

Sl No.	SLP Title	Number	Background of Petitioner	Whether Notice Issued, Date of Order, Order	Whether Party before Hon'ble High Court	Main Arguments
1	<i>Suresh Kumar Koushal & Another v. Naz Foundation and Others</i>	SLP(C) No. 15436/2009	Astrologers	Notice Issued on 9.7.2009 "Taken on board. Permission granted. Issue notice. Petitioner is permitted to serve Union of India. Dasti, in addition, is permitted. Petitioner is permitted to file amended Memo of Parties and issue notice on the newly added parties. List on 20.07.2009."	No.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Homosexuality akin to mental sickness and homosexuals akin to persons who commit rape. (para 5(d)) - Indian Society is very "primitive" and does not accept homosexuality and homosexuality is immoral and condemned by all religions (para 3(c)) - Homosexuality is western and the High Court should not have relied upon foreign law. (para 3(d)) - If homosexuality is legalized then incest will also have to be legalized. (para 3(j)) - Homosexuality will lead to a break down of army discipline leading, prejudicing the defence of the country. (para 3(f)) - Homosexuality is unnatural and AIDS is a curse from nature (para 5(p))
2	<i>Delhi Commission for the Protection of Child Rights v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 24334/2009	Commission constituted by the Delhi Government under the Protection of Child Rights		No.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether Constitutional morality is devoid of social morality? (para 2(d)) - Whether the doctrine of severability can be applied? (para 2(f)) - Whether Article 15 can be read to include sexual orientation? (para 2(j)) - The right to perform such acts in private would definitely include right to propagate ideas about such acts which may have potential of indoctrinating children (para 5(II)) - The High Court failed to take into account that Article 19(2) and 25(1) provide restrictions may be placed on Fundamental Rights on the ground of public morality. (para 5(XI))

			Act, 2005			
3	<i>Ram Murti v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.</i>	SLP(C) CC. No. 13105 / 2009	Petitioner in Person	No notice issued “Post along with SLP (c) 15436/2009”	No.	No grounds pleaded No interim relief sought
4	<i>B.P. Singhal v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 22267/2 009	Former BJP Rajya Sabha MP, DGP of Police	Notice issued on 11/12/2009 “Issue notice on the Special Leave Petition as well as on the application for stay. Post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009 @ CC 9255. Learned counsel appears for the respective parties and accepts notice. Counter, if any, be filed within four weeks.”	Yes	- If homosexuality is legalized then other offences such as gambling, sati, sale of organs, will also have to be legalized. (para 2(B)) - Whether the HC failed to consider the case of <i>Sakshi v. Union of India</i> (para 2(I)) - Homosexuality is a perversion. Alcohol, drug and disease are the natural concomitants of homosexual activity. (para 2(K)) - Art 51(a)(f) provides that the State should endeavour to protect India’s composite culture. Homosexuality is not part of Indian culture (para 2(S))
5	<i>B. Krishna Bhat v. Naz Foundation & Ors.</i>	SLP(C) No. 34187/2 009	“public-spirited individual, a social worker and an environmentalist”. Filed many PILs in	No Notice issued. Order on 07/12/2009 “Post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009 @ CC 9255/2009.”	No.	- Whether Article 21 includes the right to commit unnatural sexual acts? (para 2(c)) - Judgment Against Indian values, Religions (para 2(d-f)) - High Court has not considered what rules of divorce, marriage and inheritance will now apply to gay couples. (para 2(h)) - Judgment has inspired gay marriages being celebrated publicly-people flouting their newly legal status (para 5(j))

			Karnataka HC			
6	<i>Joint Action Council Kannur (JACK) v. Naz Foundation & Ors.</i>	SLP(C) No. 286/2010	Not averred	Notice issued on 04/01/2010 “Issue notice and post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.”	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Whether right under Art 21 includes right to homosexuality? (para 2(i)) -Whether the theory of concomitant rights has been rejected by the Supreme Court? (para 2(ii)) -Judgment fails to take into account power of the state to impose restrictions on rights on the grounds of morality and decency under article 19(2) (para 2(iii)) - The Judgment will lead to male prostitution (para 5(II)) - The Right under Article 21 does not give a right to have unnatural sex (para 5(III)) - Article 15(3) does not include homosexuality as a protected ground. (para 5(V)) - The judgment will lead to a spread of HIV/AIDS (para 5 (XIII))
7	<i>Tamil Nadu Munnetra Kazhagam v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 872/2010	“Mass based voluntary organization of the Muslims in Tamil Nadu.”	Notice issued on 06/01/2010 “Issue notice and post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.”	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the HC can strike down a legislation in a public interest litigation? (para 2(ii)) - Whether a statute can be ‘read down’? (para 2(iii)) -Whether consensual same-sex intercourse is a part of right under Article 21 (para 2(viii)) - The judgment will lead to bestiality, sadism, adultery, drug addiction (para 2(x-xi)) - The HC failed to appreciate that restrictions on fundamental rights can be placed on the grounds of decency and morality. (para 5(III))
8	<i>Raza Academy v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 873/2010	“An organisation working for the welfare of	Notice issued on 06/01/2010 “Issue notice and post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.”	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether constitutional morality, which is based on western values, can replace public morality and Indian tradition? (para 2(C)) - Whether sexual orientation is a ground analogous to sex contained under Article 15? (para 2D) - Whether religious scriptures can be overlooked in the name of constitutional morality (para 2F)

			the general public”			- Homosexuality is not genetic or inborn (para 5II) -The judgment will lead to the spread of HIV/AIDS. -Judgment will lead to increased paedophilia (para 5XXVI)
9	<i>Krantikari Manuvadi Morcha Party & Anr v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 36216/2009	Not averred	Notice issued on 17/12/2009 “Permission to file SLP granted. Issue notice and post along with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.”	No	- Whether the judgment is correct in law considering the public opinion against homosexuality (para 2(d)) - Whether the HC entered into the legislative field? - Judgment will lead to increase in male prostitution (para 5FG)
10	<i>S.K. Tizarawala v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 20913/2009	“Spokesperson for Yoga Guru Swami Ramdev, and a social Welfare Trust in the name of Bharat Swabhim an, Patanjali Yogpeeth Trust”	Notice issued on 17/08/2009 “Permission to file SLP granted. Issue notice on the Special Leave Petitions as also on the applications for stay. Tag with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.”	No	-Whether the right to privacy includes right to enjoy deviant sexual practices? (para 2B) - Social norms, morality are opposed to homosexuality (para 2E) -Homosexuality will lead to the spread of HIV/AIDS, prejudicing public health (para 2H) - Judgment has not provided for consent obtained by way of fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, fear, intoxication as provided under Section 375 IPC. (para 2L) - Judgment does not balance rights of citizens with the interest of the state in preserving public morality and dignity -HC erred in holding that discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation is barred by Art 15 (para 5(s))
11	<i>Apostolic Churches Alliance through its</i>	SLP(C) No. 20914/2009	Not averred	Notice issued on 17/08/2009 “Permission to file SLP granted.	No	- Judgment hurts sentiments of the Christian minority in India (para 2(1)) - Judgment will lead to reservation for homosexual community. (para 2(4))

	<i>Bishop v. Naz Foundation & Ors.</i>			Issue notice on the Special Leave Petitions as also on the applications for stay. Tag with SLP(C)No.15436/2009.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the impugned judgment failed to consider the enforcement of morality as a sufficient state interest to justify the infringement of fundamental right. (para 2(9)) - Cites Leviticus (para 4A) - HC accords strange interpretation to the word ‘sex’ in Article 15 to include sexual orientation. (para 4D) - HC has not constitutional power to declare a law invalid (para 4L)
12	<i>Bhim Singh v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) No. 25346/2009	Not averred	Notice issued on 30/09/2009 “Permission to file SLP is granted. Issue notice. Post along with SLP(C)No.20913/2009.”	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether homosexuality is a fundamental right under the constitution? (para 2C) - HC goes into legislative domain (para 5III)
13	<i>Utkal Christian Council v. Naz Foundation & Ors</i>	SLP(C) CC.No. 19478 / 2009	Not averred	Notice not issued “Post along with SLP(C) No. 15436/2009”	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the judgment suffers from lack of judicial impartiality? (para 2(3)) - HC ignored the right to health of other citizens. (para 2(5)) - HC ignored the observation of the SC that homosexuality is a result of a perverse mind. (para 2(11)) - Sexual minorities are not minorities recognized under the Constitution (para 2(12)) - Govt has the duty and power to protect public morality. (para 4D) - HC has no power to strike down a law and has exceeded its jurisdiction (para 4VV)
14	<i>All India Muslim Personal Law Board v. Naz Foundation</i>	SLP(C) CC.No. 425/2010	“Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 and	Notice not issued. “Post along with SLP (C) No. 15436/2009	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether HC erred in holding that sexual orientation is a ground analogous to sex and that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is not permitted under Art 15 of the Constitution? (para 2(v)) - Can constitutional morality trump public morality? (paras 2(ix – x)) - The HC has misapplied the doctrine of severability (para 2(xvi –

	<i>n & Ors.</i>		it has been established to protect and preserve Muslim Personal Law prevailing in India.			xviii)) - Islamic law prohibits sodomy (para 5(G))
--	---------------------	--	--	--	--	---

Sl No.	Applicant Name	Number	Background of Petitioner	Main Arguments
1.	Suresh Kumar Koushal & Another	IA No. 5	Astrologers. Petitioners in Main SLP	- Application to implead Ministry of Defence as a party - Cites statements by officials of the Ministry of Defence which question the appropriateness of the impugned judgment and state that there will be harm to the armed forces. In the armed forces, homosexuality is deemed indecent, unnatural behaviour that can lead to a court martial (para 4, 5)
2.	Trust God Ministries	IA No. 7	Registered charitable trust with the objective to preserve and protect the life for humanity and earth. (para 3) For intervention	- Judgment disturbed the basic structure of 377 and opened the door for making laws against public morality and against values of Indian society. - Held dharna's against judgment, protest marches against the judgment (para K, L)
3.	Shyam Benegal	IA No. 6	Film maker, concerned citizen (in support of the impugned judgment)	- The applicant seeks to be impleaded to place his view as a public figure and concerned citizen (para 5) - Applicant states that he represents a substantive body of public opinion which favors decriminalization of carnal intercourse between

				consenting adults, and that section 377 has become an impediment of a more well informed society in the wake of pandemics like AIDS. (para 8)
4.	Minna Saran & Others	IA No. 8	19 Parents of LGBT persons from New Delhi, Bangalore, Mumbai, Pune, Thrissur Distt (Kerala), Chennai and Kolkata. (in support of the impugned judgment)	<p>- The Applicants submit that the viewpoints of those who have an intimate stake in the matter, and therefore have the <i>locus standi</i> to be impleaded in these proceedings namely the parents of LGBT individuals must be considered before this Hon'ble Court (para 27)</p> <p>- The scope of the right to privacy under Article 21, <i>inter alia</i>, includes the right to privacy of the family. Applicants submit that as parents, their fundamental role of providing a loving and supportive family and safeguarding it against arbitrary and unjust intrusion from the state authorities, is hindered by Section 377 (para 28)</p> <p>- The level of harassment and social stigma against homosexuality is so acute that it makes it impossible for families of LGBT persons to cope with the different sexuality of their children. This has led in numerous cases of misguided actions by parents by opting for unscientific aversion and reparative therapies, which operate on the untenable scientific notion that homosexuality is a curable disease. Further, the bias, superstition and outdated medical theories that Section 377 fosters, impedes the creation of a loving and supportive environment for LGBT persons. (para 30)</p> <p>- Section 377 which is a threat to family values, as it directly affects the rights of the Applicants to safeguard their families from illegal and arbitrary intrusion from the state authorities. Section 377 invades the sanctity of the family, home or correspondence and allows for unlawful attacks on the honour and reputation both parents of LGBT persons as well as LGBT persons themselves. (para 32)</p> <p>- Section 377 also discriminates against families of LGBT persons and targets them arbitrarily. The Applicants submit that the said stigma and prejudice is not confined to the LGBT person alone, but envelops the family as a whole. The Applicants submit that therefore</p>

				families of LGBT persons are equally affected by the continued presence of Section 377. (para 35)
5.	Dr. Shekhar Seshadri & Others	IA No. 9	Application for impleadment by 13 Psychiatrists and Psychologists from Bangalore, Delhi, Pune, Panjim, and Kolkata (in support of the judgment)	<p>- The Applicants submit that they are all reputed mental health professionals dealing with a diversity of mental health issues which they have come across in their practice. As psychologists, psychiatrists and reputed academics in the field of mental health, the Applicants share a wide range of experiences in dealing with patients who may be Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender and hence have had considerable expertise in addressing the mental health concerns of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Persons. (para 10)</p> <p>- The Applicants further submit that the existence of Section 377 IPC and its applicability to consensual adult homosexual relations has created a social perception of homosexuality as illegal and abnormal. Thus though homosexuality is a normal variant of human sexuality, it is perceived and treated as abnormal. This larger public climate of intolerance fostered by the law encroaches on the individual rights of LGBT persons and causes severe mental distress and loss of self-esteem. (para 12)</p> <p>- The Applicants are deeply disturbed by the above arguments of the Petitioners, as they are not based on any scientific evidence or principles. The Applicants are of the opinion that the petitioners have made various incorrect and false assertions of scientific 'fact' that can only serve to confuse, misguide and mislead. It is most respectfully submitted that irrationality and prejudice are at odds with the Fundamental duty of every citizen of India under Article 51A (h) of the Constitution of India which is to develop a scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform. (para 25)</p>
6.	Prof. Nivedita Menon & Others	IA No. 10	Application for Impleadment filed by 16 Professors and Teachers from Bombay and Delhi (in support of the impugned judgment).	- That as is evident from their respective records, all the Applicants herein are accomplished academicians and have achieved significant success in their respective fields. They are

				<p>involved in various social causes and believe that they would be in a position to contribute to the proceedings before this Hon'ble Court in the instant case. (para 21)</p> <p>- The Applicants, with their extensive experience and knowledge in the fields inter alia, of sociology, International Law and Political Science and Gender Studies can make a significant contribution to the debate on the issues raised by the impugned judgement, providing insight into the evolution of society and the natural evolution of laws and social mores which had adapted themselves to such social change over time, the world over. (para 23)</p>
7.	Ratna Kapur, Babu Matthew and eight other law professors		Application for impleadment filed by 10 law professors	<p>. It is further submitted that recently, the Centre for Health Law, Ethics and Technology at Jindal Global Law School carried out a survey to assess the impact of the Delhi High Court Naz Foundation decision on homosexuals in Delhi. It was found that most of the interviewees felt that the police harassment and stigmatization by society had reduced substantially as a result of the reading down of section 377 by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court.</p>