

Revisiting Sec 124-A of IPC - Sedition

Why in news?

\n\n

\n

- The Law Commission is in the process of revisiting the section 124-A of Indian Penal Code.

\n

- It calls for a thorough reconsideration and presents the various issues related to it before the public for a national debate.

\n

\n\n

What is Sec 124 A of IPC?

\n\n

\n

- Sec 124-A deals with sedition, and was introduced by the British colonial government in 1870.

\n

- It says that the act of Sedition is to bring hatred or contempt towards the Government established by law in India.

\n

- In this case, the punishment may be of imprisonment for life and fine, or imprisonment for 3 years and fine.

\n

- It was actually brought to suppress the freedom struggle prevalent then.

\n

\n\n

What does the previous Law Commission report say?

\n\n

\n

- In an earlier report in 1968, the Law Commission had rejected the idea of repealing the Section.

\n

- In 1971, the panel wanted the scope of the section to be expanded.

- \n
- It called for covering the Constitution, the legislature and the judiciary, in addition to the 'government to be established by law'.
- \n
- It meant that 'disaffection' against all these institutions should not be tolerated.
- \n
- The only dilution it mooted was to modify the wide gap between the two jail terms prescribed (either three years or life).
- \n
- It called for fixing the maximum sanction at seven years' rigorous imprisonment with fine.
- \n

\n\n

What are the concerns?

\n\n

- \n
- **Purpose** - It is an irony to retain a provision that was used extensively to suppress the freedom struggle.
- \n
- It is to be noted that, Britain itself abolished it 10 years ago.
- \n
- Also, there have been repeated instances of misuse of the Section.
- \n
- **Definition** - The foremost objection is that the definition of sedition remains too wide.
- \n
- Under the present law, it offers scope to consider as seditious
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- i. strong criticism against government policies and personalities
- \n
- ii. slogans voicing disapprobation of leaders
- \n
- iii. depictions of an unresponsive or insensitive regime
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- In recent times the core principle enunciated by the Supreme Court in this regard has been forgotten.

- \n
- It specifies that incitement to violence or tendency to create public disorder are the essential ingredients of the offence.
- \n

\n\n

What is the way forward?

\n\n

- \n
- As long as sedition is seen as a reasonable restriction on free speech on the ground of preserving public order, it will be difficult to contain its mischief.
- \n
- There are thus two ways of undoing the harm that sedition provision does to citizens' fundamental rights:
- \n

\n\n

- \n
1. It can be amended so that there is a much narrower definition of what constitutes sedition
- \n
2. The second and best course is to repeal the section altogether
- \n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu

\n

