

Section 144 CrPC

For Prelims: Section 144, CrPC, High Court, fundamental rights, Citizenship (Amendment) Act

For Mains: Issues with Section 144 CrPC, Issues Arising Out of Design & Implementation of Policies

Why in News?

Recently, the administration of Uttarakhand's Haridwar district imposed prohibitory orders under <u>Section</u> 144 of the <u>Code Of Criminal Procedure (CrPC)</u>. 1973 near the town of Roorkee.

What is Section 144 CrPC?

About:

- This law **empowers the magistrate of any state or union territory in India** to pass an order prohibiting the gathering of four or more people in a specified area.
- It is imposed in urgent cases of nuisance or apprehended danger of some event that has the potential to cause trouble or damage to human life or property.
- This order can be passed against a particular individual or general public.

Features of Section 144:

- It **places restrictions on handling or transporting** any kind of weapon in the given jurisdiction.
 - The maximum punishment for such an act is three years.
- According to the order under this section, there shall be no movement of public and all educational institutions shall also remain closed.
- Further, there will be a complete bar on holding any kind of public meeting or rallies during the period of operation of this order.
- It is **deemed a punishable offence** to obstruct law enforcement agencies from disbanding an unlawful assembly.
- It also empowers the authorities to block internet access in the region.
- The ultimate purpose of Section 144 is to maintain peace and order in the areas where trouble could erupt to disrupt the regular life.

Duration of Section 144 Order:

- No order under this section can remain in force for a period of more than 2 months.
- Under the state government's discretion, it can choose to extend the validity for two more months with the maximum validity extendable to six months.
- Once the situation becomes normal, Section 144 levied can be withdrawn.

What is the Difference between Section 144 and Curfew?

- Section 144 prohibits the gathering of four or more people in the concerned area, while during curfew people are instructed to stay indoors for a particular period. The government puts a complete restriction on traffic as well.
- Markets, schools, colleges and offices remain closed under the curfew and only essential services are allowed to run on prior notice.

Why has this Section been Criticized?

- Gives Absolute Power:
 - It is too broad and the words of the section are wide enough to give absolute power to a magistrate that may be exercised unjustifiably.
 - The **immediate remedy against such an order is a revision application** to the magistrate himself.
- Infringement of Rights:
 - An aggrieved individual can approach the <u>High Court</u> by filing a <u>writ petition</u> if his <u>fundamental rights</u> are at stake.
 - However, fears exist that before the High Court intervenes, the rights could already have been infringed.
- Imposing Prohibition on Large Area not Justifiable:
 - Imposing prohibitory orders over a very large area is not justified because the security situation differs from place to place and cannot be dealt with in the same manner.
 - Prohibitory orders over a very large area were ordered in all of Uttar Pradesh during the protests against the Citizenship (Amendment) Bill.

What has been the Court's Ruling on Section 144?

- Dr Ram Manohar Lohiya case 1967: The <u>Supreme Court</u> held that "no democracy can exist if 'public order' is freely allowed to be disturbed by a section of the citizens".
- 'Madhu Limaye vs Sub-Divisional Magistrate, 1970:
 - A seven-judge Bench headed by then Chief Justice of India M Hidayatullah said the power
 of a magistrate under Section 144 "is not an ordinary power flowing from
 administration but a power used in a judicial manner and which can stand further judicial
 scrutiny.
 - The court, however, upheld the constitutionality of the law, ruling that the
 restrictions imposed through Section 144 are covered under the
 "reasonable restrictions" to the fundamental rights laid down under Article
 19(2) of the Constitution.
 - The Court held that the fact that the "law may be abused" is no reason to strike it down.
- In 2012, the Supreme Court criticised the government for using Section 144 against a sleeping crowd in Ramlila Maidan.
 - The court held that such a provision can be used only in grave circumstances for maintenance of public peace.
 - The efficacy of the provision is to **prevent some harmful occurrence immediately.**Therefore, the emergency must be sudden and the consequences sufficiently grave.
- The Supreme Court also held that such a section cannot be used to impose restrictions on citizens' fundamental right to assemble peacefully, cannot be invoked as a 'tool' to 'prevent the legitimate expression of opinion or grievance or exercise of any democratic rights'.

Way Forward

- Section 144 is a useful tool to help deal with emergencies. However, absence of any narrow tailoring of wide executive powers with specific objectives, coupled with very limited judicial oversight over the executive branch, makes it ripe for abuse and misuse.
- Before proceeding under this section, the Magistrate should hold an enquiry and record the urgency of the matter.
- There is a **need to balance the granting of plenary powers** by the legislature to deal with emergent situations, and the need to protect the personal liberty and other freedoms granted to the citizens under the fundamental rights of the Constitution.

