

## Form minority commission with judicial power

<https://www.thedailystar.net/news/bangladesh/news/form-minority-commission-judicial-power-3615781>

Shahriar Kabir, the outgoing president of Ekattorer Ghatak Dalal Nirmul Committee, yesterday said the government's initiative to protect the rights of minorities does not seem sufficient.

"For a long time, we have been demanding the formation of a minority commission. If the government can't do that, we will form the National Minority Commission ourselves," he said.

He made the remarks at the announcement ceremony of the organisation's new executive committee at Jatiya Press Club.

India, Canada, and Australia have national minority commissions with judicial powers. Although there is a National Human Rights Commission in Bangladesh, it is not empowered.

Speaking at the event, Justice Shamsuddin Chowdhury Manik said, "India, Canada, and Australia have national minority commissions with judicial powers. Although there is a National Human Rights Commission in Bangladesh, it is not empowered. We demand a minority commission with judicial powers from the government."

Names of the members of the new 91-member committee have been officially announced after the Eighth National Conference of the organisation.

Shyamoli Nasrin Chowdhury is president of the newly elected committee, while Asif Munir Tanmoy is the general secretary.

"The Nirmul Committee will not make any compromise in upholding the spirit of the Liberation War and the 1972 constitution," said the newly-elected president.

Muntassir Mamoon, advisor of the committee, also spoke at the event.

## Humiliation over NHRC's status

<https://www.deccanherald.com/opinion/editorial/humiliation-over-nhrc-s-status-3033009>

The deferral was put in place by the GANHRI sub-committee on accreditation (SCA) after a peer-reviewed process. It did not downgrade the NHRC to 'Category B' as sought by some international organisations, but it rejected India's request and resisted its diplomatic efforts for lifting of the deferral.

The deferral of the accreditation of India's National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) by the United Nations-linked Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) for the second year in a row is specifically a sign of disapproval of the body's functioning and generally a comment on the country's human rights record. The deferral was put in place by the GANHRI sub-committee on accreditation (SCA) after a peer-reviewed process.

It did not downgrade the NHRC to 'Category B' as sought by some international organisations, but it rejected India's request and resisted its diplomatic efforts for lifting of the deferral. The NHRC had an uninterrupted 'A' grade status ever since the accreditation process started in 1999 till 2016. The status was deferred in 2016 but restored in 2017. It has now been suspended for two years in a row. The next review is likely to take place later this year or early next year.

The grounds for deferral have not been made public but last year's submission by the SCA gives an idea. It had said that the NHRC had failed to create conditions required to be "able to operate independent of government interference."

It had criticised the involvement of police officers in the NHRC's investigative process, terming it a "conflict of interest".

It had cited lack of diversity in staff and leadership, and insufficient action to protect marginalised groups. This could be a reference to the absence of a member of the largest minority religions in the commission. One member, Rajiv Jain, belongs to a minority religion but he is a former Intelligence Bureau (IB) Director identified with the government.

The DG (Investigation) is Ajay Bhatnagar, a former Special Director, CBI. Such associations constrain the working of the commission and adversely affect its credibility. In fact, the appointment of Justice (Retd) Arun Mishra as chairman had also not inspired much confidence. A brochure recently published by the NHRC stated that the "Manusmriti... outlines principles of justice, including punishment proportionate to the crime".

It is difficult for an organisation that vouches by the Manusmriti to have the right notion of human rights. The deferral decision could affect India's ability to vote at the Human Rights Council and some UN bodies and bring greater adverse international attention to the country's human rights record.

The treatment of minorities, situations like that in Manipur and their handling by the government, repressive actions against Opposition leaders, critics and dissenters, and the partisan functioning of bodies like the National Commission for Women have shown the poor human rights situation in the country. India should try to get its status back not by diplomatic manoeuvres but by actually improving the human rights situation in the country and the institutions meant to protect them, especially the NHRC itself.

## After NHRC Loses Its UN Links, India Might Lose Vote at Human Rights Body

<https://thewire.in/rights/after-nhrc-loses-its-un-links-india-might-lose-vote-at-human-rights-body>

India has been repeatedly told of concerns about the lack of diversity in the NHRC, and asked to have a “pluralistic balance in its composition and staff” by ensuring the representation of a diverse Indian society including, but not limited to religious or ethnic minorities.

On May 13 this year, a headline was published which read: “UN-linked body defers NHRC-India accreditation for second year in a row”. Beneath this was the line: “The decision could now affect India’s ability to vote at the Human Rights Council and some UNGA bodies”.

NHRC stands for the National Human Rights Commission and this column is about why its accreditation was deferred. Last year, on March 9, 2023, a group of non-governmental organisations (including mine) wrote to the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), the UN-linked body. We told it to review India’s accreditation status because the NHRC’s lack of independence, pluralism, diversity, and accountability were contrary to United Nations principles on national institutions (called “The Paris Principles”). Taking cognisance of our letter and other civil society submissions, the global body deferred the NHRC’s re-accreditation by 12 months after considering its failure to effectively discharge its mandates to respond to the escalating human rights violations in India. The NHRC was also told to improve its processes and functions, but a year later this had not happened. This is what led to the second deferral of accreditation.

So, what were the things that were contrary to the “Paris Principles”? First was a lack of independence. Both in the appointing of the NHRC’s functionaries and its functioning. The chairperson and other members of the NHRC are appointed by the President, based on the recommendation of a committee consisting of the prime minister, the speaker of the Lok Sabha, the minister of home affairs, the leaders of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, and the deputy chairperson of the Rajya Sabha. However, since 2019, the post of the leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha has been vacant, leaving only a single Opposition voice in the selection committee.

After his retirement from the Supreme Court, Justice Arun Mishra was made the NHRC chair on May 31, 2021, despite strong disagreement by the lone Opposition voice in the selection committee. The second problem was that the NHRC has police officers investigating human rights violations by the State, including by the police.

This is a conflict of interest, not independence from government interference. Despite this being pointed out in the 2023 review, the Narendra Modi government did not begin a legislative process to correct it or to invite a consultation to begin it.

In November 2023, seven former IPS officers were appointed by the NHRC as special monitors. One of them, accused of corruption in 2018 while working as special director of the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), India's federal investigation agency, was given the responsibility to oversee the thematic areas of terrorism, counter-insurgency, communal riots and violence. A former director of the Intelligence Bureau was made a member of the commission.

India has been repeatedly told of concerns about the lack of diversity in the NHRC, and asked to have a "pluralistic balance in its composition and staff" by ensuring the representation of a diverse Indian society including, but not limited to religious or ethnic minorities. This of course was not done in this country, where the prime minister rants against the minorities constantly, including in his election speeches.

Yet another issue was the NHRC's lack of effective engagement with civil society and human rights defenders in India. Towards this end, the NHRC was asked to interpret its mandate in a "broad and purposive manner to promote a progressive definition of human rights", and told to address all human rights violations and ensure consistent follow-up with the state authorities. This may surprise those who have bought this government's framing of the matter, where all those who oppose its violence are "anti-nationals". However, that is not how the rest of the world views it, and proper democracies must engage with civil society.

In India, human rights defenders languish in detention for years without trial under various draconian laws, including UAPA, with not a squeal from the NHRC. This includes those detained in connection with the Bhima Koregaon-Elgar Parishad case for more than five years; Kashmiri human rights defender Khurram Parvez, who has been in detention since November 2021; and Umar Khalid. The NHRC has not taken any concrete steps to respond to the situation of the HRDs or to intervene in a timely manner despite various UN special rapporteurs calling on the Indian authorities to release these individuals. The NHRC has been next to useless on the issue of Manipur, Jammu and Kashmir, communal violence in Haryana and Uttarakhand and other ones that made the headlines. It has not covered itself in glory and the predicament it and the government now find itself in is of their own making. India holds an "A" rating currently and the deferral of reaccreditation means its "A" rating is under threat. That further means that the NHRC stands to lose its voting position in the United Nations Human Rights Council and other bodies. This can only be corrected by doing the right thing, which nobody is stopping the government from doing.

All of us, including all the signatories to that letter, want to see India accredited at the highest level on the global body. However, such an accreditation should be an honest one, reflective of a strong and independent human rights body in India committed in particular to responding to the rights violations by the State. It should not be an automatic right given to the self-appointed “mother of democracy”.

## Why has a UN body withheld accreditation to India's NHRC?

<https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-law/un-accreditation-india-nhrc-9342732/>

What are the Paris Principles and the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions? How does not having GANHRI accreditation affect the National Human Rights Commission?

For the second year in a row, an organisation affiliated with the UN human rights office has deferred accreditation for India's human rights body, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC).

Without accreditation from the Geneva-based Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), NHRC cannot represent India or vote at the UN Human Rights Council (formerly United Nations Commission on Human Rights).

The delay in accreditation can also be cited to raise questions about the independence, competence, and fairness of the NHRC. The NHRC, which was established on October 12, 1993 after Parliament enacted the Protection of Human Rights Act (PHRA), is currently chaired by former Supreme Court judge Arun Mishra.

### What is the accrediting agency?

GANHRI, which represents about 120 national human rights institutions, is responsible for reviewing and accrediting these institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles every five years.

GANHRI acts through its Subcommittee on Accreditation (SCA), which categorises member NHRIs into two groups, 'A' and 'B'. As of November 29, 2023, 120 NHRIs were accredited by GANHRI, 88 of which were given 'A' rank, indicating full compliance with the Paris Principles; the remaining 32 were put under 'B', indicating partial compliance.

### And what are the Paris Principles?

The Paris Principles, formally Principles Relating to the Status of National Human Rights Institutions, which were adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 20, 1993, set out minimum standards that NHRIs must meet in order to be considered credible and to operate effectively.

The Paris Principles lay down six main criteria to determine which NHRIs are functioning effectively, and would receive accreditation from GANHRI.

They are (i) broad mandate based on universal human rights norms and standards; (ii) autonomy from the government; (iii) independence guaranteed by the statute or Constitution; (iv) pluralism, including membership that broadly reflects their society; (v) adequate resources; and (vi) adequate powers of investigation.

These Principles also say that NHRIs should be equipped to receive complaints and cases brought by individuals, third parties, NGOs, trade unions, or other organisations representative of professionals such as lawyers and journalists.

### **What happens if India loses accreditation?**

NHRIs with 'A' status can participate in the UN Human Rights Council, its subsidiary bodies, and some UNGA bodies and mechanisms. They are also eligible for full membership of GANHRI, which includes the right to vote and hold governance positions.

NHRIs accredited with 'B' status can participate in GANHRI meetings, but cannot vote nor hold governance positions.

Unless India is accredited, the NHRC can't represent the country at the UN Human Rights Council, or vote or hold governance positions. India's review has been deferred, with no final decision yet.

### **Why has India's accreditation been put on hold?**

The decision was taken after an SCA meeting held on May 1 at the United Nations Palais des Nations in Geneva. The SCA has such sessions twice a year, and receives detailed briefings on each country. Subsequently, a pre-session is held to ascertain issues for consideration, followed by an interview with each country's human rights institution.

The May 1 meeting was chaired by New Zealand. South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Spain were among the countries that participated.



The committee is yet to release its report. However, last year's report listed the areas where the NHRC was seen as not properly adhering to the Paris Principles. These included a lack of transparency in NHRC appointments, conflict of interest caused by the appointment of police to oversee investigations, and no minority or female representation on the panel.

Also, on March 26, nine human rights organisations, including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, jointly wrote to GANHRI expressing concern about India's human rights institutions. "...The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Volker Türk, [has] raised concerns about the increasing restrictions on the civic space and discrimination against minorities in India ahead of the country's General Elections," the letter said. These concerns were also raised by UN human rights experts who drew attention to "attacks on minorities, media and civil society" in India, it said.

The letter urged GANHRI-SCA to amend the current 'A' rating of the NHRC.

What is India's record of accreditation with GANHRI?

The NHRC was established in 1993, and was accredited for the first time in 1999. It got 'A' rank in 2006, and retained it in 2011. In 2016, accreditation was deferred due to reasons that included the appointment of political representatives, and the failure to ensure gender balance and pluralism in NHRC staff, but the SCA ultimately gave NHRC 'A' status in 2017.

Last year, the SCA withheld India's accreditation again, and gave six reasons for it, including that the NHRC couldn't create conditions for operating without government interference, that there were too many government officials and individuals affiliated with the ruling party in the NHRC.

## Opinion | UN s Double Standard? Why India's NHRC Deserves Accreditation

<https://www.news18.com/opinion/opinion-uns-double-standard-why-indias-nhrc-deserves-accreditation-8898974.html>

Recently, the United Nations-linked Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) delayed the accreditation of the National Human Rights Commission-India (NHRC) for the second year in a row. The decision could now affect India's ability to vote at the Human Rights Council and some UNGA bodies. This decision was taken during the meeting of the Sub Committee on Accreditation (SCA) on May 1, which included representatives from New Zealand, South Africa, Honduras, and Greece.

This is not the first time, as in 2017, GANHRI had granted 'A' status of accreditation to the NHRC after deferring it for a year. The main setback for India is that without the accreditation, NHRC will be unable to represent India at the UN Human Rights Council. While the committee's latest report is still awaited, its previous report cited several reasons what they called the lack of transparency in appointing members to the NHRC, the appointment of police officers to oversee human rights investigations, and the lack of gender and minority representation on the member panel. The deferment raises important questions regarding the process of accreditation, the functioning of the NHRCs in general and specifically taking the case of India, and the possible way forward.

It needs to be understood that even though created at the state or country level, the NHRIs are defined as State organs with constitutional and/or legislative mandates to protect and promote human rights. Despite this, the UN has defined a normative framework for the National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) with an aim to enhance the effectiveness of the international system for the promotion and protection of human rights as mandated under the UN Charter.

In this context, the Sub Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance for National Human Rights Institutions has been bestowed with the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting all NHRIs in compliance with Paris Principles every five years. In this sense, NHRIs are increasingly acquiring an autonomous status under UN human rights treaties which is the product of the cooperative relationship between UN human rights treaties and the 'Paris Principles', an autonomous legal order of, by, and for NHRIs, under the overarching values and principles of human rights protection, democracy, and subsidiarity.

The rationale is that the treaty bodies interact with the NHRIs for strategic reasons as they assist treaty bodies in exercising their functions in a more effective manner.

NHRIs possess competence in various areas, including advising the government, parliament, and other competent bodies on human rights issues; promoting the effective implementation of human rights treaties; and contributing to the activities of international human rights bodies.

Coming back to India, the NHRC was created under the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, which also provides for the establishment of the State Human Rights Commission. Its functions are to protect and monitor human rights as well as investigate and recommend remedies for immediate wrongs and to strive for the development of a human rights culture. The NHRC of India is a well-recognised body and has accomplished many reviews and human rights movements in India.

Considering the delay in the accreditation of NHRC in India, the gaps existing in the accreditation process at the international level need to be addressed by answering the question related to whether treaty bodies recognise the autonomous status of NHRIs only based on strategic and/or sociological reasons, or are they also guided by certain normative demands in recognising such autonomous status? The normative basis of the autonomous status given to NHRIs in UN human rights treaties has not been fully explored. Specifically, the Paris Principles, which constitute the primary source of the legitimacy of the NHRIs, or the relationship between the Paris Principles and UN human rights treaties in a systematic manner.

## **Data: In About 90% Cases Registered by NHRC, the 'Nature of Incident' is Reported as 'Others'**

<https://factly.in/data-in-about-90-cases-registered-by-nhrc-the-nature-of-incident-is-reported-as-others/>

According to various media reports, the GANHRI, a UN linked body, has deferred the accreditation of India's NHRC for the second consecutive year, signalling concerns over India's human rights record. But what do the numbers say about the cases registered by the NHRC?

According to various media reports, the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), a UN linked body, has deferred the accreditation of India's National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) for the second consecutive year, signalling concerns over India's human rights record. National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) with 'A' status can participate fully in international and regional activities. They have the right to speak at the UN Human Rights Council and UN treaty bodies, act as representatives in multilateral discussions, vote, and hold leadership roles in NHRI networks. NHRIs with 'B' status can join GANHRI meetings but cannot vote or hold leadership positions. India's human rights watchdog, NHRC's 'A' status is under the lens now.

India's former Finance Minister P Chidambaram expressed his disappointment on Twitter regarding the GANHRI's decision to decline accreditation to India's NHRC for the second consecutive year. He tweeted, "It is sad – and a shame – that the GANHRI has declined accreditation to India's NHRC. The status of NHRC as an accredited Human Rights body was suspended in 2023 and now again in 2024." He noted that GANHRI concluded the NHRC failed to demonstrate its independence from government interference, calling it a rebuke to both the NHRC and the Indian government.

What is GANHRI's accreditation and why is it significant? Why was NHRC's status deferred? How has NHRC's performance been over the years? This story aims to address these questions.

**GANHRI promotes and strengthens NHRIs worldwide**

Established in 1993, GANHRI, formerly known as the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, is an international body that promotes and strengthens NHRIs worldwide. GANHRI facilitates cooperation among NHRIs, enabling them to share best practices and collaborate on global human rights issues. It provides support, capacity building, and accreditation to ensure NHRIs comply with international standards, particularly the Paris Principles.

The Paris Principles emphasize pluralism, independence, and effectiveness

The Paris Principles establish the minimum standards that NHRIs must meet to be credible and effective. These principles emphasize three key pillars: pluralism, independence, and effectiveness. The Paris Principles outline several key requirements for NHRIs:

**Broad mandate:** NHRIs should be capable of promoting and protecting all human rights.

**Broad functions:** NHRIs should provide advice, report, monitor, handle complaints, and educate on human rights, among other responsibilities.

**Independence from government:** This should be ensured through legislation or constitutional provisions.

**Pluralism:** The composition of NHRIs should reflect the diverse social forces involved in human rights promotion and protection.

**Adequate powers:** NHRIs should be able to initiate inquiries and investigations, gather necessary evidence and documents, consult with NGOs and State institutions, and publicize their reports and recommendations.

**Adequate resources:** NHRIs should have sufficient funding, staffing, infrastructure, and institutional capacity to perform their functions.

**Cooperative work:** NHRIs should collaborate with other State institutions, NGOs, and civil society groups for effective human rights work.

**International engagement:** NHRIs should contribute their knowledge and expertise to international and regional human rights bodies and mechanisms.

Sub-Committee on Accreditation reviews and gives accreditations to NHRIs based on their adherence to principles

The compliance to the principles is monitored and reviewed by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA). It is also responsible for the accreditation. This process involves representatives from NHRIs across the four regions: Africa, Americas, Asia Pacific, and Europe, engaging in a rigorous, peer-based evaluation. NHRIs undergo SCA review when they apply for the initial accreditation, when seeking re-accreditation every five years, and when there are changes in the NHRI's circumstances that could impact its adherence to the Paris Principles.

As of December 2023, GANHRI had 120 members including 88 NHRIs with 'A' status accreditation and 32 with 'B' status accreditation. In accordance with the UN Paris Principles and the GANHRI Statute, 'A' status is given when the NHRI is fully compliant with the Paris Principles and 'B' when it is only partially compliant with the Paris Principles.

NHRC achieved 'A' status accreditation for the first time in 1999

The NHRC of India achieved 'A' status accreditation for the first time in 1999. This accreditation was reaffirmed during reviews in 2006 and 2011. In the 2016 review

process, the accreditation was deferred to the second session in November 2017. During this session, the SCA recommended that the NHRC be granted 'A' status accreditation once again.

In 2023, the review of NHRC was deferred for a year. Although the latest report about the recent deferment is pending, the Sub-Committee identified several areas of concern regarding the NHRC's adherence to the principles in 2023, as outlined below.

**Involvement of Police Officers:** The NHRC's reliance on police officers for investigations, as mandated by the Protection of Human Rights Act, raised questions about its independence from government interference. The SCA recommended amending the investigative structure to remove government secondments, ensuring independent appointment of qualified staff.

**Composition and Pluralism:** The NHRC's composition lacked gender balance and representation from diverse backgrounds, contrary to the Paris Principles. The SCA urged filling vacant positions and amending PHRA to ensure pluralistic representation.

**Selection and Appointment Process:** The NHRC's selection process lacked transparency, broad consultation, and formal involvement of civil society organizations. The SCA recommended a more inclusive and transparent process to enhance independence and public confidence.

**Appointment of Secretary General:** The NHRC's practice of appointing a senior civil servant as Secretary General raised concerns about perceived independence. The SCA recommended amendments to enable independent recruitment for this role.

**Cooperation with Civil Society:** The NHRC's engagement with civil society, particularly NGOs and human rights defenders, was deemed ineffective. The SCA advised enhancing collaboration and engagement outside core groups.

**Addressing Human Rights Issues:** The NHRC was urged to address concerns about reviewing laws, protecting marginalized groups' rights, and handling complaints effectively, ensuring transparency and public accessibility of its positions on human rights issues. The SCA reported that it received a third-party submission highlighting concerns about the NHRC not fulfilling its mandate to review the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act 2010, Citizenship (Amendment) Act 2019, and Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act 1967.

Cases of human rights violations registered in NHRC have increased

Data from NHRC's website and Dataful indicate that the number of cases registered in NHRC has increased from about 76.6 thousand in 2019 to more than 112.3 thousand in 2022, registering an increase of 46%. However, the figure dropped to about 79 thousand cases in 2023, a reduction of more than 29%. In the first four months of 2024, a total of 21.64 thousand cases have been registered.

According to our previous analysis for the period from 2015-16 to 2019-20, there was a steep fall in the number of cases registered by the NHRC. However, in 2020 and 2021, the cases registered have increased to 2015-16 levels.

Among the cases registered between 2021 and 2024, close to 90% in each of the years were registered under the 'others' category. Cases related to women, children, SC/ST/OBCs, custodial deaths, police encounters, and bonded labour made up the remaining 10 to 12%. Categorizing a large portion of complaints under 'others' hampers the analysis of the nature of complaints received by NHRC. This lack of detailed categorization makes it difficult to identify and effectively address specific human rights issues.

Backlog of pending cases has dropped

Data also indicates that the backlog of pending cases has declined over the years. Cases pending and cases disposed of include those from preceding years and the current year. Except in 2021, more cases are being disposed of than those registered each year.

The role of NHRC and its effectiveness have always been a matter of discussion. Reports by various global bodies like the Human Rights Watch (HRW) and Amnesty International have highlighted that there have been human rights violations by the government. The reports of the deferment of NHRC's status come at a time when the Ministry of External Affairs rejected US State Department's report on alleged human rights abuses in India that spoke about the Manipur ethnic clashes. The government maintained that the report is deeply biased and reflects a very poor understanding of India. The US State Department's report criticized the government for taking minimal credible steps or action to identify and punish officials who may have committed human rights abuses.

## उच्च न्यायालय ने जेलों में अप्राकृतिक मौतों के लिए राज्य को जिम्मेदार ठहराया

<https://jantaserishta.com/national/high-court-holds-state-responsible-for-unnatural-deaths-in-jails-3283110>

हैदराबाद: तेलंगाना उच्च न्यायालय ने कहा है कि राज्य सरकार और जेल विभाग साथी कैदियों द्वारा कैदियों की मौत के लिए उत्तरदायी दायित्व से बच नहीं सकते हैं। न्यायमूर्ति सी.वी. भास्कर रेड्डी ने फैसला सुनाया कि कैदियों के संरक्षक होने के नाते जेल अधिकारी ऐसी मौतों के लिए मुआवजा देने के लिए उत्तरदायी हैं। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के आदेशों का हवाला देते हुए, न्यायमूर्ति रेड्डी ने फैसला सुनाया कि राज्य मुआवजा देने के लिए उत्तरदायी था। उन्होंने कारावास के दौरान हिरासत में और अप्राकृतिक मौतों के लिए मुआवजे की मात्रा तय करने का सिद्धांत भी निर्धारित किया।

उन्होंने कहा कि मुआवजे की गणना मोटर दुर्घटना दावा न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा मोटर वाहन अधिनियम के तहत दावों पर निर्णय लेने के मामले की तरह की जानी चाहिए। मौजूदा मामले में, अदालत ने मुआवजे की गणना 7.2 लाख रुपये की। **राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग** के आदेश पर परिवार को एक लाख रुपये का भुगतान करने के साथ, अदालत ने सरकार को 2012 से छह प्रतिशत वार्षिक ब्याज के साथ शेष 6.2 लाख रुपये का भुगतान करने का निर्देश दिया। न्यायमूर्ति भास्कर रेड्डी मेडक जिले की करोला जयम्मा की याचिका पर सुनवाई कर रहे थे, जिनके पति करोला वैकैया पर 4 जुलाई, 2012 को चेरलापल्ली केंद्रीय जेल में आजीवन कारावास की सजा काटते समय सह-कैदी दसारी नरसिमुलु ने जानलेवा हमला किया था। यह कहा गया कि यह घटना जेल अधिकारियों की घोर लापरवाही के कारण हुई, जो हिरासत में रहते हुए हमलावर को धारदार हथियार रखने से रोकने में विफल रहे।