, Md. Shabbar Rashidi

Insurance Law & Claims
Motor Insurance Claims (Own, Second and Third-party)

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HC

Insurer liable despite driver's fake licence unless owner's wilful breach is proved

The dispute. In November 1997 a truck killed Kulwinder Singh, 17, on the Panchkula-Barwala road. His parents claimed compensation before MACT, Chandigarh. The driver's licence was confirmed forged. National Insurance insured the truck. MACT awarded Rs 1,50,000 with 9% interest on a pay-and-recover basis. The insurer appealed; claimants cross-objected for enhancement.

The reasoning. Liability avoids only if the insured wilfully entrusted the vehicle to an unlicensed driver. A later-found forged licence does not discharge the insurer. The owner's explanation, raised in testimony alone and never pleaded, was rejected.

> *The Punjab & Haryana High Court clarified that an insurer cannot escape liability for a motor accident merely because the driver's licence was forged, unless the insurer proves a willful breach by the insured.*
>
> FROM THE JUDGMENT

For your practice. Insurers must plead the owner's knowledge of the licence defect; late oral evidence fails. File a Sarla Verma multiplier calculation at the outset in death claims.

The order. Insurer's appeal dismissed. Compensation enhanced to Rs 4,63,500 with 9% p.a. from 22.01.1998, jointly against driver, owner and insurer. Father deceased; award goes to the mother.

§ Section 166, Motor Vehicles Act, 1988

NATIONAL INSURANCE CO LTD Vs JASPAL KAUR & ors.

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	BENCH
Punjab and Haryana High Court	03.08.2026	FAO/209/2002	Yashvir Singh Rathor

Property & Asset Disputes
Possession and Encroachment Issues

DELHI HC

Suit for possession over void documents governed by twelve-year limitation

The dispute. Dinesh and Anil Kumar own two plots in Najafgarh, Delhi. Defendants Sushila Devi and Balwan Singh occupied them in 2014. A forensic report established that the defendants' 1989 title documents were forged. Suits filed in 2019 claimed possession and sought a declaration of voidness. The ADJ dismissed both suits in October 2023 as time-barred under Article 58; the appellants challenged those orders in two Regular First Appeals.

The reasoning. A void instrument triggers Article 65 (twelve years) for possession, not Article 58 (three years) for declaration. Limitation ran from June 2014; the 2023 filing was within time and summary dismissal on a mixed limitation question was impermissible.

For your practice. Possession-dominant suits over void documents fall under Article 65, not Article 58. State the hierarchy of reliefs in the plaint; run limitation from the date of dispossession.

The order. The ADJ's order dated 06.10.2023 is set aside. Article 65 (twelve years) governs; possession is the principal relief and the documents are void. Both suits remanded for trial on the merits; parties to appear before the ADJ on 18.08.2026.

§ Article 65, Limitation Act, 1963

DINESH vs SUSHILA DEVI & ors.

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	CITATION	BENCH
Delhi High Court	03.08.2026	RFA-95/2025	2026:DHC:6233	Neena Bansal Krishna

Judgment

BOMBAY HC

Investment intent and long hold: flat sales are capital gains, not trade

The dispute. Aurum Ventures bought land in 2008 and completed the 7 Marine Drive project by 2013. It sold seven flats across three years, treating proceeds as capital gains; the AO added Rs 16.09 crore for AY 2017-18, classifying them as business income instead. The ITAT reversed on 20 June 2023, holding the income was capital gains; the Revenue appealed to the Bombay High Court under Section 260A.

The reasoning. The multi-factor test favoured the assessee: the MOA showed letting intent, books recorded an investment, and thirteen years elapsed to first sale. The Revenue had accepted capital-gains treatment in prior years and produced no new evidence.

For your practice. Prior acceptance bars reclassification absent new evidence. Record MOA objects, holding period and consistent accounting. Burden to prove an adventure in trade rests with Revenue.

The order. The Revenue's appeal was dismissed and the ITAT order upheld. Proceeds from the seven flats at 7 Marine Drive are taxed as capital gains for AY 2017-18. The unsold flat is treated as an investment, not stock-in-trade. No costs imposed.

§ Section 2(13), Income Tax Act, 1961

PR.COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX CENTRAL 4 Vs AURUM VENTURES PRIVATE LIMITED

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	BENCH
Bombay High Court	04.08.2026	ITXA/220/2024	G. S. Kulkarni, Aarti A. Sathe

Property & Asset Disputes
Possession and Encroachment Issues

CALCUTTA HC

Notice of refusal triggers limitation for specific performance

The dispute. Rama Mondal sued in 2016 for specific performance of a 1993 sale agreement, asserting refusal in 2015. Usha Raju argued the plaintiff had notice of the predecessor's refusal since 2007 via a letter to the Tehsildar, rendering the suit time-barred; they counter-claimed for title and eviction. Trial court relieved the plaintiff and dismissed the counter-claim; both were affirmed in 2023 and are now in second appeal.

The reasoning. Under Article 54, limitation runs from notice of refusal; the 2007 letter fixed that knowledge, expiring in 2010 and barring the suit. Under Article 65, adverse possession from 2007 made the counter-claim timely. Second appeals address only questions of law.

For your practice. Limitation under Article 54 starts at earliest notice of refusal, even from a predecessor; adverse possession date triggers Article 65. Frame second appeals on questions of law.

The order. Both appeals allowed. The 2022 and 2023 judgments are set aside. Counter-claim decreed: declaration of title to appellants, plaintiff to vacate within 30 days. No costs; decree to be drawn up.

§ Article 54, Limitation Act, 1963

Usha Raju & ors. v. Rama Mondal

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.	BENCH
Calcutta High Court	04.08.2026	SA/4/2025	Partha Sarathi Sen

Tribunals

1 judgment in this edition

KEEP SWIPING →

Judgment

ITAT

Finance Act 2021 amends s 149 prospectively; s 148 notice beyond the six-year limit is invalid

The dispute. Rooprekha Vyapaar raised Rs 20.04 crore in share capital from 18 subscribers in 2008. The AO added this as unexplained cash credit for AY 2008-09. For AY 2015-16 the Revenue issued a Section 148 notice on 23 March 2023, beyond the six-year limit. CIT(A) upheld the AY 2008-09 addition; the ITAT restored the matter to the AO in December 2022; the assessee brought both years before the Kolkata ITAT.

The reasoning. PCIT directed Section 131 summons; the AO relied on Section 133(6) alone. Unanswered notices cannot ground an addition where documents are supplied. Finance Act 2021 amends Section 149 prospectively; the six-year limit for AY 2015-16 had expired.

For your practice. For pre-2021 years the pre-amendment s 149 six-year cap applies. AO non-compliance with a PCIT s 131 summons direction is an independent ground to quash the resulting addition.

The order. Both appeals allowed. Rs 20.04 crore addition for AY 2008-09 deleted. The s 148 notice of 23 March 2023 and subsequent assessment for AY 2015-16 quashed as time-barred under s 149(1)(b). Matter restored to the AO for fresh adjudication.

§ Section 149(1)(b), Income-tax Act, 1961

Rooprekha Vyapaar Pvt. Ltd.,Kolkata vs D.C.I.T., Cc - 4(1), , Kolkata

COURT	DECIDED	CASE NO.
Income Tax Appellate Tribunal	04.08.2026	ITA No.895/KOL/2026 & ITA No.896/KOL/2026

BENCH

Duvvuru R.L. Reddy, Rajesh Kumar

Also decided today

§ Section 12, Probation of Offenders Act, 1958 — SUPREME COURT

Section 12, Probation Act does not bar dismissal of a convicted public servant

Section 12 removes statutory disqualifications only; it does not bar dismissal on conviction. A conviction remains a valid ground for removal irrespective of probation. Discharge before conviction without notice is unlawful and attracts compensation.

C.A. No.-009749-009749 - 2016 · 2026 INSC 798 · 04.08.2026

§ Interim Order dated 11 August 1995 establishing subvention scheme for profess... — SUPREME COURT

Subvention scheme lapses on day it is struck down; admissions after 2002-03 carry no claim

An executive scheme struck unconstitutional by a constitutional bench ceases on the date of the decision, not prospectively. The 01.04.2003 clarificatory order did not save it. Claims for later admissions failed for want of factual evidence in the writ.

C.A. No.-010669-010669 - 2010 · 2026 INSC 799 · 04.08.2026

§ Clause 15, Tender Conditions, 2025 — BOMBAY HC

Blacklisting without a show-cause notice is void

Gorkha Security Services requires a specific show-cause notice before blacklisting; a general tender-clause warning of unspecified action does not suffice. Where no specific notice precedes the order, blacklisting is void for breach of natural justice.

WP/7923/2026 · 03.08.2026

Also decided, continued

§ Section 313, Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — PUNJAB AND HARYANA HC

Omission to Put Incriminating Evidence Is Curable Irregularity

Section 313 CrPC requires each incriminating fact to be put to the accused; generic questions do not suffice. Where the omitted material is central to the prosecution case, the curable defect requires remand for fresh examination, not appellate affirmance.

MRC/3/2022 · 04.08.2026

§ Section 33(2)(b), Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 — KARNATAKA HC

Non-compliance does not bar back wages and tribunal jurisdiction

Non-compliance with Section 33(2)(b) renders dismissal inoperative; back wages are mandatory from dismissal to reinstatement. The Labour Court's jurisdiction to adjudicate misconduct on merits is unaffected by the procedural lapse.

WP/12014/2013 · 03.08.2026

§ Clause 6.10(a), Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity S... — JHARKHAND HC

Auction purchaser not liable for prior electricity dues under Clause 6.10(a), Supply Code 2015

Clause 6.10(a) of the 2015 Supply Code exempts an auction purchaser from prior electricity dues; Clause 5.3.3 applies only to direct sales. An encumbrance-free sale certificate with no nexus to the prior consumer brings a transaction within 6.10(a).

WPC/2089/2019 · 2026:JHHC:22928 · 04.08.2026

Also decided, continued

§ Section 29, Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 DELHI HC

Presumption Not Automatic, Conviction Overturned

Section 29 POCSO creates a rebuttable presumption that operates only after the prosecution first proves the foundational facts. Material contradictions between a victim's pre-trial statements, absent corroboration, create reasonable doubt requiring acquittal.

CRL.A.-348/2026 · 2026:DHC:6255 · 04.08.2026

§ Section 5, Limitation Act, 1963 GUJARAT HC

Gross negligence precludes condonation of delay

Sufficient cause under Section 5 must be bona-fide and free of negligence. Failure to obtain certified copies or comply with statutory communication duties is gross negligence; pandemic claims fail where internal correspondence continued throughout.

R/CA/1690/2025 · 2026:GUJHC:48580-DB · 03.08.2026

§ Section 21, National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 DELHI HC

Extension of investigation order not appealable

An order extending investigation under Section 43D(2)(b) UAPA is interlocutory under the Madhu Limaye test: it does not conclude proceedings and merely postpones the right to default bail; Section 21(3) NIA Act bars its appeal, leaving Section 482 CrPC.

CRL.A.-630/2026 · 2026:DHC:6261-DB · 04.08.2026

Also decided, continued

§ Section 25-B(8), Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 DELHI HC

Impugned dismissal orders set aside, leave to defend granted

Under Section 25-B(8) DRCA, subsequent events that materially affect a landlord's bonafide need may be considered; the non-disclosure of alternate premises violates clean-hands. Relocation abroad extinguishes the need and entitles tenants to leave to defend.

RCR - 99/2016 · 2026:DHC:6221 · 03.08.2026

§ Rule 13(2), Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965 DELHI HC

Charge-sheet must be issued by proper DA

Under Rule 13(2) CCS (CCA) Rules, only the Rule 2(a) appointing authority is the competent DA; a senior officer's unilateral decision does not suffice. An unauthorised charge-sheet vitiates disciplinary proceedings ab initio, regardless of the charge merits.

W.P.(C)-9366/2022 · 2026:DHC:6245-DB · 04.08.2026

§ Section 420, Indian Penal Code, 1860 JHARKHAND HC

Deception must exist at transaction inception

Sections 406 and 420 IPC require dishonest intent at the inception of the transaction. Breach of contract, poor workmanship, or post-delivery threats do not supply that intent. Where no deception existed at the outset, the accused must be discharged.

Cr.M.P./1925/2025 · 2026:JHHC:22829 · 03.08.2026

Also decided, continued

§ Section 44(1)(c), Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 — MADRAS HC

Premature committal applications rejected

Section 44(1)(c) PMLA requires cognizance by both courts: the scheduled-offence court and the Special Court. A pre-cognizance notice falls short. Without the s.197(1) sanction the Special Court cannot take cognizance; an earlier application is premature.

CRL OP(MD).3792/2026 · 2026:MHC:3219 · 04.08.2026

§ Article 65, Limitation Act, 1963 — DELHI HC

Permissive licensee cannot claim adverse possession; limitation runs from hostile occupation

Permissive occupation cannot establish adverse possession; animus possidendi must be hostile. Limitation under Article 65 runs from when possession turns hostile, not from the start of permissive occupation. A licence revocation marks that date.

RFA-955/2023 · 2026:DHC:6244 · 03.08.2026

§ Section 73(1), Finance Act, 1994 — CESTAT

Pre-2016 mining royalty outside service tax; extended limitation unavailable on interpretation

Service-tax liability is fixed at the date the right is agreed to be assigned, not at formal execution. A pre-amendment assignment falls outside the tax net. Extended limitation cannot cure a demand where the controversy is interpretational.

Service Tax Appeal No. 75628 of 2026 · 04.08.2026

Also decided, continued

§ Section 5, Limitation Act, 1963 ITAT

Reliance on wrong advice condones delay; revised encashment ceiling applied

Under Section 5, sufficient cause is liberally construed; reliance on wrong professional advice qualifies. Notification 31/2023 raising the encashment limit to Rs 25 lakhs is retrospective; PSU employees qualify as government employees for Section 10(10AA).

ITA No. 206/JPR/2026 · 04.08.2026

The Supreme Court's direction in the motor-vehicle insurance matter raises a question that will reach every claims file: if the four-layer policy structure becomes the standard and ANPR enforcement follows, at what point does a vehicle owner's failure to maintain valid cover shift from a technical breach to wilful non-compliance sufficient to displace insurer liability? The answer will likely shape motor-accident litigation for the next decade.

28 judgments **6** Supreme Court **19** High Courts **3** Tribunals

Every judgment here, analysed in full.

The facts, the reasoning and the precedents each court engaged with.

cassie.in/newsletter