

Criminal Laws (Rajasthan Amendment) Ordinance, 2017

Why in news?

\n\n

The Rajasthan government has recently brought an ordinance to shield judges and bureaucrats facing allegations of corruption from probe.

\n\n

What are the provisions?

\n\n

\n

- The Rajasthan government recently passed Criminal Laws (Rajasthan Amendment) Ordinance, 2017.

\n

- It is now sought to be made into a law.

\n

- It protects serving and former judges, magistrates and public servants from being investigated for on-duty action, without government's prior sanction.

\n

- It provides 180 days immunity to the officers.

\n

- If there is no decision on the sanction request after this stipulated time period, it will automatically mean that sanction has been granted.

\n

- In addition, it prevents the media from reporting on accusations on such persons till the sanction for probe is obtained.

\n

- Violating this clause would call for two years imprisonment.

\n

\n\n

What is the concern?

\n\n

\n

- **Corruption** - These changes seem to be increasingly shielding the public officials from corruption cases.

- \n
- Insulating honest officials from frivolous or motivated charges of wrongdoing is justifiable.
- \n
- However, prosecution for disclosing the identity of the public servants concerned offers an unjustifiable protection to erring officials.
- \n
- Also this special protection to those in power, in instances of corruption, seems to go against Article 14 of the Constitution, conferring equal rights in front of the law.
- \n
- **Media freedom** - This is the first time a section prescribing punishment for disclosure is being introduced in India.
- \n
- It is a grave threat to media freedom and the public's right to know.
- \n
- **Investigation** - Provisions in CrPC and Prevention of Corruption Act already make prior sanction mandatory, before a court can take cognizance of a public servant corruption case.
- \n
- In addition to this, the ordinance, also restrains judicial magistrates from ordering an investigation without prior sanction.
- \n
- This could hamper a possible probe, as no investigating agency can approach a sanctioning authority without gathering any material.
- \n

\n\n

What should be done?

\n\n

- \n
- Noticeably, the Supreme Court had earlier struck down a statutory provision for prior government clearance for a CBI probe against officials of the rank of joint secretary and above.
- \n
- This verdict is a touchstone to test the constitutionality of the pre-investigation sanction requirement.
- \n
- So centre should speed up amendments that redefine criminal misconduct among public servants at the same time protecting legitimate decisions.
- \n
- In all, the anti-corruption legislations should aim at punishing the corrupt, protecting the honest, and ensuring whistle-blower safety.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu, Business Standard

\n

