



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam

Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

MOCK TEST-3

MAINS EXAMINATION-TRANSLATION AND ESSAY WRITING

PAPER-III

TIME: 2:00 HRS

MARKS:70

Instruction:

- 1) Attempt all the questions compulsorily
- 2) All questions carry Equal Marks
- 3) Write the answers as orders of the questions
- 4) Strict your answer to the Question only
- 5) Write an Essay in 800-1000 words in words only

QUESTION AND KEY PAPER

1. Translate the following from English to Telugu

(1*15=15 Marks)

A bench of **Justice JK Maheshwari and Justice Sanjay Karol** quashed an FIR filed by the father of a divorced woman seeking the recovery of her 'stridhan'—gifts and ornaments given at the time of marriage—from her former in-laws.

"We find that the law provides for a situation where a woman may, in law, grant a person of her choosing the authority to do any act which she may herself execute. Section 5 of the Power of Attorney Act, 1882, provides as under:- "5. Power-of-attorney of married women.—A married woman, of full age, shall, by virtue of this Act, have power, as if she were unmarried, by a non-testamentary instrument, to appoint an attorney on her behalf, for the purpose of executing any non testamentary instrument or doing any other act which she might herself execute or do; and the provisions of this Act, relating to instruments creating powers-of-attorney shall apply thereto. This section applies only to instruments executed after this Act comes into force." It cannot be disputed that no such power of attorney, within the meaning of this Act, stood

executed by the complainant's daughter, in favour of her father, respondent No.2", the Court observed.

The Court further observed that the FIR, filed more than five years after the woman's divorce and three years after her remarriage, lacked merit.

The complainant filed the complaint against his daughter's former in-laws, accusing them of withholding her 'stridhan'—which included 40 Kasula gold and other articles given at the time of her marriage in 1999. The daughter had divorced her husband in 2016 and remarried in the United States in 2018.

Despite the passage of time and the settlement of all marital issues through a Separation Agreement at the time of the divorce, the father filed the FIR in January 2021, alleging that the in-laws had not returned the 'stridhan.'

A charge sheet was filed for offence under Section 406 of the IPC for criminal breach of trust and under Section 6 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. The former in-laws approached the Telangana High Court to quash the proceedings. The High Court, on December 22, 2022, refused to quash the FIR, finding the allegations in the charge sheet to be prima facie triable. Thus, the accused filed the present appeal before the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court considered whether the father had any locus standi to file the FIR. The Court emphasized the established legal principle that 'stridhan' is the exclusive property of the woman.

The Court cited several precedents, including *Pratibha Rani v. Suraj Kumar* and *Rashmi Rashmi Kumar v. Mahesh Kumar Bhada*, *Maya Gopinathan v. Anoop SB* and *Mala Kar v. State Of Uttarakhand* which affirm that a woman has absolute ownership over her 'stridhan,' and neither her husband nor any other relative can claim any rights over it. The Court further noted that under Section 14 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, a Hindu female is the absolute owner of her property, which includes 'stridhan.'

వివాహ సమయంలో ఇచ్చిన బహుమతులు, ఆభరణాలను తన మాజీ అత్తమామల నుంచి రికవరీ చేయాలని కోరుతూ విడాకులు తీసుకున్న మహిళ తండ్రి దాఖలు చేసిన ఎఫ్ఐఆర్ను **జస్టిస్ జేకే మహేశ్వరి, జస్టిస్ సంజయ్ కరోల్** కూడిన ధర్మాసనం కొట్టివేసింది.

"ఒక మహిళ చట్టప్రకారం తనకు నచ్చిన వ్యక్తికి తాను చేయగలిగిన ఏ పనినైనా చేసే అధికారాన్ని కల్పించే పరిస్థితిని చట్టం కల్పిస్తుందని మేము కనుగొన్నాము. పవర్ ఆఫ్ అటార్నీ చట్టం, 1882లోని సెక్షన్ 5 ఈ క్రింది విధంగా పేర్కొంది:- "5. వివాహిత స్త్రీలకు పవర్ ఆఫ్ అటార్నీ: ఈ చట్టం ద్వారా వివాహిత స్త్రీ, ఈ చట్టం ద్వారా, ఆమె అవివాహితురాలి వలె, ఆమె తరపున ఒక న్యాయవాదిని నియమించడానికి, ఏదైనా రుజువు కాని పరికరాన్ని అమలు చేయడానికి లేదా ఆమె స్వయంగా అమలు చేయగల లేదా చేయగలిగే ఏదైనా ఇతర చర్యను చేయడానికి అధికారం కలిగి ఉంటుంది; మరియు



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam

Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

అటార్నీ అధికారాలను సృష్టించే సాధనాలకు సంబంధించిన ఈ చట్టంలోని నిబంధనలు దీనికి వర్తించాయి. ఈ చట్టం అమల్లోకి వచ్చిన తర్వాత అమలు చేసే పరికరాలకు మాత్రమే ఈ సెక్షన్ వర్తిస్తుంది. ఈ చట్టం యొక్క అర్థంలో అటువంటి ఏ అధికారాన్నీ ఫిర్యాదుదారుని కుమార్తె తన తండ్రి, ప్రతివాది నెం.2 కు అనుకూలంగా అమలు చేయలేదని సుప్రీంకోర్టు వ్యాఖ్యానించింది.

మహిళ విడాకులు తీసుకున్న ఐదేళ్ల తర్వాత, పునర్వివాహం చేసుకున్న మూడేళ్ల తర్వాత దాఖలు చేసిన ఎఫ్ఐఆర్లో మెరిట్ లేదని హైకోర్టు అభిప్రాయపడింది.

1999లో పెళ్లి సమయంలో ఇచ్చిన 40 కాసుల బంగారం, ఇతర వస్తువులతో సహా తన 'స్ట్రీడాన్'ను నిలిపివేశారని ఆరోపిస్తూ తన కుమార్తె మాజీ అత్తమామలపై ఫిర్యాదు చేశాడు. కూతురు 2016లో భర్తకు విడాకులు ఇచ్చి 2018లో అమెరికాలో రెండో వివాహం చేసుకుంది.

విడాకుల సమయంలో సెపరేషన్ అగ్రిమెంట్ ద్వారా వైవాహిక సమస్యలన్నీ పరిష్కారమైనప్పటికీ, అత్తమామలు 'స్ట్రీడాన్'ను తిరిగి ఇవ్వలేదని ఆరోపిస్తూ తండ్రి 2021 జనవరిలో ఎఫ్ఐఆర్ దాఖలు చేశారు.

ఐపీసీ సెక్షన్ 406 కింద, వరకట్న నిషేధ చట్టం 1961లోని సెక్షన్ 6 కింద ఛార్జీషీట్ దాఖలు చేశారు. దీంతో విచారణను రద్దు చేయాలంటూ మాజీ అత్తమామలు తెలంగాణ హైకోర్టును ఆశ్రయించారు. ఛార్జీషీటులోని ఆరోపణలు ప్రాథమికంగా సహేతుకమైనవని భావించిన హైకోర్టు 2022 డిసెంబర్ 22న ఎఫ్ఐఆర్ను రద్దు చేయడానికి నిరాకరించింది. దీంతో నిందితులు సుప్రీంకోర్టులో అప్పీల్ దాఖలు చేశారు.

ఎఫ్ఐఆర్ దాఖలు చేసే హక్కు తండ్రికి ఉందా అని సుప్రీంకోర్టు పరిశీలించింది. 'స్త్రీధన్' అనేది స్త్రీ యొక్క ప్రత్యేక ఆస్తి అనే స్థాపిత న్యాయ సూత్రాన్ని సుప్రీంకోర్టు నొక్కి చెప్పింది.

ప్రతిభారాణి వర్సెస్ సూరజ్ కుమార్, రమ్మీ రమ్మీ కుమార్ వర్సెస్ మహేష్ కుమార్ భడా, మాయ గోపీనాథన్ వర్సెస్ అనూప్ ఎస్సీ, మాలా కార్ వర్సెస్ ఫ్లేట్ ఆఫ్ ఉత్తరాఖండ్ సహా అనేక ఉదాహరణలను సుప్రీంకోర్టు ఉదహరించింది. హిందూ వారసత్వ చట్టం 1956లోని సెక్షన్ 14 ప్రకారం హిందూ మహిళ తన ఆస్తికి సంపూర్ణ యజమాని అని, ఇందులో 'సర్దీదాన్' కూడా ఉందని సుప్రీంకోర్టు పేర్కొంది.

2. Translate the following Telugu to English

(1*15=15Marks)

భారత శిక్షాస్మృతి (ఐపిసీ) సెక్షన్ 307 కింద హత్యాయత్నం నేరం కింద అభియోగాలు మోపబడిన నిందితుడిని సుప్రీంకోర్టు నిర్దోషిగా ప్రకటించింది, ఎందుకంటే నేరం యొక్క ఉద్దేశం నిరూపించబడలేదు మరియు సాక్షులలో వ్యత్యాసాలు ఉన్నాయి.

'ఐపీసీ సెక్షన్ 307 కింద శిక్షను సమర్థించడం సమర్థనీయం' అని జస్టిస్ సూర్యకాంత్, జస్టిస్ దీపాంకర్ దత్తా, జస్టిస్ ఉజ్జల్ భుయాన్ లతో కూడిన ధర్మాసనం పేర్కొంది.

బాధితులపై కత్తులు, లారీలతో దాడి చేశారని, ఫలితంగా బాధితులకు గాయాలయ్యాయని పిటిషనర్లు/నిందితులపై అభియోగాలు మోపిన కేసు ఇది. వినికిడి సాక్ష్యాల ఆధారంగా ఎఫ్ఐఆర్ నమోదు చేయబడింది మరియు గాయపడిన బాధితురాలి వాంగ్మూలాలు / ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ సాక్షులలో అనేక వ్యత్యాసాలు సంభవించాయి.

సాక్షుల వాంగ్మూలాల్లో నిజానిజాలను అనుమానించిన కోర్టు, సంఘటనల క్రమానికి సంబంధించి ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ సాక్షులు సమర్పించిన సాక్ష్యాలలో వ్యత్యాసాల కారణంగా అటువంటి సాక్ష్యాలపై ఆధారపడటానికి నిరాకరించింది.

సాధారణంగా నేరానికి సంబంధించిన విషయాల్లో సాక్షి ఇచ్చిన లెక్కల్లో వ్యత్యాసాలు ఉంటాయని, ముఖ్యంగా సంఘటన జరిగిన తేదీకి, వాంగ్మూలం ఇచ్చిన సమయానికి మధ్య స్పష్టమైన వ్యత్యాసం ఉన్నప్పుడు. ఏదేమైనా, వ్యత్యాసాలు ఒక సాక్షి యొక్క వాస్తవికతపై తీవ్రమైన సందేహాన్ని కలిగించే విధంగా ఉంటే, కోర్టు అటువంటి సాక్ష్యాలపై ఆధారపడటానికి నిరాకరించవచ్చు. ముఖ్యంగా జరిగిన సంఘటనల క్రమానికి సంబంధించి ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ సాక్షులు సమర్పించిన సాక్ష్యాలలో వ్యత్యాసాలు ఉన్నప్పుడు ఇది నిజం. ఇటువంటి మౌఖిక సాక్ష్యాలు అమాయక వ్యక్తులను తప్పుగా ఇరికించేందుకు మొగ్గు చూపినప్పుడు న్యాయస్థానాలు మరింత జాగ్రత్త మరియు మనస్సాక్షిని ఉపయోగించాలి." అని జస్టిస్ సూర్యకాంత్ రాసిన తీర్పులో పేర్కొన్నారు. ఐపీసీ సెక్షన్ 307 కింద తమకు విధించిన శిక్షను సమర్థించుకోవడానికి పిటిషనర్లకు ఎలాంటి ఉద్దేశం లేనందున ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ కేసును కోర్టు అంగీకరించలేదు.

గాయపడిన సాక్షులు ఇమ్రాన్, మాధు తమ క్రాస్ ఎగ్జామినేషన్లో తమకు, నిందితులకు మధ్య ఎలాంటి శత్రుత్వం, ద్వేషం లేదని స్పష్టంగా చెప్పారు. ఇది యాదృచ్ఛిక సంఘటన అని ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ కేసు కూడా కాదు. నిందితులు, బాధితులు ఒకరికొకరు పరిచయస్థులేనని, ఏదో రకమైన అనుబంధం ఉందని తెలుస్తోంది. కంటికి కనిపించే దానికంటే ఎక్కువే ఉంది. ప్రాసిక్యూషన్ సమర్పించిన మరియు గ్రహించిన కథనంతో మాకు పూర్తిగా నమ్మకం లేదు" అని కోర్టు వ్యాఖ్యానించింది. దీని ప్రకారం అప్పీలుకు అనుమతి ఇచ్చి, పిటిషనర్లను దోషులుగా నిర్ధారిస్తూ హైకోర్టు ఇచ్చిన తీర్పును కొట్టివేసింది.

The Supreme Court acquitted the accused who was charged with an offence of attempt to murder under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code ("IPC") since the intention for the crime wasn't established and there were discrepancies in the testimonies.

"it would be apposite to recount the settled proposition of law that a conviction under Section 307 of the IPC may be justified only if the accused in question possessed intent coupled with some overt act in aid of its execution.", the bench comprising **Justices Surya Kant, Dipankar Datta, and Ujjal Bhuyan** said.

It was a case where the allegation labeled against the appellants/accused was that they attacked the victims with knives and lathis which resulted in injury being suffered by the victims. The FIR was registered based on the hearsay evidence, and several discrepancies occurred in the injured victim's statements/prosecution witnesses.



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam

Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

The Court doubted the veracity of the witness testimonies and declined to rely on such evidence consequent to the variations in the evidence tendered by prosecution witnesses regarding the sequence of events as they occurred.

“Usually in matters involving criminality, discrepancies are bound to be there in the account given by a witness, especially when there is a conspicuous disparity between the date of the incident and the time of deposition. However, if the discrepancies are such that they create serious doubt on the veracity of a witness, then the Court may deduce and decline to rely on such evidence. This is especially true when there are variations in the evidence tendered by prosecution witnesses regarding the sequence of events as they have occurred. Courts must exercise all the more care and conscientiousness when such oral evidence may lean towards falsely implicating innocent persons.”, the judgment authored by **Justice Surya Kant** said. The Court was not convinced by the case of the prosecution as there was no motive attributed to the Appellants, in order to justify their conviction under Section 307 of the IPC.

“Both the injured witnesses, Imran and Mathu, during their cross-examination, clearly explicated that there was no enmity or ill will between them and the accused persons. It is not even the prosecution's case that this was a chance occurrence. It seems that the accused and the alleged victims were familiar with each other and had some kind of association. There is thus more to this than meets the eye, and we are not entirely convinced of the narrative presented and perceived by the prosecution.”, the court observed.

Accordingly, the appeal was allowed and the impugned decision of the High Court convicting the appellants was set aside.

3. write an essay on the following

(2*20=40 Marks)

1.Examine the rules of admissibility of electronic evidence under the Indian Evidence Act. How has the rise of digital technology affected the handling and admissibility of electronic records in court?

Introduction

The advent of digital technology has profoundly transformed various facets of modern life, including the legal field. In particular, the handling and admissibility of electronic evidence have become crucial aspects of contemporary judicial proceedings. This essay examines the rules of admissibility of electronic evidence under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, and explores how the rise of digital technology has affected the handling and admissibility of electronic records in court.

Legal Framework for Electronic Evidence

The Indian Evidence Act, 1872, primarily governs the admissibility of evidence in Indian courts. Traditionally, it focused on physical forms of evidence such as documents, oral testimony, and material objects. However, with the increasing reliance on digital technology, amendments and new provisions have been introduced to address electronic evidence.

1. Section 65A and 65B of the Indian Evidence Act:

The primary provisions for the admissibility of electronic evidence are contained in Sections 65A and 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, introduced by the Information Technology Act, 2000. Section 65A deals with the special provisions related to electronic records, while Section 65B provides for the conditions under which electronic records can be admissible in court.

- **Section 65A:** This section stipulates that electronic records are considered to be evidence in the same manner as traditional documents if they comply with the provisions laid out in Section 65B.
- **Section 65B:** This section outlines the specific conditions for the admissibility of electronic records. It requires that:
 - The electronic record must be produced from a computer or similar device.
 - The device must be in regular use and maintained in a proper manner.
 - The electronic record must be accompanied by a certificate, as provided under Section 65B(2), attesting to its authenticity and accuracy. This certificate must be signed by a responsible person.

2. Certificate Under Section 65B(4):



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam

Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

Section 65B(4) requires a certificate to be produced along with electronic records, certifying the manner in which the record was produced, and that it was stored and maintained properly. This certificate serves as evidence of the authenticity and integrity of the electronic record.

Impact of Digital Technology on Admissibility

The rise of digital technology has introduced new challenges and considerations for the admissibility of electronic evidence in court. Several factors highlight the impact of digital technology on this process:

1. Volume and Variety of Electronic Records:

Digital technology has led to an exponential increase in the volume and variety of electronic records. From emails and text messages to social media posts and cloud storage, the range of electronic evidence has expanded significantly. This variety poses challenges in terms of standardization and consistency in the handling and admissibility of such records.

2. Authenticity and Integrity:

Ensuring the authenticity and integrity of electronic evidence is crucial. Unlike physical documents, electronic records can be easily altered or manipulated. Courts have had to grapple with issues related to the verification of electronic evidence. The requirement for a certificate under Section 65B(4) is designed to address these concerns, but challenges remain in verifying the authenticity of digital records and detecting tampering.

3. Chain of Custody:

Maintaining a proper chain of custody is essential for the admissibility of electronic evidence. Digital records can be copied, modified, or transferred easily, raising concerns about the continuity and integrity of evidence. Courts require that electronic

evidence be handled and stored in a manner that preserves its original state and ensures that it is not tampered with.

4. Expert Testimony and Technical Challenges:

The complexity of digital technology often necessitates expert testimony to interpret and validate electronic evidence. Experts may be required to testify about the functioning of devices, data retrieval processes, and the reliability of electronic records. This reliance on technical expertise can add layers of complexity to the judicial process.

5. Legal Reforms and Judicial Interpretation:

The legal framework governing electronic evidence has evolved over time to address emerging technological advancements. Courts have interpreted and applied provisions related to electronic evidence in various judgments, adapting to new challenges. Landmark cases such as *Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer* (2014) have clarified the requirements for admissibility and highlighted the importance of adhering to procedural safeguards.

Case Studies and Jurisprudence

Several significant cases illustrate the impact of digital technology on the handling and admissibility of electronic evidence:

- **Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer (2014):** This Supreme Court case emphasized the importance of a certificate under Section 65B for the admissibility of electronic records. The court ruled that without the requisite certificate, electronic evidence could not be admitted, highlighting the need for adherence to statutory requirements.
- **State of Maharashtra v. Praful B. Desai (2003):** The Supreme Court held that electronic records, including video recordings, could be admissible as evidence under Section 65A and 65B, provided they met the conditions outlined in the Act. This case affirmed the legitimacy of electronic evidence in legal proceedings.

Conclusion

The rise of digital technology has had a profound impact on the handling and admissibility of electronic evidence under the Indian Evidence Act. While the



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

introduction of Sections 65A and 65B has provided a framework for dealing with electronic records, challenges related to authenticity, integrity, and technical complexity persist. The judiciary's evolving interpretation and application of these provisions reflect the ongoing efforts to adapt to technological advancements and ensure the effective administration of justice. As technology continues to evolve, it is likely that further legal reforms and judicial innovations will be necessary to address emerging issues and ensure the reliable admissibility of electronic evidence in court.

2. Examine the impact of the doctrine of precedent on judicial independence. To what extent does adherence to precedents constrain judicial creativity and discretion? Illustrate your answer with judicial decisions where adherence to precedent has significantly impacted legal development

Introduction

The doctrine of precedent, or *stare decisis*, is a cornerstone of common law systems, ensuring consistency and predictability in legal decisions. This principle mandates that courts follow established rulings from previous cases when making judgments on similar issues. While adherence to precedent promotes stability in the law, it also raises important questions about its impact on judicial independence. Specifically, the doctrine can constrain judicial creativity and discretion, potentially limiting a judge's ability to adapt the law to evolving societal needs. This essay examines the relationship between the doctrine of precedent and judicial independence, exploring how adherence to precedent influences judicial creativity and discretion, and illustrates these points with significant judicial decisions.

Doctrine of Precedent and Judicial Independence

1. Doctrine of Precedent:

The doctrine of precedent operates on the principle that courts should adhere to established legal principles from previous judgments to ensure consistency in the law.

When a higher court sets a precedent, lower courts are bound to follow it in subsequent cases involving similar facts and legal issues. This adherence ensures that similar cases are treated similarly, providing predictability and stability in the legal system.

2. **Judicial Independence:**

Judicial independence refers to the freedom of judges to make decisions based on their understanding of the law and the facts, without undue influence from external pressures or personal biases. It is a fundamental aspect of a fair and impartial judiciary. However, the doctrine of precedent can sometimes constrain judicial independence by requiring judges to follow prior rulings even when they might disagree with them or believe them to be outdated.

Impact of Adherence to Precedent on Judicial Creativity and Discretion

1. **Constraints on Judicial Creativity:**

Adherence to precedent can limit judicial creativity by compelling judges to follow established rulings, even when they believe that the law should evolve or change. This constraint can be particularly significant in cases where precedents may no longer align with contemporary values or societal developments. Judges are expected to interpret and apply the law based on previous decisions, which may inhibit their ability to innovate or adapt the law to new circumstances.

- **Example: *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)*:** In this landmark case, the Supreme Court of India established the Basic Structure Doctrine, which holds that certain fundamental features of the Constitution cannot be altered by amendments. This decision was a significant departure from previous precedents and showcased the Court's willingness to innovate. However, the adherence to established principles also meant that the Court had to navigate complex legal terrain to ensure that the new doctrine was consistent with existing constitutional norms.

2. **Balancing Stability and Innovation:**

While adherence to precedent can constrain judicial creativity, it also plays a crucial role in maintaining stability and predictability in the legal system. The doctrine ensures that legal principles are applied consistently, which is essential for upholding the rule of law. However, judicial discretion is not entirely eliminated. Courts have the



RK JUDICIAL ACADEMY

Institute for Judicial Services Exam Hyderabad

www.rkjudicialacademy.com | Mob:9052439463 | rkjudicialacademy@gmail.com

flexibility to distinguish cases based on factual differences or to overturn precedents when they are no longer applicable.

- **Example: *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)*:** In this seminal case, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the precedent set by *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), which had upheld the constitutionality of racial segregation under the doctrine of “separate but equal.” The decision in *Brown* represented a significant shift in the legal landscape, demonstrating how courts can exercise discretion to correct past injustices and adapt the law to evolving social values.

3. Judicial Discretion and Interpretation:

Judges have the discretion to interpret precedents in light of new developments and changing societal norms. While they must respect established rulings, they also have the authority to apply precedents in ways that reflect contemporary values and circumstances. This interpretive discretion allows judges to adapt legal principles to new contexts while maintaining the core stability provided by the doctrine of precedent.

- **Example: *R v. R (1991)*:** In this case, the House of Lords (now the Supreme Court) revisited the precedent set in *R v. Clarence* (1888), which had held that marital rape was not a crime. The Court in *R v. R* recognized the need to update the legal understanding of consent within marriage, demonstrating how judicial interpretation can evolve while still respecting the foundational principles of the law.

Case Studies Illustrating the Impact of Precedent

1. Adherence to Precedent:

- **Example: *Donoghue v. Stevenson (1932)*:** The House of Lords established the modern law of negligence in this case, introducing the concept of a duty of care. The precedent set in *Donoghue v. Stevenson* has been followed

and applied in numerous subsequent cases, shaping the development of tort law. While this adherence to precedent has provided consistency, it has also required courts to balance established principles with evolving understandings of negligence.

2. Challenging Precedents:

- **Example: *Golan v. Holder* (2012):** The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Golan v. Holder* involved revisiting and overturning precedents related to copyright law. The Court upheld the constitutionality of the Copyright Term Extension Act, which had extended copyright protection beyond the previous limits. This decision demonstrated how adherence to precedent can be challenged to accommodate legislative changes and evolving views on intellectual property rights.

Conclusion

The doctrine of precedent plays a critical role in ensuring consistency and predictability in the legal system. However, it also impacts judicial independence by constraining judicial creativity and discretion. While adherence to precedent ensures stability, it can limit a judge's ability to innovate or adapt the law to new circumstances. Judicial discretion and interpretation allow for the evolution of legal principles within the framework of established precedents. Significant cases demonstrate both the constraints and the opportunities that adherence to precedent provides, highlighting the balance between maintaining stability and embracing necessary legal change. As society and technology continue to evolve, the judiciary must navigate this balance to uphold justice while respecting the foundational principles of the law.
