









JUDGEMENT ANALYSIS

The State of Punjab & Ors. v. Davinder Singh & Ors. (MANU/SC/0816/2024: 2024/INSC/562)

The Seven Judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court on 1st August 2024 upheld the States power to create sub-classification within Scheduled Castes by a 6:1 ratio.

Bench: CJI D.Y. Chandrachud, Justices Manoj Misra, B.R. Gavai, Vikram Nath, Bela M. Trivedi, Satish Chandra Sharma, Pankaj Mithal

Let's explore key issues raised in the matter:

ISSUES	MAJORITY VIEW CJI D.Y. Chandrachud & Ors.	DISSENTING VIEW Justice Bela M. Trivedi
Whether sub-classification of the Scheduled Castes for reservation is constitutionally permissible?	 Article 14 of the Constitution permits sub-classification of a class which is not similarly situated for the purpose of the law.	 Such action of sub-classification would not only lead to discrimination and violation of Article 14 of the Constitution but would also be tantamount to tinkering with Article 341 of the Constitution.
Whether the Scheduled Castes constitute a homogenous group?	 Historical and empirical evidence demonstrates that the Scheduled Castes are a socially heterogenous class.	 Scheduled Castes is an amalgam of castes, races, groups, tribes, communities or parts thereof, and is a homogenous group
Whether the Supreme Court's ruling in E.V. Chinniah v. State of Andhra Pradesh (MANU/SC/0960/2004) is correct?	 Overruled	 Upheld
Whether States have the power to further classify the Scheduled Castes?	 Upon fulfilling two conditions: (a) existence of rational principle for differentiation (b) rational principle has a nexus with the purpose of sub classification	 States have no legislative competence to provide reservation to any caste by dividing/ /sub-dividing/sub-classifying or regrouping.