

## मौत के 5 साल बाद आर्थिक मदद : जेल प्रशासन पर उठे थे सवाल

<https://www.navodayatimes.in/news/crime-plus/financial-help-after-5-years-of-death-questions-were-raised-on-jail-administration/183983/>

जेल के विचाराधीन बंदी की मौत के करीब 5 साल बाद पीड़ित परिवार को आर्थिक मदद मिल सकेगी। राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग नई दिल्ली के हस्तक्षेप पर 2 लाख रुपए बतौर मुआवजा स्वरूप दिए जाएंगे। जिला प्रशासन और कारागार प्रबंधन को इस संबंध में उच्च स्तर पर आदेश जारी कर दिए गए हैं। लंबी कानूनी लड़ाई के उपरांत यह संभव हो पाया है। यह मामला उत्तर प्रदेश के जनपद गाजियाबाद से जुड़ा है।

डासना जेल (गाजियाबाद) के विचाराधीन बंदी फरमान अहमद पुत्र नियाज की विगत 19 नवम्बर 2016 को मृत्यु हो गई थी। पीड़ित परिवार पर फरमान की मौत पर सवाल उठाए थे। पुलिस और कारागार प्रशासन को कटघरे में खड़ा किया गया था। तदुपरांत पीड़ित पक्ष ने इस प्रकरण में राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) नई दिल्ली का रुख किया था। एनएचआरसी में याचिका दायर कर न्याय की गुहार लगाई गई थी। एनएचआरसी ने इस केस की सुनवाई के बाद पीड़ित परिवार को मुआवजा राशि का भुगतान करने के आदेश दिए थे। मानवाधिकार आयोग की तरफ से गत 25 फरवरी 2021 को इस बावत जरूरी बिंदुओं पर दिशा-निर्देश दिए गए।

उत्तर प्रदेश शासन ने अब इस मामले में 2 लाख रुपए मुआवजा राशि की मंजूरी दे दी है। यह राशि मृतक फरमान अहमद के आश्रितों को उपलब्ध कराई जाएगी। उप्र शासन के विशेष सचिव सुरेश कुमार पांडेय ने इस संदर्भ में जिलाधिकारी गाजियाबाद और कारागार अधीक्षक को पत्र भेजकर पीड़ित पक्ष को तत्काल मुआवजा राशि का भुगतान करने के निर्देश दिए हैं। मुआवजा देने के उपरांत शासन को भी जानकारी देनी होगी। एनएचआरसी की गाइड लाइन के अनुरूप यह कार्रवाई करनी होगी। अलबत्ता दिवंगत फरमान के आश्रितों को लंबे इंतजार के पश्चात आर्थिक सहायता मिल पाएगी। बता दें कि डासना जेल में आए दिन किसी न किसी विचाराधीन बंदी की संदिग्ध परिस्थितियों में मौत होती रहती है। अक्सर जेल प्रबंधन की कार्यप्रणाली पर भी सवाल उठाए जाते हैं।

## टारगेट किलिंग: भाजपा नेता ने यूएनएचआरसी को लिखा पत्र, कहा- गैर मुस्लिम समुदायों को खदेड़ने की साजिश

<https://www.amarujala.com/jammu/target-killing-in-kashmir-bjp-leader-wrote-letter-to-unhrc-saying-conspiracy-to-drive-out-non-muslim-communities-from-kashmir>

कश्मीर घाटी में टारगेट किलिंग की घटनाओं को लेकर भाजपा नेता अश्वनी कुमार चुरंगू ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार परिषद और यूएन अध्यक्ष को पत्र लिखा है। पत्र में टारगेट किलिंग को घाटी से गैर मुस्लिम आबादी को खदेड़ने से प्रेरित बताया गया है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र से मांग की गई है कि टारगेट किलिंग मामले पर पाकिस्तान और उसके आतंकी संगठनों पर कार्रवाई सुनिश्चित की जाए।

चुरंगू ने पत्र में कहा है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार परिषद चुनाव की तैयारियों के बीच कश्मीर में पाकिस्तान के आतंकी संगठनों ने हिंदुओं और सिखों को निशाना बनाया। यह हमले नस्लीय थे, जिस पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार परिषद को स्वतः संज्ञान लेना चाहिए। चुरंगू ने कहा है कि बीते वर्ष संयुक्त राष्ट्र के समक्ष कश्मीर के जमीनी स्तर के प्रतिनिधियों की हत्या के मामले को उठाया गया था। ऐसे में परिषद को चाहिए कि कश्मीर घाटी में गैर मुस्लिम समुदायों को खत्म करने या खदेड़ने की साजिश पर कड़ा संज्ञान लिया जाए।

यह भी पढ़ें- कश्मीर घाटी: कभी गूंजे थे 'यहां क्या चलेगा- निजाम-ए-मुस्तफा' के नारे, अब मस्जिदों में हो रही अल्पसंख्यकों की सुरक्षा की बात

चुरंगू ने कहा कि हाल ही में राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग ने टारगेट किलिंग की घटनाओं पर सरकार से जवाब मांगा है। इन तमाम परिस्थितियों में संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार परिषद की ओर से भी पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ दंडात्मक कार्रवाई होनी चाहिए।

## RIGHTS DIVIDED

**A** vision divided thrives on contradictions. On the 28th anniversary of the foundation of the National Human Rights Commission, the prime minister criticized partisan attitudes displayed in protests against human rights violations by those who view them through a “political lens”. Bharatiya Janata Party leaders repeatedly accuse activists of being partial to non-BJP victims of rights abuses. Narendra Modi called this “selective outrage”, which demeans the country and endangers democracy. Yet there could have been no definable human rights without political awareness. But the prime minister was referring to the divisive politics of rival parties: observers have speculated that he may have been alluding to the fact that the death of four protesting farmers in Lakhimpur Kheri had aroused furious criticism although two BJP workers died there too. Since the BJP has been countering criticism of the Uttar Pradesh government for Lakhimpur Kheri by suggesting that the protests were politically motivated, perhaps the prime minister gave it a philosophical twist.

After having condemned the political lens, however, Mr Modi listed the ‘basic needs’ of various segments of people that his government had fulfilled so they could acquire ‘dignity’ — cooking gas, Jan Dhan accounts, toilets, housing, 26 month-long maternity leave, outlawing of oral triple *talaq*, and so on. To project citizens as beneficiaries of his government’s largesse, however, is not to dignify them but to suggest that they are not entitled to these. His conception of human rights is divided too. Only when people’s basic needs are met can they aspire to human rights. For Mr Modi, these are not only distinct, but also sequential. So is housing not a right because it is a basic need? Is food more ‘basic’ than justice, and not part of justice itself? Again, can a citizen whose basic needs are unfulfilled not have rights? The prime minister also emphasized — as he has done many times earlier — that the ‘flip side’ of rights was duties. Human rights could thus become conditional — and be arbitrarily granted as concessions — since the duties are not spelt out. The expressed and metaphorical divisions helped the prime minister show off his government’s achievements while suggesting that the human rights hullabaloo is a means to target his party. Or maybe he was just shy: India’s human rights record has declined sharply in the world’s perception.

## सिंधु बॉर्डर पर दलित की हत्या का मामला UN मानवाधिकार उच्चायुक्त तक पहुंचा, सामाजिक संगठन ने की शिकायत

<https://hindi.news18.com/news/delhi-ncr/singhu-border-dalit-murder-case-mission-ambekar-complains-un-human-rights-high-commissioner-office-3802124.html>

सिंधु बॉर्डर (Singhu Border) पर शुक्रवार को दलित युवक लखबीर सिंह (Lakhbir Singh) की बर्बरता से की गई हत्या का मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार उच्चायुक्त कार्यालय (OHCHR) तक पहुंच गया है। लखबीर की हत्या कर उसका क्षत-विक्षत शव बैरिकेड पर लटकाए जाने के निर्मम मामले को लेकर सामाजिक संगठन मिशन आंबेडकर ने OHCHR को पत्र लिखकर हस्तक्षेप की मांग की है। शिकायती पत्र में कहा गया है कि मानवाधिकारों के घोर उल्लंघन और जाति आधारित नृशंस हत्या के इस मामले पर तुरंत संज्ञान लिया जाए।

सामाजिक संगठन मिशन आंबेडकर के संस्थापक सूरज कुमार बौद्ध ने रविवार को संयुक्त राष्ट्र मानवाधिकार उच्चायुक्त कार्यालय को यह पत्र लिखा। उन्होंने पत्र में कहा कि 15 अक्टूबर 2021 को नई दिल्ली के सिंधु बॉर्डर पर एक 35 वर्षीय दलित मजदूर की निहंग समूह निर्वेद खालसा-उड़ना दल के निहंगों ने इसलिए लिंगिंग की, क्योंकि उसने कथित तौर पर सिखों की धार्मिक किताब को छुआ था। उसकी इतनी बेरहमी से हत्या कर दी गई कि न केवल उसका एक हाथ और एक पैर को बेरहमी से कुल्हाड़ी से काट दिया गया, बल्कि आतंक फैलाने के लिए पुलिस के बैरिकेड्स पर सार्वजनिक रूप से उसे लटका दिया गया। इस घटना ने दहशत का माहौल पैदा कर दिया है।

पुलिस मशीनरी ने हमेशा की तरह काम नहीं किया

उन्होंने पत्र में कहा, एक दलित शख्स के साथ हुई इस बर्बरता ने पूरे भारत में एससी/एसटी (SC/ST) के विवेक और आत्मविश्वास को हिला दिया है। उन्होंने आरोप लगाते हुए कहा कि सर्वोच्च न्यायालय, राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग, राष्ट्रीय अनुसूचित जाति आयोग और गृह विभाग जैसे संवैधानिक तंत्र सहित राज्य की पुलिस मशीनरी ने हमेशा की तरह काम नहीं किया।

नियमित रूप से बलात्कार किए जा रहे हैं

सूरज कुमार बौद्ध ने पत्र में कहा कि इस घटना में कई लोग आपराधिक रूप से शामिल हैं, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप राज्य की कानून और व्यवस्था की मशीनरी विफल हो गई है। जातिवाद के कारण दक्षिण एशिया विशेष रूप से भारत अनुसूचित और अन्य निचली जातियों, समुदायों के लिए अपमान, मौत का बिस्तर और गैस चेंबर बन गया है। पत्र में उनकी तरफ से आगे कहा

गया कि भारत में अनुसूचित जातियों और उत्पीड़ित समुदायों के मानवाधिकारों का न केवल घोर हनन हो रहा है, बल्कि उनकी हत्या की जा रही है और उनकी महिलाओं के साथ नियमित रूप से बलात्कार किए जा रहे हैं.

स्थिति के समाधान का अनुरोध भी किया गया है

उन्होंने सिंधु बॉर्डर की घटना को लेकर कहा कि यह जाति आधारित अत्याचार का मुद्दा है, जिसका एक जातीय मूल है, वंश श्रेष्ठता, हीनता की धारणा और एक नस्लीय पृष्ठभूमि है. लिहाजा, ओएचसीएचआर जो किसी भी प्रकार के भेदभाव को समाप्त करने के लिए प्रतिबद्ध है. इसलिए संयुक्त राष्ट्र के इस निकाय को तत्काल संज्ञान लेना चाहिए. उन्हें मामले की स्थिति का पता लगाने के लिए अपनी टीम को तैनात करना चाहिए. बिना किसी पूर्वाग्रह के प्रभावी तंत्र और उपाय सुनिश्चित करने के लिए भारत सरकार के साथ जुड़ना चाहिए. उनकी ओर से इस केस पर जल्द प्राथमिकता के आधार पर गौर करने के अनुरोध के साथ अंतरराष्ट्रीय एकजुटता, तत्काल संज्ञान और स्थिति के समाधान का अनुरोध भी किया गया है.

## SC Panel grills lorry owner in Disha case

<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/telangana/sc-panel-grills-lorry-owner-in-disha-case/article37035357.ece>

The three-member commission constituted by the Supreme Court to inquire into the Cyberabad police alleged encounter killings of the four accused in the rape and murder of Disha, a 27-year-old veterinarian, in December 2019, has found inconsistencies in the statements of Srinivas Reddy, the owner of the lorry used by the accused persons, given to the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), recorded after the incident.

Mr. Reddy was questioned at length by former judge Justice V. S. Sirpurkar, former Bombay High Court judge Rekha Sondur Baldota and former director of the CBI D. R. Karthikeyan, and the commission's advocate Parameshwar.

Mr. Reddy told the commission that his driver and accused Mohammed Arif's phone was seized by the officials of Road Transport Authority, but it was not mentioned in his statement to the NHRC.

When questioned if he had verified Arif's heavy vehicle license before employing him and what he had told the NHRC about the same question, the transporter mentioned that "I do not remember what I had stated to NHRC about Arif's license."

Mr. Reddy had described one of the rape and murder accused, Ch. Chennakesavulu, as having long curly hair which looked like the hair of Sathya Sai Baba.

"When police showed me the video footage of surveillance cameras in which the accused persons movements were captured, I could not identify all of them as the faces were not clear, and sent the same to another driver Jaffar, who identified and told me that it was Chennakesavulu," he said.

On November 28, 2019, Mr. Reddy took the police to the residence of lorry driver Arif at Jaklair in Narayanpet district, which led to the arrest of the latter and three others — Chennakesavulu, Jollu Shiva and Jollu Naveen.

He said that on the night of November 26, 2019, lorry driver Arif called him from Chennakesavulu's phone to inform him that they reached Tondupally toll plaza. "When I asked why Chennakesavulu and Naveen were with him, as the vehicle cleaner was Shiva, Arif told me that they had a party and therefore he brought them," Mr. Reddy said.

Later, the panel grilled the transporter for not paying the Income Tax and not maintaining accounts for his business. They posed 120 questions to him and later commented that he was the 'champaign' of all witnesses in the case.



## Human rights defenders don't tarnish India's image

<https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/india-human-rights-violation-nhrc-7576949/>

An event marking the 28th foundation day of India's National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) revealed much about the current state of human rights in India. By definition, defending human rights — rights that are recognised to reside in every human being and are not conferred by the state — requires vigilant scrutiny of, and curbs on, the power exercised by the state. The NHRC is India's statutory human rights body, intended to act as an independent watchdog to monitor the actions of the state and its agencies. At this event, though, the watchdog could easily be mistaken for a loyal lapdog of the institutions it is supposed to monitor.

The current chairperson of the NHRC is retired Supreme Court judge Arun Mishra, who as a sitting judge had hailed PM Modi as a "versatile genius" and an "internationally acclaimed visionary who can think globally and act locally". Mishra chose the NHRC foundation day as an occasion to lavish Union Home Minister Amit Shah with praise, declaring: "It is due to you that a new era has now begun in Jammu and Kashmir."

Mishra was referring to the abrogation of Article 370 that stripped J&K of statehood. Since then, the Modi regime has controlled the territory of Jammu and Kashmir without even the nominal rituals of democratically elected state-level representation, let alone the right to express any form of democratic protest. The petition challenging the constitutionality of that move has been gathering dust in the Supreme Court for the past two years. In this "new era", Kashmiri Muslim government employees are being summarily dismissed from their jobs without any public enquiry on the grounds of mere "association with" any person who sympathises with the self-determination for Kashmiri people. Further, the "new era" has brought back an old spectre — of civilians being killed by terrorist outfits.

From the dais of this human rights platform, PM Modi took aim at India's human rights defenders. He accused them of seeing "human rights violations in certain incidents but not in other similar incidents" and declared that such a "selective" human rights lens "tarnishes the nation's image". The fact is that India's human rights defenders have held every shade of government responsible and accountable for human rights violations and infringement of civil liberties. Sudha Bharadwaj, a leading human rights defender who is in prison for the past three years thanks to flimsy charges under a draconian law, exposed rights violations in Chhattisgarh's Bastar when the Union home ministry, then under the control of Modi's rival, the Congress, unleashed "Operation Green Hunt" that resulted in the rape, massacre and displacement of Adivasi civilians in the name of combating Maoist insurgents. Human rights bodies like the PUCL and PUDR held the Congress regime accountable for the anti-Sikh riots in Delhi in 1984 just as they held the BJP and Modi accountable for the killings of Muslims in Gujarat in 2002.

In fact, it is Modi who is guilty of the “selective” gaze of which he accuses his critics. He tweets his concern for a cricketer’s thumb injury but is silent when the SUV belonging to the son of his deputy home minister mows down protesting farmers; or a Muslim man is shot by police in BJP-ruled Assam, and his body desecrated by an embedded photographer.

Modi has repeatedly declared that “No Hindu can ever be a terrorist, and if he is a terrorist, he can never be a Hindu.” He said this in an election speech, accusing the Congress regime of having insulted Hindus by charging Pragya Thakur with a bomb blast at Malegaon, a woman he chose to field as an MP candidate from his party. He thus recognises terrorism not by the nature of an act but, selectively, by the identity of the perpetrator. Shah has likewise explained how the selective tool of the Citizenship Amendment Act will recognise undocumented Hindus, Sikhs, and other non-Muslims as “refugees” while helping to weed out undocumented Muslims as “termites”. To protect a whole category of persons from ever being accused of terror charges based on their faith as Modi does; or to declare a whole category of persons as less than human based on their faith as Shah does — this strips entire communities of their rights as human beings, ie, their human rights.



## Editorial: Rights divided

<https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/rights-divided-modi-upset-with-selective-outrage/cid/1834955>

A vision divided thrives on contradictions. On the 28th anniversary of the foundation of the National Human Rights Commission, the prime minister criticized partisan attitudes displayed in protests against human rights violations by those who view them through a “political lens”. Bharatiya Janata Party leaders repeatedly accuse activists of being partial to non-BJP victims of rights abuses. Narendra Modi called this “selective outrage”, which demeans the country and endangers democracy. Yet there could have been no definable human rights without political awareness. But the prime minister was referring to the divisive politics of rival parties: observers have speculated that he may have been alluding to the fact that the death of four protesting farmers in Lakhimpur Kheri had aroused furious criticism although two BJP workers died there too. Since the BJP has been countering criticism of the Uttar Pradesh government for Lakhimpur Kheri by suggesting that the protests were politically motivated, perhaps the prime minister gave it a philosophical twist.

After having condemned the political lens, however, Mr Modi listed the ‘basic needs’ of various segments of people that his government had fulfilled so they could acquire ‘dignity’ — cooking gas, Jan Dhan accounts, toilets, housing, 26 month-long maternity leave, outlawing of oral triple talaq, and so on. To project citizens as beneficiaries of his government’s largesse, however, is not to dignify them but to suggest that they are not entitled to these. His conception of human rights is divided too. Only when people’s basic needs are met can they aspire to human rights. For Mr Modi, these are not only distinct, but also sequential. So is housing not a right because it is a basic need? Is food more ‘basic’ than justice, and not part of justice itself? Again, can a citizen whose basic needs are unfulfilled not have rights? The prime minister also emphasized — as he has done many times earlier — that the ‘flip side’ of rights was duties. Human rights could thus become conditional — and be arbitrarily granted as concessions — since the duties are not spelt out. The expressed and metaphorical divisions helped the prime minister show off his government’s achievements while suggesting that the human rights hullabaloo is a means to target his party. Or maybe he was just shy: India’s human rights record has declined sharply in the world’s perception.

## India s Abysmal Global Hunger Index rank violates right to life ...

<https://www.theleaflet.in/indias-abysmal-global-hunger-index-rank-violates-right-to-life-under-article-21/>

The Vishwaguru's ignominious ranking of 101 out of 116 countries in the 2021 Global Hunger Index (GHI) is an anomaly considering its claims of possessing the sagacity of a world teacher. With a GHI score of 27.5, which is serious, the 2021 report—prepared jointly by Irish aid agency Concern Worldwide and German organisation Welt Hunger Hilfe—has termed the level of hunger in India “alarming”. From 38.8 points in 2000, India's GHI score has precipitously fallen to 27.5. Though the report states that India “has made substantial progress”, it flags the problem of child stunting. It has seen a significant decrease—from 54.2% in 1998–1999 to 34.7% in 2016–2018—but “it is still considered very high”. Besides, at 17.3%, India has the highest child wasting rate of all countries covered in the GHI. The right to food is an inalienable right—whether it is in a democracy or an autocracy or a dictatorship. An abysmal ranking that is only 15 ranks short of the bottom shows how not only this essential right but even Supreme Court judgements, provisions of the Constitution and international laws have been disrespected by successive governments in India.

Though these two Articles, being part of the Directive Principles of State Policy, are not enforceable in court, they could be enforced as expressions of Article 21. In January 2003, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) said during the proceedings of a hearing that the expression ‘life’ in Article 21 “has been judicially interpreted to mean a life with human dignity and not mere survival or animal existence”.

### Supreme Court judgements on the right to food

Much before interpreting the right to life with dignity to include the right to food in its judgment in *People's Union for Civil Liberties vs. Union of India & Others (PUCL)* (2001), the apex court had in a series of judgements observed that the right to food is an essential part of the right to life.

Questioning whether the right to life applies only to protection of limbs or faculties or embraces something more, the Supreme Court in *Francis Coralie Mullin* observed: “We think that the right to life includes the right to live with human dignity and all that goes along with it, namely, the bare necessities of life, such as adequate nutrition, clothing and shelter ...”

In *M/S. Shantistar Builders vs. Narayan Khimalal Totame* (1990), the top court observed that food, clothing and shelter are the basic needs of man. The right to life, which is guaranteed in any civilised society, “would take within its sweep the right to food, the right to clothing, the right to decent environment and a reasonable accommodation to live in”, the court stated.

The court further made its stand clear on how important the right to food is in a civilised society in *Chameli Singh vs. State Of U.P* on 15 December (1995). Observing that the right to live in any civilised society “implies the right to food, water, decent environment, education, medical care and shelter”, the Supreme Court said: “These are basic human rights known to any civilised society. All civil, political, social and cultural rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948, and

In April 2001, when the PUCL filed a writ petition on the right to food before the Supreme Court, the granaries were overflowing while hunger in drought-hit areas was increasing. Later, the case was extended to chronic hunger and undernutrition, and all the states were added to the list of respondents. The PIL argued that since food is necessary for survival, the right to food is an implication of Article 21. The Centre and the states had violated the right to food by not responding to the drought despite storing massive amounts of food grains, the PIL contended, adding that the public distribution system had broken down. Also read: Increasing Poverty In India Makes Zero Hunger Target Unachievable The Supreme Court clearly stated that the right to food is a constitutional right and determined a basic nutritional floor for the millions of poor Indians. In subsequent years in its interim orders, the court reconfigured specific food schemes into legal entitlements and specified the minimum allocation of food grains and supplemental

Mentioning the nationwide impact of the apex court's orders, Colin Gonsalves, the counsel for PUCL, had said: "After the judgment ... the right-to-food campaign has taken off with hundreds of groups joining the campaign. Take the Mid-Day Meal Scheme. The programme had virtually closed down. But after the order, the mid-day meal has been restarted in six to eight states." In a judgement in June this year, the top court again stressed that Article 21 could be interpreted to include "the right to live with human dignity, which may include the right to food and other basic necessities". On the plea of activists Anjali Bharadwaj, Harsh Mander and Jagdeep Chhokar, who had sought implementation of welfare measures for migrant workers who faced a harrowing time during the curfews and lockdowns as the second COVID wave ravaged India, a bench of Justices Ashok Bhushan and M.R. Shah of the apex court said that every state and government should provide food security to impoverished persons. "There has been worldwide awareness regarding the right to food for human beings. Our country is no exception. Lately, all governments have been taking steps and measures to ensure that no human being should be affected by hunger and no one dies out of hunger. The basic concept of food security globally is to ensure that all people, at all times, should get access to the basic food for their active and healthy life," the court observed.

#### International law on the right to food

India's low ranking in the index is also violative of India's international law obligations relating to the right to food. Article 25(1) of the UDHR states that "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing, medical care and necessary social services". The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Committee on ESCR), in its General Comment 12 of 1999, stated that the right to adequate food is "realised when every man, woman and child, alone and in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement". The Committee on ESCR defined the State's obligation when the Food and Agriculture Organization Council adopted the Right to Food Guidelines in November 2004. "Governments must pro-actively engage in activities intended to strengthen people's access to and utilisation of resources so as to facilitate their ability to feed.

Despite the Supreme Court's rulings and our international law commitments making it obligatory for governments to ensure the right to food, India is lagging behind its neighbours Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal in the 2021 GHI. The NFSA is intended to cover nearly two-thirds of the country's population with 75% of rural and 50% of urban population entitled to receive highly subsidised food grains under the Antodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) households and Priority Households (PHH). The Act entitles 35 kg of food grains per AAY household per month along with 5 kg per PHH person per month. The conundrum of wastage of food grains and millions going hungry continues. According to data released by the Union Ministry of consumer affairs, food and public distribution, at least, 1,571 tonnes of food grains was wasted between April and September 2020, when hunger and starvation plagued India due to the harsh lockdown.

## मानवाधिकार आयोग ने डीजीपी को भेजा नोटिस

जागरण संवाददाता, देहरादून : पदक दिलाने के लिए खर्चा पानी मांगने का मामला मानवाधिकार आयोग पहुंच गया है। आयोग ने पुलिस महानिदेशक को नोटिस जारी कर चार सप्ताह के अंदर आख्या आयोग के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करने के निर्देश दिए

हैं। स्वतंत्रता दिवस पर पदक दिलाने के बदले खर्चा पानी मांगे जाने का एसडीआरएफ के एक पुलिसकर्मी का आडियो वायरल हो गया था। डीजीपी अशोक कुमार ने खर्चा मांगने वाले पुलिसकर्मी को तत्काल निलंबित करने के निर्देश जारी किए थे।