Weekly Update for Law Optional UPSC

A mix of Conceptual, Current/Contemporary Topics

8th June -14th June, 2026

1.Mere Silence Not Cruelty: SC Sets Aside 498A Conviction..... 1
2.ICJ holds merits hearings in Guyana v. Venezuela on validity of the 1899 Arbitral Award (Essequibo)..... 2
3.ICC unseals arrest warrant against Philippine Senator "Bato" Dela Rosa for crimes against humanity..... 2

Weekly Focus

Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel, (1985) — Case Summary..... 3
PYQ Solution..... 3

Join Telegram or Whatsapp for Weekly Update

1.Mere Silence Not Cruelty: SC Sets Aside 498A Conviction

In **Jayesh Kanna v. The Assistant Commissioner Law and Order (West) (2026),** the Supreme Court has clarified that mere non-communication by a husband with his wife, absent cogent corroborating evidence, does not fall within the ambit of cruelty under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code.

A bench of Justice J.K. Maheshwari and Justice Atul S. Chandurkar held that differences in marital life are a natural incident of it, and such differences may legitimately result in non-communication. The Court reiterated that there is no fixed rule for determining mental cruelty; it turns on the facts of each case, since what is an innocent quarrel for one may cause serious agony to another. However, persistent harassment proximate to the complaint may be a relevant factor.

On the evidentiary question, the Court held that absence of WhatsApp messages cannot prove lack of communication, as conversations may occur via ordinary phone calls. The prosecution, relying only on the deceased's parents' oral testimony, failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that non-communication caused the suicide.

2.ICJ holds merits hearings in Guyana v. Venezuela on validity of the 1899 Arbitral Award (Essequibo)

From 4 to 11 May 2026, the ICJ held public hearings on the merits in **Arbitral Award of 3 October 1899 (Guyana v. Venezuela)**, concerning the long-running Essequibo territorial dispute. Guyana, which filed in 2018 under the 1966 Geneva Agreement (after the UN Secretary-General chose judicial settlement), asked the Court to declare the 1899 award, which fixed the boundary between then-British Guiana and Venezuela as final, valid, and binding.

Guyana opened on Monday 4 May; Venezuela, which contests the Court's jurisdiction and has long called the award null, presented the following week. The case squarely engages the finality of inter-state arbitration, the stability of territorial settlements, and the duty to settle disputes peacefully under the UN Charter.

3.ICC unseals arrest warrant against Philippine Senator "Bato" Dela Rosa for crimes against humanity

On 11 May 2026, ICC Pre-Trial Chamber I unsealed an arrest warrant (issued under seal on 6 November 2025) against sitting Philippine Senator Ronald "Bato" Dela Rosa, former national police chief and architect of the Duterte "war on drugs," charging him as an indirect co-perpetrator in the crime against humanity of murder (Article 7(1)(a), Rome Statute).

He took refuge inside the Senate to evade arrest. It is the companion case to former President Duterte's, whose charges were confirmed on 23 April 2026 (trial set for 30 November 2026). The episode highlights the ICC's dependence on state cooperation, since the Philippines withdrew from the Rome Statute in 2019.

Weekly Focus

Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel, (1985) — Case Summary

Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel is a leading Supreme Court decision on the limits of natural justice in service law, especially in relation to **Article 311 of the Constitution.**

The case arose from disciplinary action taken against government servants who were dismissed, removed, or reduced in rank without holding a regular departmental inquiry. Ordinarily, **Article 311(2)** protects a civil servant by requiring that he be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before such punishment is imposed. However, the government relied on the **second proviso to Article 311(2)**, which permits dispensing with an inquiry in exceptional circumstances.

The main issue before the Court was whether such denial of inquiry violates natural justice and whether the **constitutional exceptions to Article 311(2) are valid.**

The Supreme Court upheld the validity of the second proviso. It held that the rule of **audi alteram partem**, or right to be heard, is an important principle of fair procedure, but it is not an inflexible rule. Where the Constitution itself permits exclusion of inquiry, natural justice may be curtailed.

The Court recognised t**hree situations where inquiry may be dispensed with**: where the employee is convicted on a criminal charge; where holding an inquiry is not reasonably practicable; and where the President or Governor is satisfied that inquiry is not expedient in the interest of State security.

The significance of the case lies in its **balanced approach**. It does not reject natural justice, but makes it clear that natural justice must operate within the constitutional framework. At the same time, the power to deny inquiry cannot be used casually or arbitrarily. The authority must act on relevant material and for genuine reasons.

PYQ Solution

"The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 prevents the public servants from misuse and abuse of their official capacity." Comment. *(15 Marks)*

Introduction	Highlights the objective and preventive nature of the PCA to regulate public service corruption.
Body	Defines public servant, explains key sections (7, 13, 19, 20, 17A), and judicial interpretations. Notes the effect of 2018 Amendment and implementation challenges.
Conclusion	Emphasizes that while PCA is effective on paper, its success relies on enforcement and systemic reform.

Corruption by public officials corrodes the very foundation of governance and undermines public trust. To address this menace, the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PCA)** was enacted as a special legislation distinct from the general provisions of the IPC. Its objective is not only **punitive**, but also **preventive**, aimed at deterring public servants from misusing their office for **private gain**. The Act has undergone crucial reforms, notably the **2018 Amendment**, to align with international standards and contemporary governance needs.

The PCA, 1988, defines a **"public servant"** broadly under Section 2(c), encompassing government employees, politicians, and even office-bearers of government-aided institutions. Under **Section 7**, it criminalizes acceptance of undue advantage by public servants. This is reinforced by **Section 20**, which creates a presumption of guilt upon proof of acceptance unless rebutted.

Section 13 deals with "**criminal misconduct**" and initially had a wide scope, encompassing abuse of position, obtaining pecuniary advantage, and possession of disproportionate assets. However, the **2018 Amendment** narrowed this scope by requiring proof of "intention" and actual enrichment. This change drew criticism for potentially weakening the deterrent effect.

Procedural safeguards include the requirement of **prior sanction** under **Section 19** before prosecuting serving public officials, ensuring that honest officers are not harassed frivolously. Further, **Section 17A**, inserted by the 2018 Amendment, prohibits investigation without prior approval where actions relate to official functions. This has stirred debate, especially post the **Yashwant Sinha v. CBI** case, where the Supreme Court emphasized the protective yet restrictive nature of this provision.

Moreover, the PCA penalizes those **offering bribes** under Section 8, and brings **commercial organizations** under its fold (Section 9), thereby creating **corporate accountability**.

Despite robust provisions, enforcement issues persist due to **delayed sanctions**, **hostile witnesses**, and **low conviction rates**. Nevertheless, the Act remains a cornerstone in India's anti-corruption legal framework.

The PCA, 1988 is a crucial mechanism to curb abuse of official power. By criminalizing not just bribe-taking but also bribe-giving and misuse of office, and by incorporating procedural checks like prior sanction, it strives to strike a balance between accountability and protection. However, its efficacy ultimately depends on political will, institutional integrity, and judicial resolve.