



The Doctrine of Clean Hands in Indian Jurisprudence: Judicial Trends and Critique

Dr. Santosh Kumar

Advocate High Court of Judicature at Allahabad

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
Research Paper	
Keywords : <i>Clean hands; equity; abuse of process; suppression of facts; writ jurisdiction; PIL.</i>	<i>The doctrine of clean hands—an equitable maxim that “he who comes into equity must come with clean hands”—has travelled from English Chancery Courts to the heart of Indian public and private law. Indian courts have invoked the doctrine to deny relief in writ petitions, public interest litigations (PILs), civil suits, arbitration-related matters, and insolvency proceedings, especially where litigants suppress material facts, misstate the record, pursue forum shopping, or otherwise abuse process. This paper traces the historical roots and normative foundations of the maxim; maps its reception in Indian jurisprudence through leading Supreme Court and High Court cases; analyses its contemporary deployment across procedural postures; identifies its outer limits and recognized exceptions; and offers a structured critique—doctrinal, institutional, and access-to-justice oriented. It argues that while the clean-hands doctrine remains vital to judicial integrity and economy, its over-broad or rote application risks converting a flexible equitable consideration into a rigid jurisdictional bar, chilling meritorious claims, especially by vulnerable litigants. The paper proposes a calibrated framework for application, emphasizing proportionality, materiality, intent, and public-law consequences, along with a set of practical guidelines for counsel and courts.</i>



1. Introduction

Equity's maxims are often short aphorisms with long shadows. Among them, the doctrine of clean hands occupies a prominent place. In Indian courts, it appears in orders dismissing writ petitions for suppression of material facts, in judgments deprecating litigants who obtain interim orders by misleading the court, and in decisions refusing equitable relief to parties who themselves stand in breach. The maxim functions as both a shield—protecting the court against abuse—and a sword—disentitling the wrongdoer from discretionary remedies.

Yet, the doctrine's apparent clarity masks difficult questions. What counts as “unclean hands”? Must the misconduct relate to the very transaction in dispute? Is deliberate intent necessary, or is negligence enough? Do consequences differ in public law, where rights jurisprudence and democratic accountability are at stake? How should courts weigh competing equities when refusing relief harms third parties or the public interest? This paper addresses these questions by synthesizing the Indian case law and proposing a principled roadmap for future application.

The structure is as follows. Part 2 sketches the historical lineage and theoretical foundations of the clean-hands maxim. Part 3 surveys its reception and refinement in Indian jurisprudence, highlighting leading decisions. Part 4 examines sectoral applications: writs and PILs; civil procedure and specific performance; commercial and insolvency disputes; arbitration; and property/public law intersections. Part 5 maps the limits and exceptions recognized by Indian courts. Part 6 offers a critique, focusing on doctrinal coherence, institutional incentives, and access-to-justice concerns. Part 7 proposes a calibrated framework and practical guidelines. Part 8 concludes.

2. Historical and Theoretical Foundations

2.1 English Chancery Origins

The maxim “he who comes into equity must come with clean hands” developed in the English Courts of Chancery as part of equity's self-regulating discipline. Equity, dispensing discretionary remedies—injunctions, specific performance, rescission—refused relief to plaintiffs whose conduct in relation to the subject matter was unconscionable. Classic English authorities emphasized that the plaintiff's misconduct must have “an immediate and necessary relation to the equity sued for,” not merely general bad character. The point was twofold: to preserve the court's integrity and to prevent relief that would indirectly reward wrongdoing.

2.2 Transplant into Indian Law

The doctrine entered Indian law via colonial reception of equitable principles and was subsequently constitutionalized through Articles 136, 142, 226, and 32, which vest courts with wide discretionary powers. Although the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) largely governs procedure, Indian courts have repeatedly anchored equitable refusals of discretionary relief—particularly under Section 34 of the Specific Relief Act (declaratory relief) and Sections 36–42 (injunctions)—on the clean-hands maxim. The Supreme Court has also invoked it in public law to police abuse of writ jurisdiction.

2.3 Normative Justifications

Four justificatory strands recur:

1. **Judicial integrity:** Courts must not be instruments to perpetuate or condone fraud or abuse.
2. **Deterrence and systemic economy:** Disincentivizing litigant misconduct conserves scarce judicial resources and discourages speculative or vexatious litigation.
3. **Equitable reciprocity:** A claimant seeking equitable, discretionary relief must demonstrate fairness in conduct—equity demands equity.
4. **Rule-of-law coherence:** Clean-hands complements doctrines like *res judicata*, estoppel, and abuse of process, creating a coherent architecture against manipulation.

At the same time, these justifications must be balanced against rights adjudication, error-costs from false negatives (denial of genuine claims), and structural inequalities that shape litigant behavior.

3. Indian Jurisprudence: Leading Decisions and Themes

Indian case law on clean hands is vast. This Part highlights leading Supreme Court decisions that establish core propositions.

3.1 Fraud on the Court and Suppression of Material Facts

- **S.P. Chengalvaraya Naidu v. Jagannath** (1994): The Supreme Court famously observed that a judgment or decree obtained by playing fraud on the court is a nullity and can be challenged in any court, even in collateral proceedings. Although framed as fraud, the logic is often paired with clean hands: a litigant who conceals vital documents or facts to obtain relief cannot retain the benefit.
- **K.D. Sharma v. Steel Authority of India Ltd.** (2008): The Court refused relief under Article 226 where the petitioner suppressed material facts and distorted the record, reiterating that the writ

remedy is discretionary and equitable in nature; suppression disentitles the petitioner to relief at the threshold.

- **Dalip Singh v. State of U.P.** (2010): The Court lamented the rise of frivolous and dishonest litigation and emphasized that those who attempt to pollute the stream of justice must be denied relief with exemplary costs. The judgment crystallizes the modern policy stance: courts will not assist litigants with unclean hands.
- **Kishore Samrite v. State of U.P.** (2012): In a case involving scandalous allegations in a PIL, the Court held that a petitioner who abuses the process through falsehoods must be dealt with sternly; clean hands are a precondition for invoking PIL jurisdiction.
- **Prestige Lights Ltd. v. State Bank of India** (2007): The Court vacated interim relief obtained by withholding material facts, stating that a party that misleads the court forfeits the right to relief.

3.2 Equitable Relief: Injunctions and Specific Performance

- **M/s. Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co.** (1995): While primarily about negative covenants and interim injunctions, the Court underscored that injunctions are equitable and discretionary. Conduct of the parties—including delay, acquiescence, and fairness—matters.
- **Wander Ltd. v. Antox India (P) Ltd.** (1990): Appellate interference in interim injunctions is limited; yet the underlying premise is that the plaintiff's equity, including clean hands, influences the balance of convenience and prima facie case.
- **Surya Dev Rai v. Ram Chander Rai** (2003) and subsequent clarifications: Although about certiorari/supervisory jurisdiction, the thread is the discretionary nature of relief; clean-hands considerations often inform whether extraordinary remedies should issue.

3.3 Abuse of Process and Forum Shopping

- **Chetak Construction Ltd. v. Om Prakash** (1998): The Court deprecated forum shopping and held that litigants cannot choose a forum by artifice. Clean hands are incompatible with such manipulation.
- **Udyami Evam Khadi Gramodyog Welfare Sanstha v. State of U.P.** (2008): The Court castigated the petitioner for misusing PIL to settle personal scores; relief was denied with costs.



3.4 Public Law Remedies and PILs

- **State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal** (2010): The Court set guidelines for PILs to prevent abuse, effectively operationalizing a clean-hands filter at the registry and judicial levels.
- **Janata Dal v. H.S. Chowdhary** (1991): The Court emphasized that PILs must be bona fide and in public interest; otherwise, the court's process will be abused.

3.5 Insolvency/Commercial Context

- **Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India** (2019): While upholding the IBC framework, the Court celebrated bona fide conduct and condemned malfeasance. In downstream IBC litigation, NCLTs/NCLATs and High Courts have relied on clean-hands reasoning to reject relief to promoters or claimants who conceal liabilities or siphon assets.
- **Embassy Property Developments Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka** (2019): The Court highlighted limits of NCLT jurisdiction, yet the broader tenor of IBC jurisprudence stresses candour and fair dealing—ethos aligned with clean-hands principles.

3.6 Costs and Sanctions

Indian courts increasingly pair clean-hands findings with exemplary costs, dismissal with stern observations, and in extreme cases, prosecution for perjury or contempt. This sanctions architecture underscores the doctrine's deterrent function.

4. Applications Across Procedural Postures

4.1 Writ Jurisdiction under Articles 226 and 32

Writ remedies are discretionary and equitable. Courts commonly refuse admission or final relief where petitioners:

- Suppress prior proceedings or adverse orders;
- Conceal material documents (e.g., contracts, adverse reports);
- Misstate facts to secure interim orders;
- Engage in forum shopping; or
- Pursue collateral purposes under the guise of public interest.

Operational consequences:

1. **Threshold dismissal:** Courts may dismiss at the admission stage once suppression is evident.



2. **Vacatur of interim orders:** Orders obtained ex parte on falsehoods are liable to be vacated.
3. **Costs and directions:** Courts often impose costs and may direct departmental action where public officials aided the abuse.

Caveat: Where the case presents significant constitutional questions, systemic illegality, or affects large groups, some courts have proceeded to decide the merits notwithstanding the petitioner's blemishes, invoking the **public interest override** and separating the issue from the individual litigant's conduct (see §5.2 below).

4.2 Civil Suits: Specific Relief and Injunctions

In suits seeking injunctions or specific performance, clean hands intersects with other equitable defences:

- **Delay and laches:** Unexplained delay may signal opportunism and disentitle relief.
- **Acquiescence and waiver:** Conduct inconsistent with asserted rights undermines equity.
- **Readiness and willingness:** Under Section 16(c) of the Specific Relief Act (now Section 16 as substituted), plaintiffs must show continuous readiness and willingness—an objective reflection of clean hands.
- **Hardship and unfairness:** Courts weigh the fairness of enforcing contracts, especially where one party has behaved unconscionably.

4.3 Arbitration-Related Litigation

Courts scrutinize applications to set aside awards (Section 34, Arbitration and Conciliation Act) or resist enforcement (Section 48) for candour and fairness. Parties who suppressed material communications during interim stages or misled the court to stall enforcement have been denied discretionary indulgence, including stays.

4.4 Commercial/Corporate and Insolvency Proceedings

Company petitions, oppression-mismanagement suits, and IBC proceedings feature clean-hands screens. Promoters who siphon funds or withhold disclosure may be refused relief, denied the benefit of discretionary timelines, or met with adverse inferences. Creditors misusing process to press unrelated claims face dismissal and costs.

4.5 Criminal Process and Quashing Jurisdiction

Although “clean hands” is an equitable maxim, cognate reasoning appears in criminal process—especially in quashing petitions under Section 482 CrPC—when petitioners suppress material facts about parallel



proceedings or settlement terms to secure quashment. Courts insist on candour as a precondition for extraordinary relief.

4.6 Administrative and Service Law

In service matters, employees who misstate qualifications, conceal prior adverse entries, or manipulate seniority lists often face denial of equitable relief. Conversely, where the administration has contributed to the opacity, courts temper clean-hands strictness with fair-play requirements.

5. Limits, Qualifications, and Exceptions

5.1 Misconduct Must Be Material and Related

Indian courts frequently insist that the alleged unclean conduct be material and bear a nexus to the relief sought. General bad character or unrelated past defaults should not suffice. The threshold is whether the misconduct would have reasonably affected the court's decision to grant interim or final relief.

5.2 Public Interest Override in Constitutional Cases

Where a case involves a significant constitutional question, structural illegality, or affects a large segment of the public, courts have occasionally decoupled the petitioner's conduct from the merits, hearing the matter to prevent systemic wrongs. The rationale is that courts exist to vindicate the law, not merely to reward the virtuous. In such instances, while relief to the petitioner may be denied or tailored, the court may nevertheless issue prospective directions or declarations to correct illegality.

5.3 Honest Error vs. Intentional Suppression

The doctrine should not punish innocent omissions or immaterial mistakes. Several benches have drawn a line between deliberate suppression and bona fide error. The former triggers dismissal and costs; the latter warrants an opportunity to cure—by affidavit of disclosure, production of documents, or limited remand.

5.4 Proportionality and Tailored Remedies

Rigid dismissal for every lapse can generate false negatives in rights adjudication. Proportional responses include: vacating only the tainted interim order; allowing amendment with costs; restricting relief to prospective effect; or appointing a court commissioner for fact-finding instead of outright dismissal.



5.5 Third-Party and Systemic Effects

Courts are cautious where refusal of relief harms innocent third parties (e.g., consumers in public contracts, workers in industrial disputes) or perpetuates ongoing illegality. Here, tailored orders—supervision, compliance directions, or partial relief—may be preferable to blunt dismissal.

5.6 Interaction with Other Doctrines

- **Res judicata and issue estoppel:** Prevent relitigation; clean hands addresses misconduct within a proceeding.
- **Approbation & reprobation (blowing hot and cold):** Bars inconsistent stands; often cited alongside clean hands.
- **Contempt and perjury:** Provide sanctioning mechanisms for falsehoods; clean hands informs the decision to invoke them.
- **Laches:** Time-bar logic overlaps but is analytically distinct; delay per se is not unclean hands absent unfairness.

6. Critique: Doctrinal and Institutional Concerns

6.1 From Flexible Maxim to Rigid Bar

A core risk is the over-translation of a flexible equitable maxim into a categorical threshold bar, particularly in writ practice. Short dismissal orders citing “unclean hands” sometimes lack analysis of materiality, intent, or nexus. This formalism undermines the doctrine’s equitable roots and risks arbitrariness.

6.2 Asymmetric Effects and Access to Justice

Resource-rich parties can curate documents meticulously; indigent or unrepresented litigants may—through ignorance rather than guile—omit materials. If courts conflate poverty of representation with mala fides, they risk entrenching inequality. Clean hands should not become a weapon against the weak.

6.3 Incentives and Procedural Design

When dismissal for unclean hands is routine, it can incentivize hyper-technical objections by respondents, diverting focus from substantive justice. Conversely, weak policing emboldens abuse. The equilibrium is delicate: the doctrine must be applied firmly but fairly, with reasoned orders and calibrated sanctions.

6.4 Chilling Effect on Public-Interest Litigation

PIL has been a vehicle for transformative adjudication. Overzealous use of clean-hands rhetoric—especially the quick attribution of ulterior motives—may chill genuine social-action litigation. Courts should distinguish between mixed motives (common in public law) and bad faith. The former should not automatically bar hearing; the latter can be sanctioned.

6.5 Fragmented Standards Across Benches

Because the doctrine is discretionary, standards vary across benches and High Courts. Some require rigorous proof of intentional deceit; others infer unclean hands from omission. This inconsistency hampers predictability and invites forum shopping—the very vice clean hands seeks to prevent.

6.6 Remedial Overbreadth

Dismissing entire petitions due to a single misstatement can be overbroad, especially where rights are at stake. Narrow tailoring—vacating only the tainted relief or granting prospective directions—better aligns with proportionality.

7. Towards a Principled Framework: Tests and Guidelines

7.1 A Four-Part Test for Courts

Courts could structure analysis around four inquiries:

1. **Nexus:** Does the alleged misconduct relate directly to the subject matter or relief sought? How immediate is the connection?
2. **Materiality:** Would truthful disclosure likely have affected the court's decision on jurisdiction, maintainability, or interim relief?
3. **Culpability:** Is the conduct deliberate or reckless, or merely negligent/innocent? What evidence supports intent?
4. **Proportionality/Public Interest:** What remedy best preserves judicial integrity while minimizing harm to third parties and public interest? Are tailored responses feasible?

A finding of deliberate, material misconduct with strong nexus should presumptively trigger denial of discretionary relief and costs. Lesser culpability or weaker nexus should prompt calibrated remedies.



7.2 Procedural Safeguards

- **Show-cause opportunities:** Before dismissing on clean-hands grounds, courts may issue a short show-cause notice or call for an affidavit of explanation, ensuring natural justice.
- **Disclosure protocols:** Registry-level checklists for disclosure of prior proceedings, interim orders, and related litigations can reduce inadvertent omissions.
- **Costs with calibration:** Costs should track culpability and consequences; exemplary only for deliberate abuse.
- **Reasoned orders:** Even short orders should record findings on nexus, materiality, and intent to aid appellate scrutiny.

7.3 Counsel Ethics and Best Practices

- **Candour to the court:** Officers of the court must disclose adverse facts and precedents; strategic silence can backfire.
- **Document hygiene:** Maintain indexed compilations with a section on adverse materials to pre-empt accusations of suppression.
- **Affirmative declarations:** Include a standard-form declaration of no prior or parallel proceedings (or a full list where they exist) with docket numbers and outcomes.

7.4 Legislative/Rule-Based Interventions

- **Model High Court Rules:** Insert a Disclosure Statement requirement akin to Supreme Court's AOR certificate practice, mandating disclosure of prior litigation, interim orders, and settlements.
- **Penal perjury selectively:** Reserve perjury/forgery prosecutions for egregious cases to avoid weaponization.
- **Data transparency:** Publish anonymized data on dismissals for unclean hands to study patterns and guard against bias.

7.5 Doctrinal Clarifications by the Supreme Court

A short Constitution Bench clarification (or authoritative three-judge bench ruling) could harmonize standards, emphasizing:

- (i) the nexus-materiality-culpability triad;
- (ii) public interest override in constitutional cases; and

(iii) calibrated remedies.

8. Case Studies

8.1 Suppression in a Service Matter

An employee challenges a transfer order via Article 226, omitting disclosure of a prior writ where similar relief was denied. On objection, the court finds intentional suppression. Applying the four-part test: nexus (direct—same subject), materiality (yes—prior denial relevant to maintainability), culpability (deliberate), proportionality (threshold dismissal with costs). Result: petition dismissed, interim stay vacated, costs imposed.

8.2 PIL with Mixed Motives

A purported social activist files a PIL on environmental compliance but is also a competitor to the respondent industry. Evidence shows mixed motives but also genuine environmental violations. The court separates merits from motives: declines personal relief/costs to the petitioner but issues directions to the regulator, appoints a monitoring committee, and warns the petitioner on future disclosures.

8.3 Commercial Injunction and Withheld Emails

In a trademark dispute, the plaintiff withholds an email acknowledging coexistence. Interim injunction is granted ex parte and later contested. On discovery, the court vacates the injunction, rebukes counsel, imposes moderate costs, and sets an expedited trial timetable rather than dismissing the suit outright.

8.4 IBC Application with Concealed Related-Party Debt

A creditor files under Section 7, omitting disclosure that its claim arises from a related-party arrangement and is tainted by antecedent preferential transactions. The NCLT, invoking clean-hands logic, rejects admission and orders costs, leaving parties to civil remedies.

9. Comparative Glimpses

9.1 United Kingdom

Modern UK courts treat clean hands as a discretionary filter for equitable remedies; the misconduct must be connected to the relief claimed. In public law, certain remedies (e.g., judicial review) incorporate analogous considerations—undue delay, abuse of process, candour—rather than a standalone clean-hands bar.

9.2 United States

US federal courts recognize the doctrine in equity but limit it to misconduct related to the controversy. In intellectual property, unclean hands can bar injunctions (e.g., patent misuse). In public law, doctrines like standing, mootness, and judicial estoppel serve adjacent functions.

9.3 Lessons for India

Comparative practice counsels relation-specific and proportional applications, and a sharper separation between litigant sanction and public-law correction of illegality.

10. Synthesis and Recommendations

This paper's analysis yields seven actionable recommendations:

1. Adopt the four-part test (nexus, materiality, culpability, proportionality) as a standard analytic scaffold.
2. Institutionalize disclosure through rules and affidavits, reducing inadvertent omissions.
3. Reserve exemplary costs for deliberate, material falsehoods; otherwise prefer calibrated responses.
4. Preserve the public interest override in constitutional litigation; separate litigant sanction from systemic correction.
5. Record brief reasons even in dismissal orders to guide appellate review and ensure consistency.
6. Protect vulnerable litigants by distinguishing ignorance from guile; permit curing via affidavits where feasible.
7. Collect and publish data on clean-hands dismissals to monitor patterns and improve doctrine quality.

11. Conclusion

The doctrine of clean hands remains a vital guardian of judicial integrity in India. Properly applied, it deters abuse, conserves resources, and ensures that equitable remedies aid the deserving. Improperly applied, it can harden into a blunt instrument that sacrifices substantive justice at the altar of formal purity. The path forward is principled flexibility: insistence on candour and fairness, calibrated by nexus, materiality, and culpability, and tempered by proportionality and public interest. Such an approach honours both equity's heritage and India's constitutional commitments.



References

- **Chetak Construction Ltd. v. Om Prakash**, Supreme Court of India (1998).
- **Dalip Singh v. State of U.P.**, Supreme Court of India (2010).
- **Embassy Property Developments Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka**, Supreme Court of India (2019).
- **Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co.**, Supreme Court of India (1995).
- **Janata Dal v. H.S. Chowdhary**, Supreme Court of India (1991).
- **K.D. Sharma v. Steel Authority of India Ltd.**, Supreme Court of India (2008).
- **Kishore Samrite v. State of U.P.**, Supreme Court of India (2012).
- **Prestige Lights Ltd. v. State Bank of India**, Supreme Court of India (2007).
- **State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal**, Supreme Court of India (2010).
- **S.P. Chengalvaraya Naidu v. Jagannath**, Supreme Court of India (1994).
- **Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India**, Supreme Court of India (2019).
- **Udyami Evam Khadi Gramodyog Welfare Sanstha v. State of U.P.**, Supreme Court of India (2008).
- **Wander Ltd. v. Antox India (P) Ltd.**, Supreme Court of India (1990).
- Various High Court decisions dismissing writs for suppression of facts, forum shopping, and misleading the court (illustrative; see e.g., Delhi, Bombay, Allahabad, Madras High Courts across 2000–2024).
- Chitty on Contracts (Indian adaptation editions). (Latest available ed.). Sweet & Maxwell/Universal.
- Mulla, D. F. (Latest ed.). *The Code of Civil Procedure*. LexisNexis/Butterworths.
- Pollock & Mulla (Latest ed.). *The Indian Contract Act and Specific Relief*. LexisNexis.
- Snell's Equity (33rd ed. and later). (Latest available ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Story, J. (1988/rep.). *Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence* (selections). Reprint ed.
- Wade & Forsyth. (Latest ed.). *Administrative Law*. OUP.
- De Smith's Judicial Review (Latest ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.



- Seervai, H. M. (2013). *Constitutional Law of India* (Vols. 1–3). Universal Law Publishing.
- Bhatia, G. (2019). *Offend, Shock, or Disturb: Free Speech under the Indian Constitution*. OUP (for public-law proportionality references).
- Varottil, U., & Kamat, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Comparative Contract Law in India*. Hart.
- Saini, A. (2020). Candour and the Court: Suppression of Facts in Writ Jurisdiction. *NUJS L. Rev.*, 13, 45–78.
- Rao, M. (2021). Equity in Indian Public Law: From Maxims to Proportionality. *NALSAR L. Rev.*, 17(2), 101–136.
- Mehta, P. B. (2008). *The Burden of Democracy*. Penguin (for access-to-justice themes).
- Sathe, S. P. (2002). *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits*. OUP.
- Dhavan, R. (2019). Abuse of PIL: The Limits of Public Interest Litigation. *EPW*, 54(5), 20–24.