



CURRENTLY — 14 AUGUST 2026

- 1. Putin's first trip to the Pacific island chain claimed by Japan draws ire from Tokyo**
Source: The Hindu | Page: 18 | Subject: GS-II — International Relations
- 2. Southern African Customs bloc, India revive trade talks**
Source: The Hindu | Page: Not provided | Subject: GS-III — Economy & International Trade
- 3. Goods exports surge 20% as India diversifies trade**
Source: The Hindu | Page: 1 | Subject: GS-III — Economy & International Trade
- 4. Europe's AI rules may become India's opportunity**
Source: The Hindu Editorial | Page: 10 | Subject: GS-III — Science & Technology
- 5. The constitutional limits on arrest**
Source: The Hindu | Page: Not provided | Subject: GS-II — Polity, Judiciary & Fundamental Rights
- 6. Seven-judge Bench to hear case concerning legislative privileges from October 6**
Source: The Hindu | Page: Not provided | Subject: GS-II — Polity, Parliament & Judiciary

Putin's first trip to the Pacific island chain claimed by Japan draws ire from Tokyo

Associated Press

MOSCOW

Russian President Vladimir Putin on Thursday made his first visit to the Kuril Islands, a Moscow-controlled Pacific archipelago that also is claimed by Japan, which voiced a diplomatic protest over the trip.

Mr. Putin visited a fish plant, a hospital and a school on Iturup, one of the volcanic chain's southern islands. He also briefly spoke to local residents and met with the governor of Russia's Sakhalin region, Valery Limarenko.



Vladimir Putin interacts with local residents on Iturup island, part of the contested chain known as the Kuril Islands on Thursday. AFP

Japan asserts territorial rights to the four southernmost islands of the chain, which it calls the Northern Territories. The Soviet Un-

ion took them from Japan in the final days of the Second World War, and the dispute kept the countries from signing a peace treaty

formally ending their hostilities.

Japanese Foreign Minister Toshimitsu Motegi said his country “strongly protests” Mr. Putin’s visit to Iturup, which Japan calls Etorofu.

“The Northern Territories, including Etorofu (Iturup) Island, are Japan’s inherent territory both historically and from the perspective of international law,” Mr. Motegi said.

He summoned Russian Ambassador Nikolay Nozdrev to the Ministry in Tokyo and lodged a strong protest over the visit.



Context [GS-II: International Relations | Territorial Disputes | Indo-Pacific]

Russian President Vladimir Putin visited **Iturup (Etorofu in Japan) in the Kuril Islands** for the first time, prompting a strong Japanese protest. The visit has revived the long-running Russia–Japan territorial dispute, which has remained a major obstacle to a formal post-World War II peace treaty.

1. Where is the dispute?

- **Kuril Islands:** A volcanic island chain between Japan's Hokkaido and Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula, strategically connecting the Sea of Okhotsk with the Pacific Ocean.
- **Four disputed southern islands:** **Iturup (Etorofu), Kunashir (Kunashiri), Shikotan and Habomai**. Russia administers them as the Southern Kurils, while Japan calls them the Northern Territories and claims sovereignty over them.

2. Historical Background

- The Soviet Union occupied the islands in the final days of World War II in 1945. Japan disputes Russia's sovereignty and maintains that the four islands are historically and legally Japanese territory.
- The territorial dispute has prevented Moscow and Tokyo from concluding a formal peace treaty, despite decades of negotiations.

3. Why is the dispute important?

- **Strategic location:** The islands provide Russia with important access and military positioning in the Pacific and Sea of Okhotsk.
- **Security dimension:** Russia has strengthened its military presence in the region, while the islands remain strategically significant amid wider tensions in the Indo-Pacific.
- **Diplomatic impact:** Japan's relations with Russia have already deteriorated following the Ukraine conflict, making settlement of the territorial dispute more difficult.

Southern African Customs bloc, India revive trade talks

Reuters

NEW DELHI

India and the five-member Southern African Customs Union signed terms of reference on Wednesday to start talks on a preferential trade agreement, as New Delhi seeks lower tariffs on exports including cars, pharmaceuticals and industrial machinery.

The move revives talks between India and SACU, comprising South Africa, Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho and Eswatini, after five rounds of negotiations between 2002 and 2010 ended without a deal.

The pact could become India's first major trade agreement with an African regional bloc, giving Indian companies preferential access to a market of about 65 million people.

Commerce Minister Piyush Goyal said he was confident SACU countries and India would "benefit immensely" from a fair, equitable and balanced agreement.

Context [GS-III: International Trade & Regional Economic Integration]

India and the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) have signed Terms of Reference (ToR) to begin negotiations for a Preferential Trade Agreement (PTA). The talks revive negotiations that remained inconclusive after five rounds during 2002–2010.

1. What is SACU?

- **SACU is a customs union of five countries** — **South Africa, Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho and Eswatini.**
- As a customs union, members have free/preferential movement of goods within the union and a common external tariff on imports from non-member countries.
- It is the world's oldest functioning customs union, established in 1910.

2. What are Terms of Reference?

- ToR is the basic framework for negotiations. It defines what areas will be negotiated and the broad scope of the proposed agreement.
- Signing the ToR does not mean that the PTA has been concluded; it formally begins the negotiation process.

3. Why is the PTA important for India?

- **Market access:** Preferential tariffs could improve Indian exports of automobiles, pharmaceuticals and industrial machinery.
- **Market size:** The SACU market covers around 65 million people.
- **Strategic significance:** A trade agreement can deepen India's economic engagement with Southern Africa and diversify its trade partnerships.

Goods exports surge 20% as India diversifies trade

India's exports to West Asia recovered in July amid the crisis after re-routing shipping lines, says Commerce Secretary; trade deficit, however, widens as service exports grow slower than imports

T.C.A. Sharad Raghavan
NEW DELHI

Despite the ongoing turmoil in West Asia, India's merchandise exports saw a growth of nearly 20% in July this year, faster than that of imports, official data released on Thursday show.

Notably, exports to West Asia itself have recovered, with July's exports to the region nearly 9% higher than the same period last year. According to Commerce Secretary Rajesh Agrawal, this has been achieved by routing India's trade through different ports and shipping lines.

India's merchandise exports stood at \$44.2 billion in July, up 19.6% over its level in the same period last year. According to Mr. Agrawal, this was achieved

Soaring trade

India's total exports for July 2026 grew 13.31% from July 2025, while imports grew by 15.83% in the same period. The chart shows India's total exports and imports in July 2026 compared to the year-ago period



through continued diversification of export destinations. Merchandise imports, meanwhile, grew at a relatively slower 17.5% in July to \$76.2 billion.

"If you look at destination countries, we are now doing well in countries where we typically did not

earlier, such as China, Singapore, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Austria, Malaysia, and several other countries," Mr. Agrawal said at a press conference. "Even in Africa, in Kenya and the South African Customs Union region, there has been an increase

in exports in the first four months of this financial year," the Commerce Secretary noted. "Tanzania has also been a very strong silver lining where 130% growth in exports has been seen."

India's exports to China grew 65% to \$2.2 billion in July, albeit on a low base. Over the course of April-July this year, exports to China grew 36%.

However, India's trade deficit still widened to \$15 billion in July from \$11.4 billion in the corresponding period last year as services imports grew faster than services exports. The data show that services exports grew 6.4% in July to \$35.9 billion while imports grew 9.5% to \$18.9 billion.

CONTINUED ON
» PAGE 14

Context [GS-III: Indian Economy & International Trade]

India's merchandise exports recorded strong growth in July 2026 despite West Asian disruptions, reflecting diversification of India's trade geography and shipping routes.

1. Key Data

- **Merchandise exports:** \$44.2 billion, up 19.6% year-on-year.
- **Merchandise imports:** \$76.2 billion, up 17.5%.
- **Total exports:** \$80.14 billion, up 13.31%.
- **Total imports:** \$95.16 billion, up 15.83%.
- **Trade deficit:** \$15 billion, against \$11.4 billion a year earlier.

2. Diversification of India's Trade Geography

- **Changing pattern:** India is increasingly exporting to countries that traditionally served mainly as sources of imports, helping diversify its export markets and reduce dependence on conventional destinations.
- **China:** India's exports to China rose 65% to \$2.2 billion in July; during April–July, exports grew 36%.
- **West Asia:** Exports to the region recovered by nearly 9%, despite the ongoing crisis, through rerouting of shipments via alternative ports and shipping lines.
- **Africa:** Exports to Tanzania rose 130%, while Kenya and the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) region also recorded strong growth.

Europe's AI rules may become India's opportunity

The Government of India has recently indicated that it is considering a standalone legislation to govern Artificial Intelligence (AI). However, the pressure on the AI supply chain is already felt due to the European Union (EU)'s AI Act which was entered into force in August 2024 and became applicable on August 2, 2026. The Act has adopted a risk-based approach to artificial intelligence ("AI") regulation – prohibiting certain AI systems, regulating high-risk ones, and imposing lighter checks for limited-risk use cases.

While most Indian firms are likely aware that the Act applies when their AI systems produce results in Europe, there is a more consequential story that goes beyond a compliance checklist.

A post-approval issue

The Act was drafted with a particular picture in mind, and that picture does not match how India's technology industry actually works. This mismatch, more than the law's long reach, is what Indian companies should be watching. The Act assumes that software, once built and approved, is sold as a finished product. India's technology industry has never worked that way. The devil lies in the legal consequences when an AI is updated post-approval.

Before a 'high-risk' AI system, used for sensitive decisions such as hiring or education, can enter the European market, it must clear a 'conformity assessment' under Article 43: proof that it meets the law's standards on testing, documentation and human oversight. For most such systems the provider assesses itself against the Act's criteria and signs its own declaration; only a narrow set, mainly certain biometric tools, must be checked by an independent body. Either way, once the box is ticked, the system can run undisturbed. However, if the system is "substantially modified", the process must be repeated. A substantial modification is a change



**Mustafa
Rajkotwala**

Lawyer based out of
Mumbai who focuses
on the technology
law space



Dhruv Jadhav

Lawyer based out of
Mumbai who focuses
on the technology
law space

India could
build an
industry around
the paperwork
and proof
required under
the European
Union's Artificial
Intelligence (AI)
Act

not contemplated at the time of the original assessment, one that affects its compliance or alters its intended purpose.

In June 2026, the EU gave final approval to a package easing its own timelines, pushing the compliance deadline for these standalone high-risk AI systems to December 2027 and to August 2, 2028 for high-risk AI-embedded in regulated products. It retained a grandfathering clause under which systems already on the market before this date are exempted from the Act's obligations until substantially modified. A foreseen change examined during the original conformity assessment does not trigger a fresh one, while an unanticipated change likely does.

This distinction is not just a technicality. It would likely favour business models built on predictable product road maps. Providers of standardised AI products can assess planned upgrades during the initial assessment. Businesses that rely on bespoke services, offering competitive adaptability to individual client needs, may find it harder to demonstrate that future changes fall within the scope of the original assessment.

Unplanned improvement and regulation

India's technology industry, from the large IT services firms to the global capability centres in Bengaluru and Hyderabad, runs on exactly this kind of responsive adaptation. The Act also tethers liability to firms that substantially modify someone else's high-risk system. Such firms may be treated as the provider of the modified system, inheriting every one of the original maker's obligations. Thus, for an industry whose very promise is improvement on demand, an unplanned improvement that changes an AI system's intended purpose may trigger a fresh regulatory exercise.

Yet, the Act also presents an opportunity. High-risk compliance is operationalised through

paperwork and proof. Most providers will be permitted to carry out that conformity assessment themselves, but they will do so against harmonised technical standards still being drafted. The underlying work – governance measures, technical documentation, testing regimes – has to be done in volume. The scale of this obligation is likely to generate demand for quality legal and technical professionals, which India can provide. Indian professional services firms have supported clients across data protection, financial regulation and technical assurance. They can provide regulatory capability for the Act too.

Tap the trade agreement

A longer-term vision extends beyond compliance services. The Act creates a pathway for conformity assessment bodies established in third countries to be recognised and perform the functions of notified bodies, where the EU has concluded an appropriate agreement, and those bodies satisfy the requirements. This recognition is a question for treaty negotiation, and India has just signed a treaty capable of carrying it.

The India-EU Free Trade Agreement that was concluded in January includes standing machinery and regulatory cooperation provisions. If India can secure institutional arrangements as part of its partnership with the EU, it could become not just a supplier of AI compliance services but also a participant in the EU's conformity assessment ecosystem. Going ahead, it would provide the legal gateway through which qualified Indian conformity assessment bodies could eventually perform functions recognised under the Act. Europe has written itself a mountain of compliances and India has the capacity to do it. There is a version of this where the rules India fears become the work it sells. Which version arrives is still being decided, and not for much longer.



Context [GS-III: Science & Technology | Artificial Intelligence | IT & Emerging Technologies]

The European Union Artificial Intelligence (EU AI) Act is creating a new compliance ecosystem based on the risk level of AI systems. As India considers its own AI legislation, the EU framework could create an opportunity for India's technology and professional-services sector.

1. What the EU AI Act changes

- **Risk-based regulation:** Certain unacceptable AI practices are prohibited, while high-risk AI faces stricter requirements and lower-risk applications face lighter obligations.
- **High-risk systems:** Before entering the EU market, such systems require conformity assessment, covering risk management, data quality, documentation, traceability, transparency, human oversight, accuracy and cybersecurity.
- **Post-approval changes:** A key concern for Indian firms is substantial modification. If an AI system or its intended purpose is substantially changed, a fresh conformity assessment may be required. This is significant because Indian technology firms often continuously modify and improve software for individual clients.
- **The EU has extended the application of high-risk rules** to December 2027 for stand-alone systems and August 2028 for AI embedded in products, giving businesses more time to prepare.

2. Why this can become an opportunity for India

- **AI compliance services:** Continuous regulatory requirements create demand for testing, documentation, risk assessment, auditing, cybersecurity and technical assurance.
- **India's existing strength:** India already has a large IT-services and professional-services ecosystem, including major technology centres in Bengaluru and Hyderabad, which can provide these specialised services.
- **From software exporter to compliance hub:** India can move beyond developing AI systems to becoming a provider of AI governance, conformity assessment and regulatory-compliance services for global companies.
- **Skilled employment:** It can create demand for professionals combining AI + law + cybersecurity + data governance + technical auditing.

3. India-EU regulatory opportunity

- The India-EU Free Trade Agreement, whose negotiations concluded in January 2026, includes a Working Group on Conformity Assessment, creating a possible institutional route for cooperation on conformity-assessment procedures.
- India could seek recognition of competent Indian bodies so that AI compliance assessments performed in India can gain acceptance in European markets.

10 Marks | 150 Words

The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act can create new opportunities for India's technology and professional-services sector. Discuss.

यूरोपीय संघ का आर्टिफिशियल इंटेलिजेंस अधिनियम भारत के प्रौद्योगिकी और पेशेवर सेवा क्षेत्र के लिए नए अवसर पैदा कर सकता है। चर्चा कीजिए।

The constitutional limits on arrest

The Supreme Court has reinforced safeguards against arbitrary arrest, holding that an arrested person must be informed of the grounds of arrest; constitutional protections under Articles 21, 22, along with judicial guidelines, seek to balance the state's power to arrest with the individual's right to personal liberty and dignity

LETTER & SPIRIT

C.B.P. Srivastava

The constitutionality of arrest in India needs to be examined to reinforce democratic values and ensure that the authority of the state and the liberty of the citizen are properly balanced. Recently, the Supreme Court, in *Vihaan Kumar v. State of Haryana* (2025), held that every arrested person must be properly and meaningfully informed of the grounds for his arrest. Failure to provide information shall amount to a violation of Article 22(1) of the Constitution and Section 50 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Section 47 of the BNSS, 2023).

Sometimes, communication is conducted with the arrested person's relatives, which appears to be a formality. Considering this, the verdict says that communicating the details of the arrest to relatives or providing ambiguous records does not satisfy the constitutional requirements.

Therefore, the arrested person must be directly informed of the grounds of arrest in a manner that enables him to understand them. This would be in line with the Constitutional philosophy of putting a check on any possible arbitrary exercise of power.

Legal safeguards

The court has opined that if the initial arrest was unconstitutional, subsequent remand orders would also be deemed illegal. Moreover, to fulfil the requirements of Article 22(2) and Section 57 of the CrPC (Section 58 of the BNSS, 2023), the arrest memo must contain the time of arrest. These constitutional and legal provisions say that the police must present the arrested person to a local magistrate within 24 hours, excluding the travel time.

The court also condemned degrading



GETTY IMAGES

treatment in custody, affirming the right to dignity under Article 21, and directed the state to amend its procedures to prevent future violations. Thus, this judgment sets a strong precedent for safeguarding personal liberty and procedural fairness in India's criminal justice system.

Arrest is different from detention. While detention is a temporary hold for investigation and the person is not charged with any offence, arrest is a formal police custody with a probable cause of commission of an offence. Article 22 deals with both arrest and detention. In non-cognisable offences such as simple hurt, defamation, etc., a warrant is needed for arrest, whereas in cognisable offences such as murder, rape, etc., arrest is without a warrant.

Court's guidelines on arrest

In *Armesh Kumar v. State of Bihar* (2014), the Supreme Court laid down guidelines for arrests to prevent the misuse of criminal laws. The law should not be used as a tool to harass someone. Considering this, it is obvious that allowing criminal

prosecution to continue based on frivolous and false allegations would amount to an abuse of legal process and would also be detrimental to the concept of natural justice, which is perhaps the most significant form of justice enshrined in the Constitution.

In the guidelines, the court said that arrests should be an exception in cases where the punishment is less than seven years. The police must determine whether an arrest is necessary under Section 41 of the CrPC (Section 35 of the BNSS). Thus, routine arrests cannot be made merely because the power to arrest has been given to the police. The necessity must be justified.

It is well known that personal freedom is a major part of the Constitution. Unnecessary arrests hurt a person's reputation and would be detrimental to personal liberty.

Constitutionality of arrest, detention

Article 22 protects against arrest and detention to ensure freedom of person, and hence has a direct link with the concept of personal liberty under Article

21. Article 22 provides important procedural safeguards for a person who is arrested, including the right to be informed and the right to consult and be defended by his lawyer as soon as possible, and finally the right to be presented before the nearest magistrate within 24 hours.

The Article also deals with the concept of preventive detention where these procedural safeguards do not apply. The definition of preventive detention in India is inspired by a British law, Regulation 14-B of the Defence of the Realm Act, 1914, which says that all detentions that are not punitive may be considered preventive. The detention may continue for three months, and if the period expires, an Advisory Board shall permit the extension of the period.

Thus, Article 22 protects a person from being arrested or detained, signifying the protection of his liberty against any arbitrary action by the state. However, the provision of arrest and detention exemplifies the exercise of the state's authority.

Personal liberty in the Constitution is founded in the principle of natural justice, which is enshrined in the entire constitutional scheme. Further, the Golden Triangle of India's Constitution as explained by the Supreme Court in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) suggests that Article 21 is related to Articles 14 and 19. Of the two, Article 14 is an antithesis to arbitrariness and the substantive natural justice emanates from it, whereas Article 19(1) incorporates procedural natural justice. Therefore, any arbitrary exercise of the power of arrest or detention would amount to a violation of the Golden Triangle. This has been the reason why the framers of the Constitution ensured that a delicate balance between authority and liberty is maintained and vibrant democracy in India is sustained.

(C.B.P. Srivastava is president, Centre for Applied Research in Governance, Delhi)

THE GIST

Constitutional and legal safeguards require the police to record the time of arrest and produce the arrested person before a magistrate within 24 hours.

Supreme Court guidelines, including those in *Armesh Kumar*, stress that arrest should not be routine and must be justified by the necessity of the case.

Context [GS-II: Fundamental Rights | Criminal Justice]

The Supreme Court has reinforced that the power to arrest is not absolute. It must be exercised according to constitutional and statutory safeguards protecting personal liberty, dignity and due process. The framework primarily rests on Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution, read with the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

1. Constitutional safeguards

- **Article 21**: No person can be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to a fair, just and lawful procedure.
- **Article 22(1)**: An arrested person must be informed of the grounds of arrest and has the right to consult and be defended by a legal practitioner of choice. 🧑
- **Article 22(2)**: The arrested person must be produced before the nearest Magistrate within 24 hours of arrest, excluding travel time; further detention requires judicial authority. 🧑

2. Important BNSS provisions

- **Section 35**: Police may arrest without warrant in specified circumstances, but the power is subject to the statutory conditions of necessity and justification.
- **Section 47**: Requires the arrested person to be informed of the full particulars of the offence and other grounds of arrest, giving effect to the constitutional safeguard under Article 22(1).
- **Section 58**: A person arrested without warrant cannot ordinarily be detained by police for more than 24 hours without a Magistrate's special order.
- **Section 187**: Where investigation cannot be completed within 24 hours, the accused must be produced before a Magistrate, who decides whether further police or judicial custody/remand is justified.

3. Supreme Court: Vihaan Kumar v. State of Haryana (2025)

- The Court held that communicating the grounds of arrest is a mandatory constitutional requirement, not a mere procedural formality.
- The grounds must be communicated effectively and in a manner the arrested person can understand, enabling him to challenge the arrest and seek legal remedies.

4. Other important judicial safeguards

- **D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal (1997)**: Established safeguards against custodial violence and arbitrary arrest, including arrest documentation, informing relatives and medical examination.
- **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar (2014)**: Arrest should not be routine; police must satisfy the statutory necessity conditions and Magistrates must independently scrutinise the need for detention.
- **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**: Expanded Article 21 by requiring procedure affecting personal liberty to be fair, just and reasonable.

Seven-judge Bench to hear case concerning legislative privileges from October 6

Several petitions in the Supreme Court have raised substantial questions of law as to whether legislative privileges can override the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression

The Hindu Bureau
NEW DELHI

The Supreme Court has said a seven-judge Constitution Bench would commence hearing from October 6 a series of long-pending petitions questioning whether legislative privileges can override citizens' fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression.

A three-judge Bench headed by Chief Justice of India Surya Kant passed the order in a case dating back to April 2003. *The Hindu* had published an editorial criticising then Tamil Nadu Chief Minister Jayalalithaa. The Tamil Nadu Assembly Speaker at the time had passed a resolution in the House accusing the daily of having "distorted the proceedings of the Assembly, commented contrary to the events in the Assembly".

The resolution said the comments made in the editorial "amount to breach of privilege of the entire House" under Article 194 of the Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech and immunities to



A five-judge Bench had referred the case to a seven-judge Bench for an authoritative settlement of the law. PTI

Members of Legislative Assemblies. The Tamil Nadu Assembly had passed a resolution to arrest five senior journalists of *The Hindu*. Shortly after the resolution, the police sought to arrest the journalists. However, the journalists, including N. Ravi, the then Editor of *The Hindu*, approached the top court and won a stay on any coercive action against them.

When the case came up for hearing, senior advocate Harish Salve, appearing for the newspaper, argued against the invocation of Article 194(3) to choke Press freedom enshrined under Article 19(1) (a) of the Constitution. The

top court also examined the larger legal issue whether a critical speech or publication would constitute a breach of legislative privilege.

Legal tussle

However, a Division Bench of Justices Y.K. Sabharwal and B.N. Krishna had, on December 8, 2003, referred the tussle between legislative privilege and free speech to a five-judge Constitution Bench.

The Bench had noted that the petitions and intervening applications, by journalists and the Press Council of India, raised "substantial questions of law as to the interpretation of Articles 194(3), 19 and

the interplay between these two Articles and Article 21 of the Constitution".

On December 8, 2004, the five-judge Bench heard Mr. Salve's submission that the top court had given contradictory opinions in a 1959 judgment in *Pandit M.S.M. Sharma versus Shri Krishna Sharma* and a Presidential Reference of 1964 about the interplay between free speech and the scope of legislative privileges.

The five-judge Bench had further referred the case to a seven-judge Bench for an authoritative settlement of the law.

On October 12, 2023, the Union government was impleaded as a party by a seven-judge Bench, headed by then Chief Justice of India D.Y. Chandrachud, in which the current CJI, Justice Kant, was a member. The Attorney General of India was requested to assist the top court in the case.

The petitions came up again on February 2, 2024 to hear a procedural application for change of advocate-on-record. The case then came up before CJI Kant, on August 12, 2026.

Context [GS-II: Constitutional Governance & Fundamental Rights]

The Supreme Court will begin hearing from 6 October 2026 through a seven-judge Constitution Bench a long-pending constitutional question: Can legislative privilege under Article 194 override the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a)? The case arises from the 2003 Tamil Nadu Assembly action against The Hindu journalists.

1. Constitutional provisions involved

- * **Article 19(1)(a)**: Guarantees freedom of speech and expression, forming the constitutional basis of press freedom.
- * **Article 194**: Provides powers, privileges and immunities of State Legislatures, their members and committees.
- * **Article 194(3)**: Deals with privileges other than those specifically provided in the Constitution.
- * **Article 21**: Becomes relevant where exercise of legislative privilege affects a person's life or personal liberty.

2. How did the dispute arise?

In 2003, The Hindu published an editorial critical of the then Tamil Nadu Government and Assembly proceedings. The Assembly treated the publication as a breach of privilege and passed a resolution seeking the arrest of senior journalists. The journalists approached the Supreme Court, arguing that legislative privilege could not be used to suppress freedom of speech and press freedom. The Supreme Court stayed the arrests.

3. Why was it referred to seven judges?

The difficulty arises from the relationship between earlier Supreme Court decisions:

- * **M.S.M. Sharma v. Sri Krishna Sinha (1959)** — Searchlight case: Examined the conflict between legislative privilege and press freedom.
- * **Special Reference No. 1 of 1964** — Keshav Singh case: Considered the extent of legislative privilege and judicial scrutiny over its exercise.