

NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY, JODHPUR  
End Term Examination August-December, 2025  
UG V Semester  
Subject: Interpretation of Statutes (Compulsory)

Time: Three Hours

Marks: 100

**Instructions**

1. Start each question on a new page. Correctly mention the question numbers and sub-parts of each question
2. Attempt any 5 Questions
3. Missing data may be suitably assumed.

Q.1) Former Indian Supreme Court Justice Markandey Katju once stated that *"It is deeply regrettable that in our Courts of law lawyers quote Maxwell and Craies but nobody refers to the Mimansa Principles of interpretation. Most lawyers would not have even heard of their existence."*

Critically examine this statement and discuss why modern courts have gradually stopped relying on Mimansa principles? Elucidate the general principles of Mimansa interpretation and the key axioms that guide its application. Support your answer with relevant case laws. (Marks 20)

Q.2) *"When the Act itself provides a dictionary of the words used, the court must look into that dictionary first"*.

In the light of the quoted text, discuss how definitions as an internal aid help the judiciary to find out the true intention and purpose of the legislature. We find various types of definitions in statutes, discuss all such types of definitions with examples and relevant case laws. (Marks 20)

Q.3) Discuss the following:

(10+10=Marks 20)

- (a) PharmaHeal Pvt. Ltd. filed a patent application for a modified form of an existing anti-cancer drug, claiming that the new version offered better stability and absorption. The Patent Office rejected the application under Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, 1970, reasoning that the applicability of Section 3(d) is stricter in the case of product patents in medicines and chemical substances, as such inventions are particularly prone to slight modifications without any real enhancement in therapeutic efficacy.

When the rejection was challenged, the authorities contended that the Parliamentary debates during the 2005 Amendment clearly show that Section 3(d) was introduced primarily to check repetitive patenting (evergreening) in the pharmaceutical sector.

Section 3(d), Patent Act- *"The mere discovery of a new form of a known substance which does not result in the enhancement of the known efficacy of that substance or the mere discovery of any new property or new use for a known substance or of the mere use of a known process, machine or apparatus unless such known process results in a new product or employs at least one new reactant."*

In the light of above facts discuss whether Parliamentary history and debates, can be used to determine the true legislative intent behind amending Section 3 of the Patents Act. Support your answer with precedents in which help of such external aids has been taken.

- (b) Police authorities, while investigating a high-profile murder case and being pressured by the media groups and society, subjected the main accused, Rohit Verma, to narco-analysis and polygraph tests without his consent. The prosecution justified the use of these scientific techniques by arguing that Section 53 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) — which allows for the “medical examination of the accused” — should be interpreted in light of later scientific developments, and therefore, must include modern scientific methods like narco-analysis, brain mapping, and polygraph examinations.

Rohit Verma challenged this, arguing that the language of the explanation attached to the Section 53 does not expressly authorize such techniques, and that forcing an accused to undergo these tests violates Article 20(3) of the Constitution, which protects against self-incrimination.

As a judge in the above case, discuss whether Section 53 of the CrPC can be interpreted expansively to include later-developed scientific techniques like narco-analysis and polygraph tests under the principle that statutes must evolve with social and scientific advancements. Support your reasoning with relevant precedents.

Q.4) *“The Golden Rule of Interpretation is regarded as a qualified extension of the Literal Rule, permitting deviation from the plain meaning of words only to prevent absurd or unjust outcomes.”*

Critically examine this statement by distinguishing between the Literal Rule and the Golden Rule of Interpretation. Discuss the scope, rationale, and judicial application of golden rule with the help of leading case laws. (Marks 20)

Q.5) Let us assume that the legislature passes the Clean Surroundings Act, 2018 empowering local authorities to regulate the use of “parks, gardens, open spaces, and other public places” to ensure environmental cleanliness. Pursuant to this, the municipal corporation imposed restrictions on organizing political rallies and public demonstrations in open fields and grounds, claiming that these areas fall within the meaning of “other public places”.

A social activist group challenges the order, arguing that the expression “other public places” should be interpreted in light of the preceding words — parks, gardens, and open spaces — and therefore, only refers to recreational or environmental areas, not grounds used for political gatherings.

In the light of the above facts, answer whether the expression “other public places” should be interpreted using the rule of *noscitur a sociis* or the rule of *ejusdem generis*. Also discuss the differences between the rules of *noscitur a sociis* and *ejusdem generis*. Explain the concept of these subsidiary rules by relevant case laws. (Marks 20)



Q.6) *“Penal statutes and Procedural Statutes relating to imposition of penalties must be strictly construed and are generally prospective in application; in cases of ambiguity or where relief is possible, interpretation should favour the accused.”*

In light of the above statement elucidate upon the method of interpretation of Penal Statutes with the help of the relevant case laws.

(Marks 20)