

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Court reasoned that the penalization of sedition is a constitutionally valid restriction on the right to freedom of expression only when the words are intended to disturb public peace by violence.</li> <li>The Court emphasized that the phrase “Government established by law” under section 124A must be distinguished from criticism of a specific party or persons.</li> <li>The purpose of the crime of sedition was to prevent the Government established by law from being subverted because “the continued existence of the Government established by law is an essential condition of the stability of the State”.</li> </ul>
4.	<b>Shankari Prasad Singh Deo v. Union of India (1951)</b>	<p><b>Theme : Amendability of Fundamental Rights</b></p> <p>This case dealt with the amendability of Fundamental Rights (the First Amendment’s validity was challenged). The SC contended that the Parliament’s power to amend under Article 368 also includes the power to amend the Fundamental Rights guaranteed in Part III of the Constitution.</p> <p>Further, it said that a constitutional amendment act enacted to abridge or take away the fundamental rights is not void of article 13(2).</p>
5.	<b>Berubari Union case (1960)</b>	<p><b>Theme : Article 3 related</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case was regarding the Parliament’s power to transfer the territory of Berubari to Pakistan.</li> <li>The Supreme Court examined Article 3 in detail and held that the Parliament cannot make laws under this article in order to execute the Nehru-Noon agreement. Hence, the 9<sup>th</sup> constitutional Amendment Act was passed to enforce the agreement.</li> </ul>
6.	<b>Golaknath Vs State of Punjab (1967)</b>	<p><b>Theme: Right to Property - is it a Fundamental Right?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supreme Court ruled that Parliament doesn’t have the power to restrict any of the Fundamental Rights enshrined in the Constitution.</li> <li>Hence, State of Punjab couldn’t take away Golaknath or any other citizen’s land as Right to Property was deemed to be fundamental.</li> </ul>