

ITEM NO.22

COURT NO.6

SECTION XII-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 7575/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-01-2026 in CRP No. 2487/2025 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amravati]

GUMMADI USHA RANI & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SURE MALLIKARJUNA RAO & ANR.

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

Date : 27-02-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Sindoor Vnl, AOR
Ms. Thithiksha Padmam, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. This case assumes considerable institutional concern, not because of the decision that was taken on the merits of the case, but about the process of adjudication and determination.

2. The petitioners are the defendants in a suit filed by the respondents for injunction. Pending disposal of the suit, the Trial Court appointed an Advocate Commissioner to note the physical features of the property. The petitioners challenged the report of the Advocate Commissioner by raising certain objections. The Trial Court, by its order dated 19.08.2025 dismissed the objection and in

the process, relied on certain decisions being; *i) Subramani v. M. Natarajan (2013) 14 SCC 95, ii) Chidambaram Pillai v. SAL Ramasamy (1071) 2 SCC 68, iii) Lakshmi Devi v. K. Prabha (2006) 5 SCC 551 and iv) Gajanan v. Ramdas (2015) 6 SCC 223.*

3. The petitioners challenged the orders passed by the Trial Court, *inter alia*, contending that the judgments referred to and relied on are non-existent and fake orders.

4. The High Court considered the objection and realized that the judgments are Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated and after recording a word of caution proceeded to decide the case on merits and dismissed the civil revision petition affirming the decision of the Trial Court. Thus, the petitioner is before us.

5. Issue notice, returnable on 10.03.2026.

6. Pending disposal of the Special Leave Petition, we direct that the Trial Court shall not proceed on the basis of the Advocate Commissioner's Report.

7. We take cognizance of the Trial Court deploying AI generated non-existing, fake or synthetic alleged judgments and seek to examine its consequences and accountability as it has a direct bearing on integrity of adjudicatory process. At the outset, we must declare that a decision based on such non-existent and fake alleged judgments is not an error in the decision making. It would be a misconduct and legal consequence shall follow. It is compelling that we examine this issue in more detail.

8. Issue notice to the *Ld. Attorney General, Ld. Solicitor General* and the Bar Council of India.

9. We appoint Mr. Shyam Divan, learned senior counsel, to assist the Court. He may nominate an Advocate on Record for his assistance.

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER