

NAME	COURT	CITATION	KEYWORDS
<b>Emperor v. Vishnu Krishna Puranik</b> (5/12/1912)	The Maharashtra High Court	(1913) 15 Bom LR 307	Test of obscenity; whether the language complained of is calculated to deprave or corrupt those whose minds are open to immoral influences; distinction between obscenity and primitive frankness of expression
<b>Emperor v. Rahimatalli Mahomedalli Mulla</b> (30/9/1919)	The Maharashtra High Court	(1920) 22 Bom LR 166	Pamphlet ridiculing the Head priest by using abusive and vulgar language; dissenting judgements.
<b>Sukanta Halder (in custody) v. The State</b> (20/7/1951)	The West Bengal High Court	AIR 1952 Cal 214	Scientific journal; correspondence from readers; neither the cause of literature nor of science was furthered by the expressions or pictorial representations.
<b>In Re: D. Pandurangan</b> (7/11/1952)	The Tamil Nadu High Court	AIR 1953 Mad 418	Printing and publishing of book with obscene content; no presumption against the keeper of a press.
<b>Krishna Sharma v. State</b> (23/9/1953)	The Saurashtra High Court (Gujarat)	AIR 1954 Saurashtra 2	Newspaper articles, scurrilous allegations
<b>M. Ramamurthy v. State of Mysore</b> (4/2/1954)	The Mysore High Court (Karnataka)	AIR 1954 Kant 164	Monthly journal attracting Sec 292; test is that of an 'ordinary

				young person’.
<b>State v. Thakur Prasad (14/5/1958)</b>	The Uttar Pradesh High Court	AIR 1959 All 49		Treatise on sexual intercourse; convicted of obscenity.
<b>C.T. Prim v. The State (29/4/1959)</b>	The West Bengal High Court	AIR 1961 Cal 177		Importing obscene books; when responsibility is enjoined by law, mere difficulty in carrying it out is no defence.
<b>Ranjit D. Udeshi v. State of Maharashtra (19/8/1964)</b>	Supreme Court	AIR 1965 SC 881		Sale of ‘Lady Chatterley’s Lover’ in Bombay; standards of obscenity – relative; sec 292 – reasonable restriction on constitutional freedoms
<b>Shri Chandrakant Kalyandas Kakodkar v. State of Maharashtra (25/8/1969)</b>	Supreme Court	AIR 1970 SC 1390		Short story depicting a young poet with three relationships; may have exhibited bad taste; not obscene.
<b>State of U.P. v. Kunji Lal (7/4/1970)</b>	The Uttar Pradesh High Court	AIR 1970 All 614		Books alleged to be obscene; pictures in them; conviction upheld.
<b>Durlab Singh v. State (16/9/1970)</b>	The Delhi High Court	1974 Cri LJ 1182		Newspaper article; might affect teenagers and persuade married women to act similarly.
<b>K. A. Abbas v. Union of India (24/9/1970)</b>	Supreme Court	AIR 1971 SC 481		Censorship; freedom of speech and expression; justified in the interests of society.

<b>Uttam Singh v. The State (Delhi Administration)</b> (21/3/1974)	Supreme Court	AIR 1974 SC 1230	Playing cards portraying obscene pictures of men and women in sexual postures.
<b>Virendra Bandhu v. State of Rajasthan</b> (2/11/1979)	The Rajasthan High Court	AIR 1980 Raj 241	Advertisements using scantily clad females; implementation of Indecent Representation of Women Prohibition Act and Cable Television Networks Regulation Act.
<b>Raj Kapoor v. Laxman</b> (14/12/1979)	Supreme Court	AIR 1980 SC 605	Complaint of obscenity against Raj Kapoor for 'Satyam Shivam Sundaram'; censor certificate granted; film cannot be proceeded against; protected by Sec 79 of IPC.
<b>Samaresh Bose v. Amal Mitra</b> (24/9/1985)	Supreme Court	AIR 1986 SC 967	Novel; distinction between vulgarity and obscenity; reliance on leading literary personage as evidence.
<b>Sada Nand v. State (Delhi Administration)</b> (20/3/1986)	The Delhi High Court	ILR 1986 Delhi 81	Pictures of nude women in a magazine; not obscene as they lack the potential to corrupt the readers.
<b>Akhila Publishers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka</b>	The Karnataka High Court	1987 (3) Kar LJ 378	Powers of Police to seize publications.

(18/12/1987)

**Dr. Promilla Kapur v. Yash Pal Bhasin**  
(22/2/1989)

The Delhi High Court 1989 Cri LJ 1241

Book based on study of call girls; vulgar language in some portions cannot be deemed to be obscene in the overall setting; falls under the exception to Sec 292.

**P. K. Somanath v. State of Kerala**  
(20/7/1989)

The Kerala High Court 1990 Cri LJ 542

Prosecution against film magazine; IPC and Indecent Representation of Women Act; pictures of models wearing dresses which were really an 'apology for a dress'.

**Smt. Nasreen Siddiqui v. State of U.P.**  
(18/10/1989)

The Uttar Pradesh High Court 1990 Cri LJ 1318

Modelling; obscene photographs; police can interfere as it was a cognizable offence.

**Mohan Gupta v. State (Delhi Administration)**  
(6/3/1990)

The Delhi High Court ILR 1990 Delhi 371

Obscenity is to be determined taking an overall view of the work and whether it affects a class, not an isolated class. Reference to sex *per se* is not obscene.

**B. Rosaiah v. State of Andhra Pradesh**  
(17/7/1990)

The Andhra Pradesh High Court 1991 Cri LJ 189

Petitioner part of audience of a blue film; doesn't amount to commission/abetment of distribution of

				obscene material.
<b>Neelam Singh</b>	<b>Mahajan v. Commissioner of Police (1/3/1996)</b>	The Delhi High Court	1996 Cri LJ 2725	Khushwant Singh's book; shocking/disgusting passages; doesn't amount to obscenity; freedom of speech and expression.
<b>Mahila Manch, Bangalore</b>	<b>Jagran v. State of Karnataka (19/11/1996)</b>	The Karnataka High Court	1999 (4) Kar LJ 295	Writ to ban the Miss World Pageant held in India; restrictions on sale of alcohol and assistance of the govt., reversed by the SC.
<b>Amitabh Bachchan Corp. Ltd.</b>	<b>v. Mahila Jagran Manch (20/1/1997)</b>	Supreme Court	(1997) 7 SCC 91	Miss World Pageant held in Bangalore; a section of people agitating is not reason enough to put restrictions on an international event.
<b>G. Jairaj v. State of Karnataka</b>	<b>(25/7/1997)</b>	The Karnataka High Court	ILR 1997 Kar 2227	Petition to ban the book "Mahachaitra"; scandalous and mischievous references about historical characters; balance between freedom of speech and expression and public decency and morality.
<b>Chandra Rajakumari v. Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad</b>		The Andhra Pradesh High Court	1998 (1) ALD 810	Beauty pageants; unconstitutional and serve to introduce

<b>(27/10/1997)</b>			women to flesh trade.
<b>Chairman and Managing Director, Hindustan Latex Ltd. v. State of Kerala</b> <b>(7/1/1999)</b>	The Kerala High Court	1999 Cri LJ 808	Prosecution for obscene advertisement; Prior to prosecution, ad withdrawn and apologies made; prosecution quashed.
<b>Jagdish Chavla v. State of Rajasthan</b> <b>(25/2/1999)</b>	The Rajasthan High Court	1999 Cri LJ 2562	Without proving the purpose of possession (i.e. either sale or letting for hire), a man cannot be convicted.
<b>Peripogu Manohar v. State of A.P. rep. by Public Prosecutor</b> <b>(19/2/2002)</b>	The Andhra Pradesh High Court	2002 Cri LJ 3216	Certain scenes of a film to be excluded by censor certificate; scenes re-inserted when the film was shown; the operator prosecuted.
<b>Ramakrishnan v. State of Kerala</b> <b>(25/6/2002)</b>	The Kerala High Court	MANU/KE/0302/2002	Seize of certain objectionable reels of film; censor board could not certify in the absence of the full film
<b>Mamta Kulkarni v. Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate</b> <b>(17/11/2003)</b>	The Maharashtra High Court	2004 (2) Mh LJ 179	Picture in Stardust magazine; obscenity is a relative term; voluntarily exposed himself to the picture, not compelled.
<b>Abhik Sarkar v. State</b> <b>(17/3/2004)</b>	The West Bengal High Court	2004 Cri LJ 2937	Photograph in newspaper; supervisory jurisdiction of Court.
<b>N. Lakshminarayana</b>	The Karnataka High Court	ILR 2005 Kar 4843	Licensing authority

<b>Achar v. The District Magistrate</b> (17/12/2004)	Court		does not have jurisdiction to suspend or revoke license during the pendency of the proceedings, i.e. before conviction.
<b>Avnish Bajaj v. State (N.C.T.) of Delhi</b> (21/12/2004)	The Delhi High Court	116 (2005) DLT 427	Bail application; only crime -not an alacritous response; bail granted.
<b>Ms. A. Arulmozhi v. The Govt. of India</b> (5/8/2005)	The Tamil Nadu High Court	(2005) 3 MLJ 497	Tamil film; censor board; obscene sequences; innuendos and certain disturbing aspects.
<b>Sujato Bhadra v. State of West Bengal</b> (22/9/2005)	The West Bengal High Court	(2005) 3 CAL LT 436 (HC)	Forfeiture of 'Dwikhandita'; deliberate and malicious; outrage of religious feelings.
<b>Pratibha Naitthani v. Union of India</b> (21/12/2005)	The Maharashtra High Court	AIR 2006 Bom 259	Cable channels prohibited from showing 'A' rated films and ads; not violative of fundamental rights of adults as they can view such films in cinema halls.
<b>Babban Prasad Mishra v. P. S. Diwan</b> (13/2/2006)	The Chattisgarh High Court	2006 Cri LJ 3263	Newspaper advertisement; indecent representation of women.
<b>Kumarbhai Laljibhai Malhotra v. State of</b>	The Gujarat High Court	MANU/GJ/8583/2006	Revocation of arms license on prosecution

<b>Gujarat through Home Secretary (4/8/2006)</b>				for obscenity; charge does not reflect criminal background.
<b>Ajay Goswami v. Union of India (12/12/2006)</b>	Supreme Court	AIR 2007 SC 493		Fundamental freedom of speech and expression of press; protecting minors from its abuse and harmful effects.
<b>Sangharaj Damodar Rupawate, Anand Patwardhan and Kunda, Pramila v. Nitin Gadre, the State of Maharashtra and Manisha Mhaikar (26/4/2007)</b>	The Maharashtra High Court	MANU/MH/0813/2007		Forfeiture of every copy of a book; even a reader can challenge an order of forfeiture.
<b>Mr. R. Basu v. N.C.T. of Delhi (4/6/2007)</b>	The Delhi High Court	2007 Cri LJ 4254		Obscene films; no declaration of promise to abide by the programming code.
<b>Vinay Mohan Sharma v. Delhi Administration (5/11/2007)</b>	The Delhi High Court	2008 Cri LJ 1672		Magazine; repetitive photographs of nude women; without literary content or backdrop.
<b>Sopan s/o Vithal Shinde v. The State of Maharashtra (27/2/2008)</b>	The Maharashtra High Court	MANU/MH/0184/2008		Letter alleging promiscuity and adulterous nature of wife; not depraving or corrupting the person reading it.
<b>Sri Deepankar Chowdari v. State of</b>	The Karnataka High Court	2008 Cri LJ 3408		Watching an 'obscene' film at home is not



<b>Karnataka</b> <b>(31/3/2008)</b>				violative of law.
<b>Vishesh Verma v. State of Bihar</b> <b>(9/4/2008)</b>	The Bihar High Court	2008 (56) BLJR 1773		TV serial; actor resembled former Chief Minister; serial made to destabilize government; held to be legitimate creation.
<b>Shilpa Shetty and Reema Sen v. T. Dakshinamurthy</b> <b>(23/4/2008)</b>	The Tamil Nadu High Court	MANU/TN/0732/2008		Obscene photographs of Shilpa Shetty; conviction quashed as she hadn't published.
<b>Maqbool Fida Hussain v. Raj Kumar Pandey</b> <b>(8/5/2008)</b>	The Delhi High Court	2008 Cri LJ 4107		Nude painting by M.F. Hussain; nothing in the painting that is lascivious or appealing to prurient interests.
<b>Abdul Rasheed v. State of Kerala</b> <b>(21/5/2008)</b>	The Kerala High Court	2008 Cri LJ 3480		Presumption in certain cases that obscene material was for publication/distribution
<b>Nadeem v. The State (Govt of NCT of Delhi)</b> <b>(13/10/2009)</b>	The Delhi High Court	MANU/DE/2740/2009		Prosecution for obscenity (along with rape) for showing prosecutrix an obscene book.
<b>Devidas Ramchandra Tuljapurkar v. The State of Maharashtra, Vasant Dattatraya Gujjar and Dhananjay Dadasaheb Kulkarni</b> <b>(20/1/2010)</b>	The Maharashtra High Court	(2010) 112 Bom LR 535		Obscene poem on Mahatma Gandhi; <i>prima facie</i> case for prosecution.
<b>Jagat Talkies</b>	The Delhi High Court	MANU/DE/0741/2010		Cinema hall; screening

**Distributors v. Dy.  
Commissioner of  
Police (7/4/2010)**

of obscene film;  
cancellation of license  
during pendency of  
proceedings.