

## कोर्ट में हाजिर हुआ एनएचआरसी और सीवीसी के नाम पर ठगी करने का आरोपित

गुड़गांव, 8 सितम्बर (ब्यूरो): राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) और केंद्रीय सतर्कता आयोग (सीवीसी) के नाम का दुरुपयोग कर लोगों को फर्जी कार्ड जारी करने और साजिश के तहत मोटी रकम ऐठने के आरोपित रविन्द्र कुमार 20 लाख के चेक बाउंस मामले में ज्यूडिशल मजिस्ट्रेट फर्स्ट क्लास गुरुग्राम कोर्ट में हाजिर हुआ। कोर्ट ने जमानत मिलने की धाराओं के अधीन मानते हुए उसे जमानत तो अवश्य दे दी लेकिन इस मामले में सुनवाई जारी रहेगी। कोर्ट ने स्पष्ट रूप से अपने ऑर्डर में उल्लेख किया है कि इन धाराओं के तहत जमानत मिलने के प्रावधान को देखते हुए आरोपित को 2 लाख के मुचलके के आधार पर जमानत दी गई है।

हरियाणा के गुरुग्राम निवासी, राष्ट्रीय सामाजिक कार्यकर्ता एवं शिकायतकर्ता सूर्य प्रकाश माथुर

कोर्ट ने 20 लाख के चेक बाउंस मामले में किया था तलब

वैश्य ने बताया कि ह्यूमन राइट काउंसिल आफ इंडिया के नाम से एनजीओ चलाने वाले रविन्द्र कुमार ने एनएचआरसी और सीवीसी के नाम का दुरुपयोग करते हुए कई लोगों से लाखों रुपए की धनउगाही कर इन दोनों ही प्रतिष्ठित सरकारी आयोगों के नाम पर पहचान पत्र (शपथ पत्र) जारी किए हैं।

आरोप है कि रविन्द्र कुमार ने फर्जी प्रमाण पत्र के साथ दोनों ही आयोगों से मान्यता प्राप्त करने से संबंधित अनुबंध पत्र भी संलग्न किए। इस तरह से रविन्द्र कुमार ने दर्जनों लोगों को ठगी का शिकार बनाया है। शिकायतकर्ता सूर्य प्रकाश माथुर वैश्य ने बताया कि रविन्द्र कुमार ने मुझसे भी इसी तरह से ठगी का शिकार बनाते हुए अपने हाई प्रोफाइल बिजनेस और एनजीओ का हवाला देते हुए 20 लाख रुपए ले लिए, हमने विश्वास कर रविन्द्र कुमार को पैसे दे

दिए लेकिन उसने हमारे पैसे नहीं लौटाए। बार-बार मांग करने के बावजूद पैसे देने से इनकार करता रहा।

अंततः किसी तरह उसने 14 मार्च 2020 को 20 लाख रुपए का चेक जारी कर दिया जिसका हस्ताक्षर मिलान ना होने के कारण चेक बाउंस हो गया। 1 माह का समय देते हुए रविन्द्र कुमार को इस संबंध में नोटिस भेजा लेकिन उसने कोई संज्ञान नहीं लिया।

इस मामले को गंभीरता से लेते हुए कोर्ट ने रविन्द्र कुमार को स्पष्टीकरण देने के लिए 4 सितंबर 2023 को ज्यूडिशल मजिस्ट्रेट फर्स्ट क्लास, गुरुग्राम कोर्ट में हाजिर होने का नोटिस जारी किया था। कोर्ट के आदेश के अनुपालन में आरोपी को कोर्ट में हाजिर होना पड़ा जहां से उसे धाराएं वेलेवल होने के कारण जमानत तो जरूर मिल गई लेकिन इस मामले में कोर्ट की सुनवाई जारी रहेगी और आरोपी को चेक बाउंस मामले में स्पष्टीकरण देना होगा।

## Two ex-cops eye tickets for same seat in upcoming Raj elections

<https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/two-ex-cops-eye-tickets-for-same-seat-in-upcoming-raj-elections-101694201257787.html>

Two former police officers from the Central Bureau of Investigation and Delhi Police are among the many aspirants for tickets in the Rajasthan assembly election that will be held later this year. Both are trying for a ticket from the same assembly constituency, Ramgarh (no 67), and from the same party, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP).

Two former police officers eye tickets from the same seat of Ramgarh constituency in the upcoming Rajasthan elections. (ANI)

There are other similarities as well between Mahesh Bhardwaj, a former Delhi police officer took voluntary retirement on August 1 and joined the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) later in the month , and ML Sharma, who retired as the special director of CBI in 2008, said he will formally join the party in a day or two. Sharma was later appointed Central Information Commissioner between 2008 and 2013.

Both Indian Police Service (IPS) officers were part of probes in high-profile criminal and anti-corruption cases. Both hail from Alwar in Rajasthan. Both were posted in Delhi for much of their career. And both opted for voluntary retirement towards the end of their careers.

The election in the Ramgarh constituency is significant in the backdrop of the recent communal violence in Nuh, Haryana, which shares its border with Ramgarh constituency. The current MLA is Shafia Zubair of the Congress party.

Bhardwaj has served in the Delhi anti-corruption unit, as personal security officer (PSO) of Indian President, and also been part of the NHRC team appointed by the Supreme Court to probe alleged fake encounters in Manipur. Sharma during this decades-long stint with CBI probed three hijackings including that of IC814 in 1999, the 1995 assassination of Punjab chief minister Beant Singh , and the ISRO espionage case.

“As a bureaucrat or a police officer, there is a limit when it comes to serving the people. This is why I decided to take the plunge and join politics. I have been meeting people of the constituency every day and I am in touch with senior party leaders. I think the time is right to join politics and serve my people here. And there is no party better than the BJP,” Sharma said.

Bhardwaj, who retired as additional commissioner in Delhi police, said he too has been actively meeting people since the day he retired. “My police job offered a limited canvas. Politics will offer a bigger canvas to serve the people of my native district. India is the

biggest democracy and BJP is the largest party. I decided to take plunge into politics and join the party months before the election.”

The two former officers are aware that they are trying for a ticket from the same constituency. Sharma said any person is free to contest and seek a ticket. “I have met party leaders and have also started campaigning in the area. I am not only from Alwar but also from the Ramgarh constituency and know the issues well.”

Bhardwaj said, “I am also trying for a ticket from Alwar constituency. I am aware Sharma is looking to contest from Ramgarh. It is up to the party to decide who it thinks is the suitable candidate.”

## **Joint Letter - India: Concern regarding the Asia-Pacific Forum Conference to be hosted by the National Human Rights Commission of India (NHRCI) in September 2023**

<https://www.frontlinedefenders.org/en/statement-report/joint-letter-india-concern-regarding-asia-pacific-forum-conference-be-hosted>

We write to you with great concern about the proposed Asia-Pacific Forum Conference of national human rights institutions of 26 countries scheduled to be hosted by the National Human Rights Commission of India (NHRCI) in New Delhi on September 20-21, 2023. We are alarmed that the NHRCI has been chosen as the host of this prestigious conference, given its disappointing stance on grave human rights violations in the country in the recent past. As you must be well aware, in March 2023, the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) deferred the re-accreditation application of the NHRCI by one year, raising concerns regarding its functioning, appointment procedure, lack of pluralism, independence, transparency, and commitment to address human rights violations. It is therefore unsettling that the NHRCI is being provided the platform to host the national human rights institutions of 26 countries of the Asia-Pacific region, which amounts to an endorsement of its sub-par performance in protection and promotion of human rights.

The SCA had also deferred the re-accreditation of the NHRCI in 2016 for a period of one year and had only granted it the 'A' status in 2017 after assurances that its recommendations would be seriously considered and reflected in the composition and functions of the Commission. However, in the years following 2017, the role of the NHRCI has consistently regressed—a fact reiterated by the SCA in 2023. Ahead of the review of NHRCI's accreditation by the SCA, seven international human rights organizations had written to the Chairperson of GANHRI, raising concerns regarding the inefficiency of the NHRCI and its non-compliance with the United Nations Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles).

On July 4, 2023, the Supreme Court of India sought a response from the Union Government based on a petition highlighting three vacant positions in the NHRCI—namely of two judicial members and a female member. These positions have been vacant since September 11, 2021, April 4, 2022 and January 4, 2023 respectively, severely impacting the Commission's ability to effectively engage with human rights issues in the country. According to a 2019 amendments to the Protection of Human Rights Act (PHRA) , the members of the NHRCI must include a chairperson who is a former Chief Justice of India or a judge of the Supreme Court, one member who is a current or former judge of the Supreme Court, one member who is a current or former

Chief Justice of a high court, and three members out of which at least one shall be a woman to be appointed from among persons having knowledge of, or practical experience in, matters relating to human rights.

However, in March 2023, the SCA while deferring the re-accreditation of the NHRCI noted that the 2019 amendments were not enough to fulfil “the pluralism requirements of the Paris Principles.” The SCA recommended that the vacant positions of the NHRCI should be filled without further delays and in a way that reflects “pluralism” and should represent India’s religious and ethnic minorities.

The SCA also criticised the appointment process enlisted by the PHRA amendment, noting that the selection committee did not allow a proper engagement with civil society, and reiterated the importance of the “formalisation of a clear, transparent, and participatory selection and appointment process”. Currently, members of the NHRCI are appointed by the President based on the recommendation of a committee consisting of the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the Lok Sabha (House of the People) , the Minister of Home Affairs, the Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha, the Leader of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha (Council of States), and the Deputy Chairperson of the Rajya Sabha. This had led to the appointment of members that have been sympathetic to the ruling party and share their political sentiments. This appointment process also reflects poorly in the light of the SCA recommendation to ensure that the NHRCI is able to “operate independent of government interference”.

Along with the NHRCI’s less than satisfactory composition, appointment procedure, pluralism and non-partisan representation, its complete silence on grave issues of human rights violations in the country, including but not limited to—the attacks faced by religious and caste minorities, the forced evictions and demolitions undertaken with complete impunity, the consistent persecution of human rights defenders, the demonization of critical journalists by Indian authorities and government-aligned media outlets, the repression on dissent, freedom of expression, and peaceful assembly, and the arbitrary detentions, travel restrictions and silencing faced by human rights defenders, activists, and civilians in Kashmir has been deeply disappointing. In recent months, the state of Manipur in the Northeast of the country has seen devastating communal violence and attacks against the state’s minority Kuki tribe. The lack of intervention by the NHRCI, even in the face of grave and disturbing allegations of sexual and gender-based violence against women in these tribes , has aided the impunity with which the rampant human rights violations by dominant Hindu Meitei community are being carried out in Manipur. After the Supreme Court of India took suo-moto cognizance of the issue, the NHRCI reluctantly sent a notice seeking a response from the government of Manipur on 24 July 2023 after a video of two Kuki women being paraded naked by a mob of Hindu Meitei men surfaced two and a half months after the violence began in Manipur causing public outrage.

Given these concerns regarding the functioning of India's foremost human rights commission, we are surprised to learn that it has been chosen as the host for the prestigious Asia-Pacific conference. While India plays an important geopolitical role in the Asia-Pacific region, especially within South Asia, it is also crucial that the NHRIs in the region hold it accountable for its lack of action regarding violations of human rights and essential freedoms, rather than providing it an opportunity to whitewash its disregard and non-compliance with international human rights standards.

We urge you to reconsider your decision in choosing NHRCI as the host for the conference and also call upon it to adhere to the recommendations made by the SCA and the larger civil society in India to fulfil its mandate to protect and support human rights in the country.

## सोनभद्र में बच्चों की मौत के मामले में मानवाधिकार आयोग ने दर्ज किया केस

<https://samtamarg.in/2023/09/08/human-rights-commission-registered-a-case-regarding-the-death-of-children-in-sonbhadra/>

# आईपीएफ के महासचिव दिनकर कपूर के पत्र पर हुई कार्रवाई

7 सितंबर। बेलहथी गांव के खुटंहा टोला में हुई बच्चों की मौत के मामले में राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग ने केस दर्ज कर कार्रवाई शुरू कर दी है। ऑल इंडिया पीपुल्स फ्रंट के उत्तर प्रदेश महासचिव दिनकर कपूर की शिकायत पर डायरी संख्या 126976/ सीआर/2023 आयोग में दर्ज किया गया है। शिकायती पत्र में आईपीएफ ने आरोप लगाया था कि प्रशासनिक लापरवाही के कारण बेलहथी गांव के खुटंहा और बड़वान टोला में बच्चों की मौतें हुई हैं और दर्जनों बच्चे बीमार पड़े हुए हैं। इन दोनों टोलों में अभी भी सड़क, शुद्ध पेयजल और स्वास्थ्य सुविधाओं का अभाव है। पूर्व में इस संबंध में मानवाधिकार आयोग द्वारा दिए गए दिशा-निर्देशों का शासन और प्रशासन ने पालन नहीं किया। नतीजतन यह दुखद घटना हुई है।

आईपीएफ नेता ने बताया कि अब डीपीआरओ के नेतृत्व में गई प्रशासनिक टीम ने भी यह स्वीकार किया है कि सड़क न होने से शुद्ध पेयजल की व्यवस्था करने व इलाज का इंतजाम करने में बेहद कठिनाई हो रही है। प्रशासनिक अधिकारियों की इस स्वीकृति के बाद तत्काल खुटंहा तथा बड़वान में जाने के लिए सड़क का निर्माण कराया जाए, शुद्ध पेयजल के लिए आरओ प्लांट लगाया जाए और पूर्व में मानवाधिकार आयोग के निर्देशों के अनुरूप रजनी टोला में प्राथमिक स्वास्थ्य केंद्र खोला जाए व मृतक बच्चों को मुआवजा दिया जाए।

# An overhaul, the criminal law Bills, and the big picture

**T**he central government introduced three Bills in Parliament in August. Called the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 and the Bharatiya Sakshya (BS) Bill, 2023 they are to replace the existing Indian Penal Code, 1860, the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), 1973 and the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, respectively. Though some amendments have been made and gaps filled through judicial pronouncements, the statutes have stood the test of time. It is worth examining how the proposed changes will impact law enforcement agencies.

## The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita

There is an explicit provision in the BNSS on the registration of a cognisable offence in any police station, irrespective of the area where the offence is committed. Though this practice (known as recording first information report, or FIR at Zero) has been in use for many years now, its formal inclusion in the BNSS may help complainants get their cases registered as a matter of right without running around.

A provision has been added to permit the conduct of a preliminary inquiry to ascertain the existence of a *prima facie* case even if the information discloses commission of a cognisable offence punishable with more than three years but less than seven years of imprisonment. This is at variance with the ratio of the Supreme Court judgment in *Lalita Kumari versus Govt. of Uttar Pradesh* (2013), where it was held that the police have no option but to register an FIR if the information discloses commission of a cognisable offence. Though certain categories were carved out to conduct a preliminary inquiry, this was only to ascertain commission of a cognisable offence and not check their truthfulness.

As there does not seem to be an intelligent differentia vis-à-vis the rest of the cognisable cases with overall objective of the provision, this differentiation may not stand scrutiny in constitutional courts. Nevertheless, this clause has advantages and disadvantages. The parties at dispute may arrive at a compromise in the given limit of 14 days to conduct a preliminary inquiry, or cases may not turn out to be true, *prima facie*, to proceed further. On the other hand, the police may misuse this period and avoid registering even true cases.

All provisions of the CrPC on arrest have been retained in the BNSS. It would have been appropriate to include the ratio of the Supreme Court judgment in *Armesh Kumar versus State of Bihar* (2014) to justify an arrest by making it mandatory for the police officer to mention reasons of arrest supported with justifiable material, and for the judicial magistrate to record satisfaction and make it a formal part of the BNSS.

A new clause says that for offences punishable with less than three years of imprisonment, an arrest could be done only with the prior permission of Deputy Superintendent of Police if



**R.K. Vij**

is a retired Indian Police Service officer

the accused person is infirm or is aged over 60. This may provide some relief to these two categories of persons provided the Deputy Superintendent of Police uses the clause judicially.

The new Codes provide for handcuffing in at least a dozen categories of persons who are accused of serious offences *inter alia* such as one who commits a terrorist act, murder, rape, acid attack or offence against the state. This is sure to help police, who may be short staffed, to secure their custody. But the enabling section that guides handcuffing has not changed. It says that 'the person arrested shall not be subjected to more restraint than is necessary to prevent his escape'. Therefore, the investigating officer will still have to justify handcuffing with the possibility of escape (or physical attack) when such criminals are produced before court. Since the constitutional provision and enabling provision of the law remain unaltered, the Supreme Court's guidelines on handcuffing will still prevail.

## At the scene of crime

The new Sanhita provides for a mandatory visit of the crime scene by a forensic expert and the collection of forensic evidence for offences punishable with more than seven years of imprisonment. But on realisation of the ground reality (of limited forensic infrastructure at field level), a maximum five years of leverage has been given to State governments to bring this clause into operation. Therefore, unless State governments commit themselves to the provision of sufficient resources for the development of forensic infrastructure (technology and manpower), the impact of this change may not be visible soon. The Sanhita rightly encourages the use of audio-video means in recording the various steps of investigation; this includes searches. However, the preferred use of smartphones (as recommended) has its limitations. The Supreme Court in *Shafiqi Mohammad vs The State Of Himachal Pradesh* (2018) directed the Ministry of Home Affairs and States to develop facilities for the videography and photography of crime scenes during investigation at the level of the police station. A pilot project is in progress, and this needs to be taken forward to ensure that the provisions of the new Code are implemented in their true spirit.

Despite a ban on the two-finger test in a case of rape, and this test having been termed by the Supreme Court to be unscientific and violative of the dignity and privacy of a rape victim/survivor (in *Lillu @ Rajesh & Anr vs State Of Haryana*, 2013), the ban does not have a place in the Code. Since the Union Ministry of Health and Family Welfare had also issued similar instructions, with guidelines for the medical examination, this was a good opportunity for the central government to have ensured compliance of its own instructions in a legal way.

On the disclosure of identity of victim/survivor of rape, the provision of giving authorisation (to

disclose identity) to the next of kin in case the victim is minor, may also be omitted as the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, which exclusively deals with this issue and does not have a similar provision. The Supreme Court in *Nipun Saxena vs Union Of India* (2018) also expressed reservations as the next of kin may not be an appropriate party to delegate such authority.

## Duration of police custody

A provision in the Sanhita that has raised the eyebrows of critics is the increase in the period of police custody exceeding 15 days, as provided in the CrPC. This may help the police to interrogate an accused person again if additional evidence is found during an investigation. However, there are two caveats to this provision. First, there must be adequate grounds to permit an extension. Second, the 15 day limit can be exceeded only after the initial 40 days or 60 days out of a total detention of 60 days or 90 days (depending on whether an offence is punishable with imprisonment of up to 10 years, or more). The accused will still be eligible to be released on default bail after a total detention of 60 days or 90 days, as provided in the CrPC. Thus, the discretion to permit additional police custody rests with the judiciary.

The Sanhita also proposes enlarging the scope of judicial inquiry into suspicious deaths by including dowry deaths, but relaxes the provision of the mandatory recording of statement of a woman, a male under the age of 15 or above 60 (65 years in the CrPC) at the place of their residence based on their willingness. It is hoped that this provision is not misused by the police, especially in crimes against women and children.

A standing order that could have been included in the Sanhita with respect to inquest is the videography and photography of a post-mortem, particularly in cases where it is a custodial death or is a death caused in an exchange of fire with the police or other authorities. The Supreme Court and the National Human Rights Commission of India have repeatedly asked States to comply with such instructions. Another observation of the Court to make a spot sketch of the scene of crime drawn on scale by a draftsman in order to make it admissible in court, could also be included in the Sanhita to improve the quality of investigation.

Overall, some of the proposed changes are definitely progressive in nature, but cannot be termed as path-breaking or radical. What must not be forgotten is that police stations are generally under-staffed, have poor mobility, insufficient training infrastructure and poor housing facilities. Police personnel work under stressful conditions. Therefore, the colonial mindset will go only if police reformation is taken up in its entirety and not just by tweaking some provisions of the applicable laws.

While some of the proposed changes are progressive, the larger issue is about the need for police reformation taken up in its entirety

The views expressed are personal



# An overhaul, the criminal law Bills, and the big picture

**T**he central government introduced three Bills in Parliament in August. Called the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 and the Bharatiya Sakshya (BS) Bill, 2023 they are to replace the existing Indian Penal Code, 1860, the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), 1973 and the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, respectively. Though some amendments have been made and gaps filled through judicial pronouncements, the statutes have stood the test of time. It is worth examining how the proposed changes will impact law enforcement agencies.

## The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita

There is an explicit provision in the BNSS on the registration of a cognisable offence in any police station, irrespective of the area where the offence is committed. Though this practice (known as recording first information report, or FIR at Zero) has been in use for many years now, its formal inclusion in the BNSS may help complainants get their cases registered as a matter of right without running around.

A provision has been added to permit the conduct of a preliminary inquiry to ascertain the existence of a *prima facie* case even if the information discloses commission of a cognisable offence punishable with more than three years but less than seven years of imprisonment. This is at variance with the ratio of the Supreme Court judgment in *Lalita Kumari versus Govt. of Uttar Pradesh* (2013), where it was held that the police have no option but to register an FIR if the information discloses commission of a cognisable offence. Though certain categories were carved out to conduct a preliminary inquiry, this was only to ascertain commission of a cognisable offence and not check their truthfulness.

As there does not seem to be an intelligent differentia vis-à-vis the rest of the cognisable cases with overall objective of the provision, this differentiation may not stand scrutiny in constitutional courts. Nevertheless, this clause has advantages and disadvantages. The parties at dispute may arrive at a compromise in the given limit of 14 days to conduct a preliminary inquiry, or cases may not turn out to be true, *prima facie*, to proceed further. On the other hand, the police may misuse this period and avoid registering even true cases.

All provisions of the CrPC on arrest have been retained in the BNSS. It would have been appropriate to include the ratio of the Supreme Court judgment in *Armesh Kumar versus State of Bihar* (2014) to justify an arrest by making it mandatory for the police officer to mention reasons of arrest supported with justifiable material, and for the judicial magistrate to record satisfaction and make it a formal part of the BNSS.

A new clause says that for offences punishable with less than three years of imprisonment, an arrest could be done only with the prior permission of Deputy Superintendent of Police if



**R.K. Vij**

is a retired Indian Police Service officer

the accused person is infirm or is aged over 60. This may provide some relief to these two categories of persons provided the Deputy Superintendent of Police uses the clause judiciously.

The new Codes provide for handcuffing in at least a dozen categories of persons who are accused of serious offences *inter alia* such as one who commits a terrorist act, murder, rape, acid attack or offence against the state. This is sure to help police, who may be short staffed, to secure their custody. But the enabling section that guides handcuffing has not changed. It says that 'the person arrested shall not be subjected to more restraint than is necessary to prevent his escape'. Therefore, the investigating officer will still have to justify handcuffing with the possibility of escape (or physical attack) when such criminals are produced before court. Since the constitutional provision and enabling provision of the law remain unaltered, the Supreme Court's guidelines on handcuffing will still prevail.

## At the scene of crime

The new Sanhita provides for a mandatory visit of the crime scene by a forensic expert and the collection of forensic evidence for offences punishable with more than seven years of imprisonment. But on realisation of the ground reality (of limited forensic infrastructure at field level), a maximum five years of leverage has been given to State governments to bring this clause into operation. Therefore, unless State governments commit themselves to the provision of sufficient resources for the development of forensic infrastructure (technology and manpower), the impact of this change may not be visible soon. The Sanhita rightly encourages the use of audio-video means in recording the various steps of investigation; this includes searches. However, the preferred use of smartphones (as recommended) has its limitations. The Supreme Court in *Shafiqi Mohammad vs The State Of Himachal Pradesh* (2018) directed the Ministry of Home Affairs and States to develop facilities for the videography and photography of crime scenes during investigation at the level of the police station. A pilot project is in progress, and this needs to be taken forward to ensure that the provisions of the new Code are implemented in their true spirit.

Despite a ban on the two-finger test in a case of rape, and this test having been termed by the Supreme Court to be unscientific and violative of the dignity and privacy of a rape victim/survivor (in *Lillu @ Rajesh & Anr vs State Of Haryana*, 2013), the ban does not have a place in the Code. Since the Union Ministry of Health and Family Welfare had also issued similar instructions, with guidelines for the medical examination, this was a good opportunity for the central government to have ensured compliance of its own instructions in a legal way.

On the disclosure of identity of victim/survivor of rape, the provision of giving authorisation (to

disclose identity) to the next of kin in case the victim is minor, may also be omitted as the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, which exclusively deals with this issue and does not have a similar provision. The Supreme Court in *Nipun Saxena vs Union Of India* (2018) also expressed reservations as the next of kin may not be an appropriate party to delegate such authority.

## Duration of police custody

A provision in the Sanhita that has raised the eyebrows of critics is the increase in the period of police custody exceeding 15 days, as provided in the CrPC. This may help the police to interrogate an accused person again if additional evidence is found during an investigation. However, there are two caveats to this provision. First, there must be adequate grounds to permit an extension. Second, the 15 day limit can be exceeded only after the initial 40 days or 60 days out of a total detention of 60 days or 90 days (depending on whether an offence is punishable with imprisonment of up to 10 years, or more). The accused will still be eligible to be released on default bail after a total detention of 60 days or 90 days, as provided in the CrPC. Thus, the discretion to permit additional police custody rests with the judiciary.

The Sanhita also proposes enlarging the scope of judicial inquiry into suspicious deaths by including dowry deaths, but relaxes the provision of the mandatory recording of statement of a woman, a male under the age of 15 or above 60 (65 years in the CrPC) at the place of their residence based on their willingness. It is hoped that this provision is not misused by the police, especially in crimes against women and children.

A standing order that could have been included in the Sanhita with respect to inquest is the videography and photography of a post-mortem, particularly in cases where it is a custodial death or is a death caused in an exchange of fire with the police or other authorities. The Supreme Court and the National Human Rights Commission of India have repeatedly asked States to comply with such instructions. Another observation of the Court to make a spot sketch of the scene of crime drawn on scale by a draftsman in order to make it admissible in court, could also be included in the Sanhita to improve the quality of investigation.

Overall, some of the proposed changes are definitely progressive in nature, but cannot be termed as path-breaking or radical. What must not be forgotten is that police stations are generally under-staffed, have poor mobility, insufficient training infrastructure and poor housing facilities. Police personnel work under stressful conditions. Therefore, the colonial mindset will go only if police reformation is taken up in its entirety and not just by tweaking some provisions of the applicable laws.

While some of the proposed changes are progressive, the larger issue is about the need for police reformation taken up in its entirety

*The views expressed are personal*