Edition 2025

© Publishers

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication can be reproduced or transmitted in
any form or by any means, without prior permission of the publishers.

ISBN: 978-93-48076-91-5

Published by:

LAW & JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO

www.lawjusticepublishing.com
A-58, GT Karnal Road Industrial Area, Delhi-110033
Phones: 011-47082254 sales@lawjusticepublishing.com

C-27, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001
edit@lawjusticepublishing.com

Distributors:
UNIVERSAL BOOK TRADERS
80 Gokhale Market, Opp. Tis Hazari Courts,
Delhi-110054
Phones: 011-23911966, 23961288
e-mail: sales@ubtlawbooks.com

Cover designed by Shashwat Gupta

Recommended Citation :
Aruneshwar Gupta: Legal Revolution 5.0
Edition 2025 (New Delhi: Law & Justice Publishing Co.)

The publication is being sold on the condition and understanding that the information, comments, and views it contains are merely for guidance and reference and must not be taken as having the authority of, or being binding in any way on, the authors, editors, publishers, and sellers, who do not owe any responsibility whatsoever for any loss, damage, or distress to any person, whether or not a purchaser of this publication,on account of any action taken or not taken on the basis of this publication. Despite all the care taken, errors or omissions may have crept inadvertently into this publication. The publishers shall be obliged if any such error or omission is brought to their notice for possible correction in a future edition. In the case of binding defect, misprint, missing pages, etc. the publishers' liability is limited to replacement of the defective copy within one month of its purchase by a copy of the same edition or reprint.
All disputes are subject to the jurisdiction of competent courts in Delhi.

Printed at Glorious Printers, New Delhi

Dedicated to
Judges, Advocates, and Lawmen
Committed to
Justice and evolving Legal Landscape.

Contents

	Forward	*ix*
	Preface	*xiii*
	Introduction	*xv*
	Table of Cases	*xix*
1.	Revolutions	1
2.	Purposes of Legal Revolutions	13
3.	Law, Judges, and Lawyers – The bedrock of Civil Society	18
4.	Legal Revolution 1.0 (Pre 1215) The Evolution of Institutional Framework: The Pre-Codified Law Era	32
5.	Legal Revolution 2.0 – The Magna Carta Epoch (1215 – 1785)	35
6.	Legal Revolution 3.0 – Post-American Independence and the Rise of Judicial Independence (1785–1985)	50
7.	Legal Revolution 4.0 – 1985 – 2020 – Independence of Judiciary and ADR	74
8.	Legal Revolution 5.0 – Peace Mediation and Online Conflict Resolution (2020 onwards)	106
9.	Legal Revolution 5.0 is Irreversible Phenomenon as Human Consciousness Shifts	131
10.	Philosophical Perspective Shift from 2D to 5D of Human Motivation and Action	141
11.	Movies Reflecting Shift in Human Consciousness	144
12.	Books and Authors Reflecting Shift in Human Consciousness from 3D to 4D to 5D	150

13. Shift to Fifth Dimension (5D) 157
14. First Industrial Revolution to Fourth Industrial Revolution 165
15. Globalization 1.0 to Globalization 4.0 172
16. Legal Revolution 5.0 and Balancing the Energies 185
17. Rise of Digital Assets, Crypto Currencies, and Blockchain Technology during Legal Revolution 5.0 197
18. AI and Legal Revolution 5.0 204
19. Legal Revolution 5.0, AI, Collegium System, Appointment of Judges and Peace Mediators 208
20. Legal Revolutions as Building Blocks: The Evolution from Legal Revolution 1 to Legal Revolution 5 225
21. United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal 16 and Legal Revolution 5.0 230
22. India as a Hub for Legal Revolution 5.0: Peace Mediation in the context of India's inclusive culture and heritage 235
23. Legal Revolution 6.0: The Future Horizon 239

Subject Index 243

RAJESH BINDAL
Judge



SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
TILAK MARG
NEW DELHI - 110 001

FOREWORD

In a world defined by rapid technological advances and shifting paradigms, Aruneshwar Gupta's Legal Revolution 5.0 emerges as a beacon of thought leadership, capturing intersection of law, technology, and humanity with unparalleled depth and foresight. This monumental work does more than chronicle the evolution of legal systems; it reimagines the very essence of justice in an era of globalization and digital transformation.

Gupta's ingenuity shines through his ability to weave the intricate tapestry of legal history, from the raw, tribal norms of Legal Revolution 1.0 to the algorithm-driven sophistication of Legal Revolution 5.0. Each chapter demonstrates the author's profound understanding of how law evolves alongside societal, political, and technological upheavals. What sets this book apart is not just its meticulous exploration of the past but its visionary gaze into the future, offering readers a glimpse of Legal Revolution 6.0—a phase where humanity and technology will converge in unprecedented ways.

The structure of this book reflects a masterful grasp of the interconnection between law and societal development. By tracing legal evolution alongside industrial revolutions and globalization, the book provides a unique perspective on how each transformative phase reshaped the contours of justice. His ability to correlate historical milestones with emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and online conflict resolution systems reveals an unparalleled foresight into the challenges and opportunities of our times.

BUNGALOW NO. 2, AKBAR ROAD, NEW DELHI - 110011. TEL. NO. (011) 23018043

RAJESH BINDAL
Judge

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
TILAK MARG
NEW DELHI - 110 001

What is particularly striking in the book is emphasis on the human dimension of law. In discussing Legal Revolution 5.0, the author moves beyond the surface-level analysis of technological tools to delve into the ethical, emotional, and spiritual facets of justice. The emphasis on peace mediation, empathy, and the shift to a more inclusive and restorative justice system highlights his profound belief in the law as a medium for healing rather than mere adjudication. This perspective is both refreshing and deeply relevant, as societies around the world grapple with conflicts that demand not just legal resolutions but holistic harmony.

The breadth of Gupta's scholarship is matched by the clarity of his vision. His exploration of the philosophical shift from two-dimensional to five-dimensional consciousness is a bold yet compelling argument for the role of law in fostering not just external order but internal peace. By integrating ancient wisdom with modern innovation, Gupta bridges the gap between tradition and progress, offering a balanced approach to the future of law.

The chapters on artificial intelligence, blockchain, and digital assets are particularly commendable for their nuanced treatment of complex subjects. The book raises critical questions about accountability, ethics, and the human role in a landscape increasingly dominated by machines. His discussion on the role of AI in judicial processes and blockchain in contract enforcement exemplifies his ability to tackle intricate issues with clarity and insight. At the same time, he does not shy away from addressing the potential pitfalls of these technologies, urging for a balanced approach that prioritizes humanity over efficiency.

The alignment of Legal Revolution 5.0 with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 16 underscores its relevance to global discourse on

BUNGALOW NO. 2, AKBAR ROAD, NEW DELHI - 110011. TEL. NO. (011) 23018043

RAJESH BINDAL
Judge

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
TILAK MARG
NEW DELHI - 110 001

peace, justice, and strong institutions. The authors focus on international frameworks and the role of mediation in fostering global harmony resonates deeply with contemporary challenges, from climate change to transnational conflicts. His vision of a conflict-free individual, society, and world offers not just a legal framework but a blueprint for a more equitable and sustainable future.

Gupta's work also celebrates the rich cultural heritage of India, positioning the nation as a hub for peace mediation and inclusive legal innovation. By drawing from India's diverse traditions and philosophies, he showcases the country's potential to lead the global legal revolution. This perspective is both inspiring and timely, as India emerges as a significant player on the world stage.

Legal Revolution 5.0 is not just a book—it is a transformative experience. It challenges readers to rethink their understanding of justice, to embrace the possibilities of technology while remaining rooted in ethical principles, and to envision a future where law serves as a bridge to collective harmony. Aruneshwar Gupta's visionary work is a testament to his brilliance as a thinker, scholar, and advocate for a just and compassionate world.

For those who seek to understand the past, navigate the present, and shape the future of law, this book is an indispensable guide. It is with great admiration and respect that I commend this groundbreaking work and its author, whose ingenuity and foresight will undoubtedly leave an indelible mark on the legal and intellectual landscape.

[JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL]

3

BUNGALOW NO. 2, AKBAR ROAD, NEW DELHI - 110011. TEL. NO. (011) 23018043

Preface

A revolution is a fundamental and irreversible transformation in the structure, processes, or power dynamics of a society, system, or institution. Revolutions occur when the existing order is challenged and replaced by a new framework, driven by shifts in values, innovations, or widespread discontent. They take many forms:

- Political revolutions involve changes in governance or power structures.
- Social revolutions transform cultural norms and societal frameworks.
- Technological revolutions reshape industries and economies through innovation.
- Educational revolutions bring significant shifts in how knowledge is imparted and learned, often responding to societal or technological advancements, such as the integration of digital education.
- Legal revolutions involve transformative changes in legal frameworks, justice systems, and dispute resolution processes, adapting to new societal demands and technological progress.
- Spiritual revolutions represent profound changes in religious or philosophical thought, reshaping humanity's understanding of existence, morality, and purpose.

In all cases, revolutions mark pivotal moments of change, setting the course for new eras and reshaping the future. Every revolution builds upon existing structures, propelling society into new eras of development. The earlier structure sometimes disappears into oblivion and at other times not only forms the basis for the new but continues to exist together catering to the services linked to it. Steam, electricity, electronics, the internet, and blockchain were built on the earlier revolutionary technology, but all exist together to supplement each other.

Although the concept of legal revolutions is not formally recognized, it

effectively segments legal history in a way similar to revolutions in industry, education, and globalization viz. Fourth Industrial Revolution, Fourth Education Revolution, and Globalization 4.0. Legal revolutions represent monumental shifts in the balance of power and legal practices, transitioning from rudimentary frameworks to more sophisticated systems driven by institutional changes and technological advancements. In the case of a Legal Revolution, laws, dispute resolution processes, and the pursuit of justice play a pivotal role in responding to broader social, economic, educational, and industrial changes. These legal transformations evolve alongside shifts in other sectors, ensuring that legal systems continue to meet the emerging needs of society by promoting justice, equity, and order.

Each legal revolution marks a transformative period in the legal landscape, characterized by dramatic changes in the structure, application, and accessibility of law. Whether through shifts in institutional power, the creation of new legal frameworks, or the impact of globalization and technology, these periods fundamentally alter how law is perceived and practiced. Legal revolutions, although not as widely recognized as those in other sectors, are critical to understanding the evolution of legal systems and their role in supporting and shaping modern society. As technology, international cooperation, and societal values continue to evolve, further legal revolutions are expected.

The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the transition to Legal Revolution 5.0. Judges, lawyers, and legal professionals are now adapting to new realities, where efforts to resolve conflicts, fostering coherence and harmony by adopting generative dialogue and more collaborative approaches, reflecting a deeper understanding of the interconnectedness of social and legal issues. This represents a shift from traditional adjudication of disputes according to law using adversarial and dialectic methods.

The *sanaatan* narrative of cosmic interplay serves as a timeless reminder of humanity's ongoing struggles with conflicts disputes, battles, wars, and world wars including nature's way of dealing with and balancing irresponsible *karmas* of *homo sapiens*. All this suggests that legal systems and all stakeholders of the legal industry must continue to hone themselves and evolve to address new challenges.

Aruneshwar Gupta

JUDGE'S CHAMBERS,
SUPREME COURT OF SRI LANKA,
COLOMBO 12.



විනිශ්චයකාර මැදිරිය,
ශ්‍රී ලංකා ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨාධිකරණය,
කොළඹ 12.

INTRODUCTION

Senior advocate Aruneshwar Gupta impresses me as a far-sighted visionary with a futuristic lens on the existential purpose of legal systems and his oeuvres appropriately titled "***Legal Revolutions***" chronicle a series of legal revolutions, each of which has given rise to a distinct order of public, legal or constitutional norms. His latest edition ***Legal Revolutions 5.0*** continuing the unbroken series of monographs brings to the fore hitherto unimagined and unchartered reflections on the evolution and utility of law, which we have only ruminated over at our subliminal crevices. These ruminations and cogitations are articulated with vim, vigour and vitality in Aruneshwar Gupta's latest "***Legal Revolution 5.0***" wherein the senior advocate waxes eloquent on online conflict resolution, peace mediation, artificial intelligence and digital assets as the transformative avatars of the changing contours of law.

As we transition to a modern era of a conflict free society which could best be described as a utopian desideratum, Aruneshwar Gupta portends that the great legal or constitutional revolution that will shape a distinct order of modern society in the future will depend to a large extent on artificial intelligence, block chain and peace mediation. The wonders of social engineering and legal revolution wrought by the above contraptions of human ingenuity are legion and too numerous to enumerate, and their perceptible impact is nowhere more keenly felt than in our quotidian existence, legal or otherwise. The author's panoply of narratives about the evolution of legal revolutions is itself a profoundly penetrative account, well worth recounting in his own categorization.

The Five Legal Revolutions

Throughout history, legal revolutions have realigned justice with the social, political, and technological realities of their time. They signify pivotal transformations, where legal frameworks adapt to meet the complexities of a global society.

Legal Revolution 1.0 (Pre-1215):

Before codified laws, justice was governed by family, tribal, and royal norms, often influenced by local power structures and personal biases. Justice was raw, decentralized, and deeply embedded in social hierarchies.

Legal Revolution 2.0 (1215–1785):

Beginning with the Magna Carta, this era saw the emergence of the rule of law, curbing monarchical power and laying the foundation for constitutional governance. Parliamentary systems began replacing absolute monarchy, shifting the focus to individual legal rights.

Legal Revolution 3.0 (1785–1985): This period witnessed judicial independence, the rise of individual rights, and constitutional democracies after the American and French revolutions. Legal systems emphasized personal freedoms, equality, and justice, reshaping the relationship between the state and its citizens.

Legal Revolution 4.0 (1985–2020): Globalization expanded the legal landscape beyond national borders, introducing Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). This era saw cross-border mechanisms for resolving disputes, reflecting an interconnected world and a need for flexible, collaborative justice approaches.

Legal Revolution 5.0 (2020 onwards): Embracing Online Conflict Resolution (OCR), artificial intelligence, and peace mediation, this era shifts toward empathy, ethics, and technological advancement, reimagining justice as a collaborative, human-centered experience.

Such is the impressive array of the author's sustained work that demonstrates the depth and breadth of his insightful and forward- thinking reflections.

Human centred dispensation of justice betokens the watershed of a paradigm shift from adjudicating legal disputes through adversarial litigation and commercial mediation to problem-solving with empathy for intended beneficiaries and stakeholders and Aruneshwar Gupta posits in all earnest that the emerging ***Legal Revolution 5.0*** reflects best practices in peace mediation and conflict resolution. With emphasis on diminished litigation, the traditional "lawyering" model recedes to the background. The question is bound to arise how peace mediation could provide a viable alternative to traditional adjudicative processes but Aruneshwar Gupta proceeds to point out that key drivers of change towards the transition are not hard to come by such as was seen in the global fight against COVID-19. In the health care Revolution, there was extensive use of biotechnology, telemedicine and public health governance that provoked changes in how healthcare law developed. The need for cross-border collaboration to manage global health crises showcased the efficacy of peace mediation and collaborative frameworks for resolving healthcare disputes. We saw emergence of intellectual property waivers and WHO affirmation of vaccines across borders. Aruneshwar Gupta unerringly highlights that ***Legal Revolution 5.0*** has witnessed paradigm shifts in public health law, vaccine distribution, and pandemic preparedness.

The recent proclamation of the UN's Pact for the Future partakes of the characteristics of what the learned author calls the Environmental Revolution. The Pact agreed upon by the UN General Assembly imposes commitments to limit global temperature rise and ensure net-zero emissions. The Pact exhorted increased funding for climate resilience and renewable energy projects and the author's clarion call for sustainability is coterminous with the global push to address climate

change. These ideals cannot be achieved other than through mediation and peacebuilding. If a legislature enacts these norms into law, it is nothing but the individual expression of legislative will borne out of collective mediation of countries *inter se*. The author quite appropriately classifies it as environmental revolution which aligns with his conception of ***Legal Revolution 5.0.*** The sustainable and collaborative dispute resolution methods used to address ecological conflicts affirm the author's vision.

The excursus "***Legal Revolution 5.0***" takes in its sweep the **Global Digital Compact,** which outlines guidelines for international cooperation on digital issues, including the regulation of artificial intelligence. In the domain of artificial intelligence, it is axiomatic that growing concerns over intrusive inroads into privacy and intellectual property infringements require resolution to ensure the enforcement of human rights in the digital realm and promote its responsible use on a global scale. What else could be the better tool for enforcement rather than peace mediation? The author benchmarks the 2015 UN Singapore Convention on Mediation as the defining moment that heralded the beginning of "***Legal Revolution 5.0***". As the author amply deals with the key aspects of the Convention, it has to be acknowledged that the convention serves as an international legal framework for enforcing mediated settlements across borders, much like the New York Convention (1958) does for International Arbitration. Thus, there are interesting comparisons that the learned author makes to drive home the eternal verity that Peace Mediation has emerged as the game changer to usher in a conflict free society and the world at large.

The book is a minefield of provocative thinking and an unputdownable vade mecum once one is seized by it. It is invigorating and bound to offer abundant food for thought, with ample intellectual stimulation to consume. The writing is so inspiring that it endures for its clarity, bringing home the truism that there lies a greater truth beyond merely asserting that long professional experience should not be lightly questioned. Aruneshwar Gupta challenges this traditional complacency with his thought-provoking salvos.

Justice A.H.M.D.Nawaz,
Judge of the Supreme Court,
Supreme Court,
Sri Lanka.

Table of Cases

Amalgamated Society of Engineers v. Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd– Australia - (1920) HCA 54 62

Anwar v. Ministry of Justice (2022) – Pakistan - Supreme Court of Pakistan - PLD 2022 SC 98 138

Ashby v. White - England - House of Lords - (1703) 92 ER 126; 2 Ld Raym 938 47

AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion(2011) - United States - 563 U.S. 333 104

Australian Communist Party v. Commonwealth– Australia (1951) - HCA 5 63

Axel Springer AG v. Germany - European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) - (2012) ECHR 39954/08 96

Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Co. Ltd. -Belgium v. Spain - ICJ Reports 1970 60

Bowers v. Hardwick (1986) 117

British Caribbean Bank Ltd. v. Attorney General of Belize- Belize - (2012) - Supreme Court of Belize - Claim No. 597 of 2011 85

Brown v. Board of Education - United States - (1954) 347 U.S. 483 - (1954) USSC 17 29, 64, 116, 117

Anwar Hossain Chowdhury v. Bangladesh- Bangladesh - Supreme Court of Bangladesh) (1989) - 1989 BLD (Spl.) 1 85

Bushel's Case - England - Court of Common Pleas - (1670) 124 ER 1006; (1670) Vaughan 135 46

Campbell v. Hall - England - Court of King's Bench - (1774) 1 Cowp 204; 98 ER 1045 48

Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth, and the Law v. Canada – Canada - (2004) 1 SCR 76 81

Case of Proclamations - England - Court of King's Bench - (1610) 12 Co Rep 74; 77 ER 1352 46

Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.– USA - (1984) - 467 U.S. 837 80

Chng Suan Tze v. Minister for Home Affairs - Singapore - Court of Appeal of Singapore - (1988) SGCA 16; (1988) 2 MLJ 276 68

City of Cape Town v. South African National Roads Authority Ltd - South Africa - (2015) ZAWCHC 135 98

Colvin R. de Silva v. Commissioner of Elections- Sri Lanka (1959) - Supreme Court of Ceylon (Sri Lanka) - (1959) SLR 1 65

Corfu Channel Case - United Kingdom v. Albania - ICJ Reports 1949 60

Cour de Cassation– France (2012) No. 11-27072 82, 96

Czech Republic v. European Media Ventures(2012) - United Kingdom - [2012] EWHC 109 (Comm) 104

David Ndii & Others v. Attorney General & Others- Kenya - (2021) High Court of Kenya - Constitutional Petition E282 of 2020 87

Doctors for Life International v. Speaker of the National Assembly (2006) South Africa - (2006) ZACC 11 81

Donoghue v. Stevenson- United Kingdom - (1932) - [1932] UKHL 100 63

Dr. Bonham's Case– England- Court of Common Pleas - (1610) 8 Co Rep 114a; 77 ER 646 46

Edwards v. Canada– Persons Case **-** Canada - (1930) - [1930] UKPC 2 63

Entick v. Carrington - England - Court of King's Bench – [1765] UKHL KB 100 47

Ex Parte Matovu - Uganda – (1966) - [1966] UGCA 65

Frances Haugen v. Facebook(2021) - United States - U.S. Senate and Federal Oversight Committees (Testimony) 140

Friends of the Earth v. Royal Dutch Shell plc(2021) – Netherlands - District Court of The Hague - C/09/571932 / HA ZA 19-379 (2021) 138

Glenister v. President of South Africa -South Africa (2011) - (2011) ZACC 6 82

Golder v. United Kingdom(1975) - Application No. 4451/70, 1 EHRR 524 61

Hall Street Associates v. Mattel, Inc. (2008) - United States - 552 U.S. 576 104

Haw Tua Tau v. Public Prosecutor– Singapore - Privy Council (on appeal from Singapore) - (1981) AC 136; (1980) 2 MLJ 173 68

Ireland v. United Kingdom(1978) - Application No. 5310/71, 2 EHRR 25 61

James v. OPO – United Kingdom – UK Supreme Court - [2015] UKSC 32 83, 116

Jeyaretnam Joshua Benjamin v. Lee Kuan Yew- Singapore - Supreme Court of Singapore - (1984) SGHC 120; (1984) 1 MLJ 437 68

John Fairfax Publications Pty Ltd v. Ryde Local Court- Australia (2005) 62 NSWLR 512 95

Kadi and Al Barakaat International Foundation v. Council of the European Union - European Court of Justice (ECJ) - (2008) C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P 96

Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala – 1973 INSC 91 84, 66, 76

Lahore High Court Bar Association v. Federation of Pakistan– Pakistan - Supreme Court of Pakistan – (2015) - 2015 PLD 401 SC 86

Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation (1997)– Australia - (1997) HCA 25; (1997) 189 CLR 520 81

Lawless v. Ireland (1961) - Application No. 332/57, 1 EHRR 15 61

Lawrence v. Texas (2003) 117

Lewis v. Wilson & Horton Ltd- New Zealand - New Zealand Court of Appeal - (2000) 3 NZLR 546 95

Liversidge v. Anderson- United Kingdom - (1942) - [1942] UKHL 1 63

Lochner v. New York (1905) 117

Love v. Commonwealth; Thoms v. Commonwealth– Australia (2020) - (2020) HCA 3; 94 ALJR 198 84

Lüth Case (1958) - Germany - Federal Constitutional Court of Germany - BVerfGE 7, 198 64

Mabo v. Queensland (No. 2)– Australia (1992) - (1992) HCA 23; (1992) 175 CLR 1 69, 80

Magyar Helsinki Bizottság v. Hungary, European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), Grand Chamber Application No. 18030/11, 08.11.2016 79

Makwanyane case [1995] ZACC 3 77

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India– India (1978) Supreme Court of India - (1978) INSC 12 67

Marbury v. Madison (1803) – US – 5 US 137 43, 58, 62

MC Mehta v. Union of India (1986), 76

Miller v. Prime Minister - United Kingdom - UK Supreme Court (2019) - (2019) UKSC 41 138

Miranda v. Arizona (1966) - 384 U.S. 436 [1966] USSC 29 65

Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth Inc (1985) - United States - 473 U.S. 614 (1985) 104

Mwenda v. Attorney General - Zambia - (2018) - Constitutional Court of Zambia - 2018/CCZ/002 86

Nallaratnam Singarasa v. Attorney General- Sri Lanka - Supreme Court of Sri Lanka (2006) - SC (FR) Application No. 182/99 85

Naresh Shridhar Mirajkar v. State of Maharashtra– India - Supreme Court of India (1966) AIR 1 95

Nicaragua v. United States - ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 61

Nicolo Case (1989) - Conseil d'État, France - CE, 20 October 1989, Nicolo, No. 108243 69

Obergefell v. Hodges – United States (2015) - 576 U.S. 644 75, 82

Ong Ah Chuan v. Public Prosecutor– Singapore - (1981) - Court: Privy Council (on appeal from Singapore) - (1981) AC 648; (1980) 2 MLJ 139 67

Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter(2013) - United States - 569 U.S. 564 (2013) 104

Plaintiff M68/2015 v. Minister for Immigration and Border Protection (2016)– Australia - (2016) HCA 1; (2016) 257 CLR 42 83

Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) 116, 117
PP v. Datuk Harun Idris (1977) - Malaysia - Federal Court of Malaysia – (1977) 1 MLJ 180 67
Rajabali Jumabhoy v. Ameer Jumabhoy– Singapore (1978) - High Court of Singapore - (1978) 1 MLJ 254 67
Re Nalpon, Zero Geraldo Mario– Singapore - (2012) SGCA 23 96
Reserve Bank of India v. Internet and Mobile Association of India (2020) – India 198
Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia- United States (1980) 448 U.S. 555 95
Roe v. Wade – USA (1973) - 410 U.S. 113 (1973) – (1973) USSC 39 66
Roncarelli v. Duplessis– Canada - (1959) - [1959] SCC 1 64
Scott v. Scott - United Kingdom - (1913) AC 417 (House of Lords) 94
SEC v. Telegram (2020) – United States - U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York 198
Secretary of State for the Home Department v. AF (2009) - United Kingdom - (2009) UKHL 28 82
Semenyih Jaya Sdn Bhd v. Pentadbir Tanah Daerah Hulu Langat Malaysia - Federal Court of Malaysia (2017) - (2017) 3 MLJ 561 86
Smith v. Ministry of Defence (2013) - United Kingdom - UK Supreme Court - (2013) UKSC 41 136
Somerset v. Stewart- England - Court of King's Bench- (1772) 98 ER 499; Lofft 1 47
Southwest Africa Case - Ethiopia and Liberia v. South Africa - ICJ Reports 1966 60
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd v. Ontario- Canada - (2005) 2 SCR 188
Tyrer v. United Kingdom (1978) - Application No. 5856/72, 2 EHRR 1 62, 75
Uganda Law Society v. Attorney General- Uganda - Supreme Court of Uganda (2009) 85
Union of India vs. Sankal Chand Himatlal Sheth (1977), 216
United States v. Harmon (2020) – United States 198
United States v. Nixon – USA (1974) - 418 U.S. 683 66
Urgenda Foundation v. Kingdom of the Netherlands (2019) – Netherlands - Supreme Court of the Netherlands - ECLI:NL: HR:2019:2007 31, 138
Vivienne Goonewardene v. Don Philip Rupasinghe- Sri Lanka - Supreme Court of Ceylon (Sri Lanka) - (1968) SLR 182 65
Wlkinson v. Devontown (1897) 83, 116
Yissacharov v. Chief Military Prosecutor- Israel - Israeli Supreme Court - (2006) CrimA 5121/98 96
Zenger Trial - New York – Colonial Court in New York – (1735) 47