



# **Supreme Court Daily Digest**

**21 August 2025**

## INDEX

1. Neelam Kumari vs. State of Himachal Pradesh 2025 INSC 1013 - Evidence - Extra Judicial Confession - Forensic Report -Motive - Circumstantial Evidence
2. Union of India vs Saleem Khan 2025 INSC 1008 - UAPA Bail
3. National Highway Authority Of India vs O.J Janeesh - Toll - National Highway
4. Suresh Chandra Maharana vs Union Of India - Withdrawal Of PIL
5. Methkupally Venkatamma vs M. Padmamma - Delay Condonation - Betrayal Of Trust
6. Prakash Singh vs Union Of India - PIL - Service Disputes

**Disclaimer:** We have made these notes (shared below) based on our understanding of the above Supreme Court judgments. You are requested to read original judgments before using our notes for any purpose. You can click on the case names below to access original judgment.

**Neelam Kumari vs. State of Himachal Pradesh 2025 INSC 1013**  
**- Evidence - Extra Judicial Confession - Forensic Report**  
**-Motive - Circumstantial Evidence**

**Evidence** - Extra-judicial confessions are generally considered weak evidence and should be corroborated by other, independent evidence (Para 11)

**Evidence** - While the prosecution is not required to examine every possible witness, it must ensure that those witnesses essential to substantiate the truth are produced before the Court- non-examination of a relevant witness at the trial persuades the Court to draw an adverse inference against the prosecution. (Para 13)

**Evidence - Forensic Examination** - Common items of clothing may contain various biological materials from everyday use, and without specific identification, such evidence remains ambiguous at best. (Para 19)

**Evidence - Motive** - The strength of the motive plays a crucial role in establishing the credibility of the prosecution's case. While a weak or absent motive alone may not be sufficient to acquit an accused if other circumstances form a complete chain pointing unerringly to guilt, it significantly weighs in favour of the accused and creates a reasonable doubt. (Para 21)

**Evidence - Circumstantial Evidence** - 'Golden principles' for evaluating circumstantial evidence from Sharad Birdhi Chand Sarda vs. State of Maharashtra-(a) The circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established. The circumstances concerned "must or should" and not "may be" established; (b) The facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt

of the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except that the accused is guilty; (c) The circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency; (d) They should exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved; and (e) There must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all human probability the act must have been done by the accused. (Para 14)

---

### **Union of India vs Saleem Khan 2025 INSC 1008 - UAPA Bail**

**Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967** - While upholding bail granted to one accused, SC observed: HC noticed that allegations found in the charge-sheet related to his connections with an organisation by the name of ALHind, which admittedly is not a banned organisation under the schedule to UAPA. Therefore, to say that he was attending meetings of the said organisation, AL-Hind and others would not amount to any prima facie offence. (Para 9)

---

### **National Highway Authority Of India vs O.J Janeesh - Toll - National Highway**

**National Highway - Toll** - SC upheld Kerala HC order and agreed with the following observation: The obligation of the public to pay a user fee under statutory provisions is premised on the assurance that their use of the road will be free from hindrances. When the public is legally

bound to pay a user fee, they simultaneously acquire a corresponding right to demand unhindered, safe, and regulated access to the road. Any failure on the part of the National Highways Authority or its agents to ensure such access constitutes a breach of the public's legitimate expectations and undermines the very basis of the toll regime - SC observed: Let the citizens be free to move on the roads, for use of which they have already paid taxes, without further payment to navigate the gutters and pot-holes, symbols of inefficiency.

---

### **Suresh Chandra Maharana vs Union Of India - Withdrawal Of PIL**

**Constitution of India - Article 226,32** - Withdrawal of a PIL is ordinarily not permissible and even if, the same is dismissed as withdrawn, it will not operate as res judicata. (Para 5)

---

### **Methkupally Venkatamma vs M. Padmamma - Delay Condonation - Betrayal Of Trust**

**Limitation Act 1961 - Section 5 - Delay Condonation Application** - In family disputes elderly women rely on their husbands or sons to look after their interest in litigation. When a case of betrayal of such trust is pleaded in a delay condonation application, the Court is required to view the same with a sympathetic slant. (Para 8)

---

### **Prakash Singh vs Union Of India - PIL - Service Disputes**

## **Constitution of India - Article 226 - Public Interest Litigation-**

PIL jurisdiction cannot be permitted to become a mechanism to settle the scores between the competing officers - If a person is aggrieved by any action of the State with regard to his illegal removal from the service or due to denial of his legitimate claim to a post, such an officer can very well take recourse to the remedies available to him in law - Public Interest Litigation is a mechanism, which has been devised by this Court so as to dilute the issue of locus and permit public spirited person to approach this Court or the High Courts on behalf of the persons who, on account of their social and economic backwardness, are not in a position to approach the High Courts or this Court. (Para 3-6)

---