

News

Supreme Court rejects to entertain Lalu Prasad Yadav appeal to suspend trial in land-for-jobs case



However, the Court stressed that the trial court's laying of charges in the case would not render Yadav's quashing plea before the Delhi High Court infructuous.

lalu prasad Yadav and supreme court

Yadav addressed the Court seeking directions to the trial court to stay proceedings till the Delhi High Court ends considering his petition to quash the case altogether.

However, a Bench of Justices MM Sundresh and N Kotiswar Singh of the Supreme Court refused to grant such directives.

It stated that the trial court's framing of charges in the case would not render Yadav's quashing petition in the High Court infructuous.

"We are not passing any order. Taking note of the apprehension, we think framing of charges will not make the present petition before the High Court infructuous," the Court stated.

The Court was dealing with an appeal filed by Yadav to suspend trial court proceedings in the matter at least till after August 12, when the Delhi High Court is set to hear Yadav's motion to quash the case.

The land-for-jobs scandal concerns claims that throughout 2004-2009, several citizens of Bihar were offered jobs when they or their family members transferred their land to the names of family members of Lalu Prasad Yadav, then the Railway minister.

The First Information Report (FIR) in this case was registered in 2022 by the Central Bureau of Investigation.

Yadav eventually filed the Delhi High Court seeking the quashing of this FIR. He sought the High Court to halt the trial court proceedings throughout the pendency of this plea.

On May 29, the High Court sent notice to the CBI but found no compelling reasons to suspend the proceedings before the trial court.

Yadav subsequently moved the top court, alleging that the trial cannot proceed without a necessary sanction under Section 17A of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

On July 28, the Supreme Court refused to interfere with the Delhi High Court's decision not to stay the trial court proceedings.

He then filed an application before the Supreme court to defer the trial court proceedings.

Yadav underlined that the trial court had directed him to complete his arguments on the criminal charges that could be brought against him by August 2.

On the other side, the Delhi High Court listed his motion to quash the case only on August 12.

On July 24, the High Court also denied his motion to schedule the case on an earlier date.

The case before the highest court further pointed out that Yadav has raised basic questions before the High Court about whether the criminal proceedings against him are viable at all.

In this regard, it was contended that a sanction required to charge a public worker under Section 17A of the Corruption Act had not been acquired.

"The Petitioner (Yadav) will suffer severe travesty of justice, if the trial court continues to hear argument on charge despite the pendency of writ petition before the High Court, which has

been kept for hearing on 12.08.2025, keeping in view of the Board of the Hon'ble High Court," Yadav's application added.

When the matter was taken up today, Yadav's attorney originally requested an adjournment since Senior Advocate Kapil Sibal, who was to lead arguments in the matter, was in another court debating a plea filed by Justice Yashwant Varma.

Representing the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Additional Solicitor General SV Raju said that Yadav might address his concerns about sanction before the trial court. He stated that Yadav's application must be dismissed with costs.

"In trial court, discharge is going on, where he can issue this 17A question ... Cost may be charged. Person with significant pockets can make numerous such applications," Raju added.

"We are not imposing costs," the Court said before making it clear that it is not entertaining the application.

The application was filed through Advocate Mudit Gupta. Advocates Varun Jain, Navin Kumar, Akhilesh Singh, Vanika Gupta, Sumit Singh and Satish Kumar also represented Yadav.