



# LegalOnus

*Aequitas Sequitur Legem*

“A QUALITY  
INITIATIVE FOR  
LEGAL  
DEVELOPMENT,  
UNDERTAKEN  
BY  
LEGALONUS”



LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL  
ISSN: 3048-8338



[www.legalonus.com](http://www.legalonus.com) Email: [journal@legalonus.com](mailto:journal@legalonus.com)

**About Us - LegalOnus Law Journal (LLJ)**  
**ISSN: 3048-8338**

**LegalOnus Law Journal (LLJ)** is a monthly, peer-reviewed, online academic journal dedicated to advancing legal scholarship. We provide an interactive platform for the publication of short articles, long articles, book reviews, case comments, research papers, and essays in the field of law and multidisciplinary issues.

Our mission is to enhance the level of interaction and discourse surrounding contemporary legal issues. By fostering a dynamic environment for discussion, we aim to elevate the quality of legal scholarship and become a highly cited academic publication.

We invite quality contributions from students, academics, and professionals across the industry, the bar, and the bench. Join us in our commitment to advancing legal knowledge and practice.

**Disclaimer for LegalOnus Law Journal (LLJ)**  
**ISSN: 3048-8338**

All content published in the LegalOnus Law Journal (LLJ) is the intellectual property of their respective authors and contributors. The authors' copyright of articles, reviews, and other contributions remains.

Reproduction, redistribution, or commercial use of any materials from LLJ is strictly prohibited without prior written permission from the copyright holder and LLJ. The opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of LLJ or its editorial board.

LLJ and its editorial team are not responsible for any copyright infringements or legal issues arising from unauthorized use of the journal's content. For permissions, queries, or copyright concerns, please contact the LLJ editorial team at [journal@legalonus.com](mailto:journal@legalonus.com) By accessing and using LLJ content, you agree to comply with this disclaimer and all applicable copyright laws.

# Ayush Chandra

Publisher, Managing Director, & Founder



Mr. Ayush Chandra is the Publisher, Managing Director, and Founder.

He pursued an extensive legal education and practical experiences, significantly enriching his expertise. He graduated with first-division marks in a 5-year integrated BA-LLB course from Amity University. His education provided a solid foundation in legal studies. His internships included the District Legal Services Authority at a lower court, the Allahabad High Court under a seasoned advocate, and the Supreme Court of India.

These experiences deepened his understanding of the legal system, honing his analytical skills and expertise in drafting and pleading.

[ayush.chandra@legalonus.com](mailto:ayush.chandra@legalonus.com)

+91 9140433246

## Editorial board



**Prof. (Dr.) Jay Prakash Yadav**  
Senior Chief Editor  
Prof., and Director, Amity Law  
School  
Amity University,  
Gurugram, Haryana



**Dr. Radha Ranjan**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Assistant Professor,  
Amity University,  
Patna, Bihar.



**Mr. Rachit Sharma**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Assistant Professor  
IILM University,  
Greater Noida



**Dr. Anandh Kumar V**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Assistant Professor  
SRM School of Law,  
SRMIST, Tamil Nadu



**Megha Middha**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Research Scholar,  
Mohanlal Sukhadia University,  
Udaipur.



**Dr Pallavi Singh**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Assistant Professor (CUSB),  
School of law and Governance,  
Central University of South Bihar,  
Gaya.



**Advo. Tarun Agarwal**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Lawyer in London and Mumbai  
Registered Foreign Lawyer in  
England and Wales



**Aakansha Verma**  
Senior Editor  
Assistant Professor,  
Presidency school of Law, Presidency  
University,  
Bengaluru, Karnataka.



**Shivani Gupta**  
Senior Editor  
Assistant Professor,  
KGP PG College,  
Moradabad.

## **Students Editors**

- 1. Advo. Anushree Tiwari**
- 2. Ashutosh Debata**
- 3. Akriti Sonwani**
- 4. Jatin Rana**
- 5. Sumit kumar**

*Legalonus*

**Publisher**

**LegalOnus Publishing Team**

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **Judicial Independence and Executive Power in the S.P. Gupta Case**

**-Jagatha Guna Sai Venkat**

#### **Abstract**

The case of *S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.* (1981), also known as the Judges' Transfer Case, is a pivotal judgment in Indian legal history, emphasizing the independence of the judiciary and the constitutional provisions governing the appointment and transfer of judges. Decided by the Supreme Court on December 30, 1981, the case arose from a controversial circular issued by the Law Minister, soliciting the consent of additional judges for inter-state transfers under the guise of fostering national integration. The legal community perceived this move as an encroachment on judicial autonomy, prompting multiple writ petitions. Chief Justice P.N. Bhagwati led the bench in addressing intricate legal and constitutional questions, ultimately delivering a judgment that reinforced the judiciary's independence while examining the executive's role in judicial matters. This landmark decision clarified the constitutional balance between judicial independence and governmental influence, setting enduring precedents for future discourse on judicial appointments and transfers in India. *S.P. Gupta* remains a cornerstone case for understanding the evolving dynamics of judicial autonomy and executive power in the Indian constitutional framework.

**Keywords:** S.P. Gupta case, Judges' Transfer Case, judicial independence, judicial appointments, judicial transfers, Indian judiciary, constitutional law, Chief Justice P.N. Bhagwati, Law Minister circular, executive influence, judicial autonomy, Supreme Court of India, landmark judgment, national integration, writ petitions.

#### **Introduction**

The case of **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.**, also commonly referred to as the Judges' Transfer Case, is a landmark decision in the annals of Indian judiciary history, particularly touching on the independence of the judiciary and the complexities surrounding

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

bail provisions. Decided on December 30, 1981, by the Supreme Court of India, this case stands out not only for its depth in addressing judicial independence but also for setting precedents in the legal provisions regarding the transfer and appointment of judges.

At the heart of the controversy was the issuance of a circular by the then Law Minister, aimed at soliciting consent from additional judges for their transfer across states under the pretext of promoting national integration and combating parochial tendencies. This circular sparked widespread debate and was perceived by many, including the legal fraternity, as a direct assault on the judiciary's autonomy, prompting the filing of multiple writ petitions led by prominent members of the legal community.

The Supreme Court, under the stewardship of Chief Justice P.N. Bhagwati, navigated through these complex legal and constitutional issues, ultimately rendering a judgment that significantly influenced the discourse on judicial appointments and transfers in India. The case is often cited not only for its conclusions on judicial independence but also for its discussions on the constitutional aspects of judicial roles and powers. *S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.* thus serves as a critical reference point for understanding the balance between government influence and judicial autonomy, providing key insights into the structural dynamics that govern judicial procedures and the legal ethos in India.

### **Judiciary's Independence: The Core Issue**

In the landmark judgment of *S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.*, the Supreme Court of India grappled with issues that struck at the very heart of judicial independence, a cornerstone of democratic governance and the rule of law. This case arose at a time when concerns about the executive's interference in judicial matters were pronounced, leading to significant discomfort within the legal community and among the public at large.

The principal contention revolved around a circular issued by the Law Minister, which sought consents from judges of the high courts for their transfer to other states. This move was ostensibly aimed at fostering national unity and diluting local biases that could arise from

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246



## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

prolonged tenures in home states. However, it was perceived by many, including the petitioners, as an attempt by the executive to influence the judiciary, undermining its independence by relocating judges who might not align with certain governmental perspectives or policies.

The Supreme Court's exploration of this issue was profound and multifaceted. Justice P.N. Bhagwati, in delivering the judgment, elaborated on the necessity of an independent judiciary, unimpeded by executive or legislative overreach. The court asserted that the independence of the judiciary was not just a desired attribute but an essential foundation of the rule of law and democracy. This independence, the court argued, was intrinsically linked to the principles enshrined in Articles 124, 217, and 222 of the Indian Constitution, which deal with the appointment and transfer of judges. These articles were designed to ensure that the judiciary remains free from executive dominance, particularly in matters concerning appointments and transfers.

The judgment referenced several prior cases that underscored the judiciary's autonomous status. One pivotal case cited was **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**, where the Supreme Court held that the basic structure of the Constitution, which includes the judiciary's independence, could not be altered by any amendment. In **S.P. Gupta's** case, the court had to ensure that this doctrine was not compromised by executive actions perceived as undermining judicial autonomy.

Furthermore, the court examined international standards and practices, noting that global norms fiercely protect judicial independence. The judgment highlighted that any system wherein the executive had significant control over judicial appointments and transfers could lead to a diminution of public confidence in the judicial process.

In its decision, the Supreme Court laid down guidelines intended to minimize undue executive influence, emphasizing that the process of judicial appointments and transfers must be transparent and based on objective criteria. The judgment clarified that while the executive has

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

a role in these processes, it must not be the dominant voice, thereby preserving the judiciary's independence.

Ultimately, **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** marked a seminal moment in the constitutional jurisprudence of India. It reaffirmed the judiciary's role as a guardian of the rule of law and an arbiter free from governmental influence. By articulating the limits of executive power in judicial matters, the Supreme Court ensured that judicial independence remained more than a mere ideal, but a practical reality underpinning the functioning of India's democracy.

### **The Controversy Around Bail Provisions**

The **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** case, while predominantly centered on the issues of judicial transfers and independence, also touched upon the broader implications for the judiciary, including the administration of bail. While the case itself did not directly argue bail provisions, the principles underscored within the judgment have resonated through subsequent bail-related jurisprudence.

Judicial independence, as emphasized in the case, is crucial for all aspects of judicial decision-making, including bail determinations. The autonomy of judges in making bail decisions is pivotal as it ensures decisions are made based on legal merits without undue external influences, including from the executive branch. The controversy, in this context, stems not directly from the case at hand but from the implications the principles set forth have on the broader administration of justice.

Bail, in the Indian legal system, is governed under the **Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC)**, primarily through sections 437 and 439. These provisions stipulate the conditions under which bail may be granted or denied, emphasizing the judiciary's role in ensuring fair application of the law. The independence guaranteed by judicial autonomy, as reinforced by **S.P. Gupta's** case, ensures that such decisions are rendered impartially and justly, maintaining the balance between the rights of the accused and the interests of society.

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

The Supreme Court in **S.P. Gupta** elucidated the necessity for judiciary decisions to be insulated from political and executive pressures, which is essential in bail contexts. The ability of a judge to make decisions independently is crucial in bail hearings where the liberty of the individual is at stake. This independence is what prevents scenarios where bail might be denied or granted based on political motivations or public sentiment rather than evidence and legal principles.

Subsequent case law post-**S.P. Gupta** has further cemented the importance of judicial independence in bail proceedings. For instance, in **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia vs. State of Punjab (1980)**, the Supreme Court expanded upon the liberal approach to bail, emphasizing that the conditions for its grant should not be too strict and should primarily consider the likelihood of the accused appearing at trial. The court highlighted that bail decisions should be guided by judicial discretion based on the case's circumstances, free from external influences, echoing the ethos from **S.P. Gupta**.

Moreover, the Supreme Court's interpretation in **S.P. Gupta** also indirectly supports the argument against punitive pre-trial detentions, advocating for bail as a norm and jail as an exception, a principle that is now a pillar in India's bail jurisprudence. This principle was underlined in the landmark judgment **Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr (2018)**, where the Court asserted that a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty, and hence, should not be detained unless necessary.

In summary, while **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** did not directly deal with bail provisions, the principles laid out regarding judicial independence have profound implications for bail jurisprudence. The case underscores the importance of protecting judicial decision-making from external pressures to uphold the rule of law and ensure fair and just treatment in bail proceedings. This reinforcement of judicial independence is vital for maintaining public confidence in the judicial system's capacity to administer justice impartially, particularly in sensitive matters of personal liberty.

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **Legal Principles Involved**

The **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** case serves as a seminal exploration of several pivotal legal principles within the Indian constitutional framework. The judgment meticulously discusses the constitutional articles related to the judiciary, providing a thorough understanding of the separation of powers and the safeguarding of judicial independence. Here are some key legal principles articulated in the case:

#### **- Judicial Independence:**

- **Constitutional Basis:** The principle of judicial independence is embedded in various provisions of the Indian Constitution, including **Articles 124, 217, and 222**. These articles collectively ensure the independence of the judiciary by detailing the appointment, tenure, and conditions of service of judges.

- **Protection from Executive Influence:** The judgment highlighted that the independence of the judiciary is a crucial element of the basic structure of the Constitution, a doctrine established in **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**. This independence protects judges from executive pressure, ensuring they can make decisions based solely on law and justice.

#### **- Doctrine of Basic Structure:**

- The doctrine asserts that certain foundational features of the Constitution cannot be altered by any constitutional amendment. Judicial independence, as reaffirmed in this case, is identified as one of these immutable characteristics.

#### **- Transfer of Judges:**

- **Article 222** of the Constitution provides the procedure for the transfer of judges from one High Court to another. The case extensively reviewed the proper application of this article, emphasizing that transfers should not undermine judicial independence.

- **Guidelines for Transparency:** The judgment underscored the need for transparency and fairness in the transfer of judges, suggesting that transfers should not be punitive or arbitrary, thus protecting the ethos of judicial fairness and independence.

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **- Interpretation of Constitutional Provisions:**

- The case provided a nuanced interpretation of various constitutional provisions related to the judiciary. It set precedents on the balance of power between the judiciary and the executive, particularly concerning appointments and transfers of judges.

### **- Role of the Chief Justice:**

- It clarified the role of the Chief Justice of India in judicial appointments and transfers, stating that the Chief Justice's opinion should be given primacy, thus ensuring that judicial appointments are insulated from political influences.

### **- Public Interest and Writ Jurisdiction:**

- The judgment also expanded the scope of who could file a petition in the Supreme Court, thereby broadening access to justice. It allowed for public interest litigation (PIL), where even those not directly affected could approach the court for addressing a larger public injury.

In summary, the **S.P. Gupta** case was not just a discourse on judicial independence but a broader commentary on the constitutional protections afforded to the judiciary. It reinforced the critical balances necessary within a democratic framework to ensure the judiciary remains a robust, independent arbiter of justice, free from partisan influences and capable of upholding the rule of law under the Indian Constitution.

### **Key Arguments and Legal Reasoning**

The **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** case is rich with intricate arguments and nuanced legal reasoning, addressing the balance between the judiciary's independence and the executive's role in judicial appointments and transfers. Here are the key arguments presented and the legal reasoning applied by the Supreme Court:

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **- Argument on Judicial Independence:**

- **Petitioners' Argument:** The petitioners argued that the executive's involvement in the transfer of judges, as facilitated by the circular issued by the Law Minister, compromised judicial independence, essential for upholding the rule of law and democracy.

- **Legal Reasoning:** The court reinforced that judicial independence is part of the Constitution's basic structure, echoing the principles set in **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**. Transfers influenced by the executive could potentially be punitive and diminish the judiciary's autonomy.

### **- Role of the Chief Justice:**

- **Petitioners' Argument:** Emphasized that the Chief Justice should have a pivotal role in the appointments and transfers of judges to safeguard judicial independence from executive overreach.

- **Legal Reasoning:** The court observed that the Chief Justice's input is crucial but should not be the sole factor. The decision must be collaborative, involving the Chief Justice of India, the Law Minister, and the President, promoting a balanced approach that respects judicial independence while incorporating reasonable executive oversight.

### **- Doctrine of Basic Structure:**

- **Argument:** The basic structure doctrine protects certain elements of the Constitution from amendments that could alter their fundamental essence.

- **Legal Reasoning:** Judicial independence, as a part of this structure, must be preserved against any form of executive or legislative encroachment. This doctrine was instrumental in assessing the constitutional validity of actions affecting judicial processes.

### **- Interpretation of Article 222:**

- **Argument:** There was a significant examination regarding the correct interpretation of Article 222 of the Constitution, which deals with the transfer of judges.

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

- **Legal Reasoning:** The court noted that while Article 222 allows for the transfer of judges, such powers must be exercised without undermining the judiciary's independence. The process must be transparent and justifiable, not arbitrary, ensuring transfers are made in the public interest and not as a tool for executive convenience.

- **Public Interest Litigation (PIL):**

- **Argument:** Expanded the locus standi in legal actions, allowing individuals or groups not directly affected by an issue to file petitions if the matter concerned public interest.

- **Legal Reasoning:** The court expanded the interpretation of who could bring a case to the court, facilitating a broader participation in judicial processes and enabling societal interests to be represented and defended more effectively.

- **Balancing Executive and Judicial Functions:**

- **Argument:** While the executive has a role in the appointment and transfer of judges, this role must be balanced carefully with the need to maintain judicial independence.

- **Legal Reasoning:** The court proposed a system of checks and balances where the executive's recommendations or decisions on judicial appointments and transfers would involve consultations with the judiciary, ensuring that the executive powers are exercised responsibly.

The **S.P. Gupta** case laid down foundational principles that have guided the judiciary and the executive in maintaining a delicate balance of power. By establishing stringent safeguards against the misuse of executive authority in judicial matters, the Supreme Court ensured that the judiciary remains a robust, independent entity capable of upholding justice and constitutional values in India.

### **Implications of the Judgment**

The judgment in **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** had far-reaching implications that significantly influenced both the structure of the judiciary and the broader legal landscape in India. Here are the critical outcomes and consequences of this landmark decision:

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **- Strengthening of Judicial Independence:**

- The ruling reinforced the principle that judicial independence is an integral part of the basic structure of the Constitution, as affirmed in **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**. This outcome has ensured that any future attempts to undermine judicial autonomy, whether through legislative amendments or executive actions, would likely be scrutinized under the lens of maintaining the basic structure.

### **- Guidelines for Judicial Transfers:**

- The judgment provided clear guidelines on the transfer of judges under **Article 222** of the Constitution. It emphasized that such transfers should not be arbitrary or punitive and must be done transparently with the judiciary's involvement, thus ensuring that transfers are made fairly and without any malintent.

### **- Role of the Chief Justice:**

- The decision highlighted the role of the Chief Justice of India in judicial appointments and transfers, establishing that while the Chief Justice's opinion is pivotal, it should be part of a consultative process with the executive. This balance aims to prevent any one branch of government from having unilateral control over judicial appointments.

### **- Expansion of Public Interest Litigation (PIL):**

- One of the most significant implications of the judgment was the formal acknowledgment and expansion of public interest litigation. The court's decision to allow individuals and organizations not directly affected by an issue to file petitions on behalf of the public interest has democratized access to justice and empowered civil society.

### **- Checks on Executive Powers:**

- The judgment acted as a check on the powers of the executive in matters related to the judiciary. By outlining the boundaries within which the executive can operate, the judgment

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246



## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

has helped maintain a clear separation of powers, which is fundamental to the functioning of a democratic system.

### **- Influence on Subsequent Legal Interpretations:**

- The principles laid down in this case have been cited in numerous subsequent judgments, shaping the legal discourse around the independence of the judiciary and the administration of justice in India. This includes influencing later decisions regarding judicial ethics, governance, and the interpretation of the law in ways that respect judicial independence.

### **- Legal Precedent:**

- The decision serves as a precedent for future cases concerning the judiciary's autonomy and the constitutional framework governing judicial administration. It provides a robust framework for evaluating the constitutionality of actions affecting the judiciary, ensuring that such actions are always in keeping with the overarching principles of fairness, transparency, and independence.

In essence, the **S.P. Gupta** case has had a profound impact on the Indian judiciary and its relationship with the other branches of government, fortifying the legal foundations upon which the independence of the judiciary is maintained and ensuring that the judiciary remains a strong, impartial arbiter of justice.

### **Critical Analysis**

The **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** decision is a cornerstone in Indian judicial history, celebrated for reinforcing the independence of the judiciary and expanding public interest litigation (PIL). However, this landmark case also warrants a nuanced critique, especially in its handling of the balance between judicial autonomy and executive authority.

### **- Advocacy for Judicial Independence:**

- The decision robustly defended the principle of judicial independence as part of the Constitution's basic structure, aligning with the precedent set in **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**. However, critics argue that while it fortifies judicial independence, it

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

also left certain areas ambiguous, particularly concerning the exact limits of executive influence in judicial appointments. This ambiguity has occasionally led to contentious appointments and transfers, impacting the perceived impartiality of the judiciary.

### **- Expansion of Public Interest Litigation:**

- The judgment's liberal approach to PIL has been pivotal in democratizing access to justice, allowing any concerned citizen to approach the courts on behalf of public interest. While this has undeniably been beneficial in many landmark cases thereafter, it has also opened the floodgates to frivolous litigations, which sometimes burden the judicial system and detract from its efficiency. Critics suggest that there needs to be a more stringent filtering mechanism to prevent the misuse of PIL.

### **- Role of the Chief Justice and Collegium System:**

- The judgment emphasized a consultative process involving the Chief Justice of India in judicial appointments and transfers, aiming to curb unilateral executive power. However, this has led to debates around the transparency and accountability of the so-called 'Collegium System' that evolved from these principles. Some legal scholars argue that this system, while protecting judicial independence, lacks sufficient checks and balances itself, leading to a lack of transparency in how judges are chosen and promoted.

### **- Implications for Separation of Powers:**

- By delineating strict roles for the executive and judiciary, the judgment aimed to enhance the separation of powers. However, the critical discourse suggests that it could have further clarified the nuances of these separations to avoid overlapping authority and potential conflicts between the branches of government.

Overall, while **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** significantly shaped the landscape of Indian constitutional law by reinforcing judicial independence and broadening public access to legal recourse, it also leaves room for critical analysis regarding its long-term implications on judicial processes and governance.

**VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2, 2024**

journal@legalonus.com | +919140433246

## **LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL (LLJ)**

### **Conclusion**

The **S.P. Gupta vs. President of India & Ors.** case remains a seminal moment in India's legal history, reinforcing the judiciary's independence and expanding the scope of public interest litigation. It underscored the importance of maintaining a balance between judicial autonomy and executive authority, guided by the principles embedded within the Constitution's basic structure as outlined in **Kesavananda Bharati vs. State of Kerala (1973)**. While the case fortified the legal framework for judicial operations, it also prompted ongoing debates about the transparency and efficiency of the judiciary, underscoring the dynamic and evolving nature of constitutional law in India.

### **References**

1. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1294854/>
2. [https://main.sci.gov.in/pdf/fullcourtreferance/Shri\\_SPGupta.pdf](https://main.sci.gov.in/pdf/fullcourtreferance/Shri_SPGupta.pdf)
3. <https://legalfly.in/case-summary-sp-gupta-v-union-of-india/>



**Maiden Issue**

<b>S. No.:</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Details</b>
1.	Place of publication	Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
2.	Language	English only
3.	Under the guidance	Dr. Radha Ranjan
4.	Owner, & Publisher	LEGALONUS LAW JOURNAL, Ayush Chandra, Lucknow, UP, India

**Guidelines for Contributors**

- Original accounts of research in the form of articles, short articles, reports, notes, comments, review articles, book reviews and case comments shall be most appreciated. • Mode of citation: Footnotes, References
- Font; Times New Roman
- Font size: 12 points for text and 10 points for footnotes.
- Spacing: 1.5
- Mode of Submission: Email
- Email: journal@legalonus.com