WHITE BLACK LEGAL LAW JOURNAL

ISSN: 2581-8503

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.

Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra

Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM
Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.
More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.

Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

LAWS OF BAIL UNDER SPECIAL ACTS: PMLA, UAPA & MCOCA

THIS DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
B.A. LL.B

SUBMITTED BY

KHUSHI SHARMA

A032134719041

B.A. LL.B (2019- 2024)

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

Mrs. Shambhavi Mishra

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

I-2 BLOCK, SECTOR 125, AMITY UNIVERSITY CAMPUS, NOIDA

2024

DECLARATION

I, **KHUSHI SHARMA** declare that the dissertation titled **"LAWS OF BAIL UNDER SPECIAL ACTS: PMLA, UAPA & MCOCA"** is the outcome of my own work conducted under the supervision of **Ms. Shambhavi Mishra,** at Amity Law School, Amity University, Noida (Uttar Pradesh). I declare that the content of this dissertation is an original piece of work prepared by me and due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used and that the same has not been submitted in any university or college or any other programme for any other purpose.

Signature:

Name: Khushi Sharma

Enrollment No: A032134719041

Date:

FACULTY GUIDE APPROVAL PAGE

This is to certify that the research work titled **"LAWS OF BAIL UNDER SPECIAL ACTS: PMLA, UAPA & MCOCA"** is the work done by **Khushi Sharma,** a student of Amity Law School, Noida under my guidance and supervision for the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of **B.A. LL.B (2019- 2024)** at Amity Law School, Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.

According to the best of my knowledge, the present dissertation is result of his/her research and hard work. She has fulfilled all the necessary requirements prescribed under the University Guideline with regard to the submission of this dissertation.

I wish her success in life.

Ms. Shambhavi Mishra

Amity Law School, Noida

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I owe an indeed thanks to many people who helped and supported me during the making of this Dissertation who all put their faith in me and supported me directly or indirectly throughout the research and study made in this regard.

I would like to express my gratitude to Amity University, Noida (Uttar Pradesh) for providing me the foundation and opportunity to be a part of the university.

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my guide Ms. Shikha Goyal for the continuous support of my Dissertation throughout my study and research, for her patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor for my Dissertation.

I offer my gratitude and it's my privilege to acknowledge indebtedness to Head of Department, Amity Law School, Amity University, Noida. for her constant encouragement.

Last but not the least I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my family and my friends for their immense support throughout my life.

Signature:

Name: Khushi Sharma

Enrollment No: A032134719041

Date:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION

FACULTY GUIDE APPROVAL PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CASES

PREFACE

CHAPETER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General Overview

1.2. Terminologies and Definitions under PMLA

1.2.1 Schedule Offence

1.2.2 Proceeds of Crime

1.2.3. Attachment

1.3 Terminologies and Definitions under PMLA

1.3.1. Unlawful activities

1.3.2. Confiscation of Properties

1.4

1.4.1. Organised Crime

1.4.2 Organised Crime Syndicate

1.4.3. Continuing Unlawful Activity

1.4.4. Wiretapping

1.4.5. Witness Protection

1.4.6. Controlled Activity

1.4.7. Criminal gang

1.5. PMLA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1.6. UAPA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1.7. MCOCA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1.8. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – PMLA

1.9. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – UAPA

1.10. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – MCOCA

2. CHAPTER 2

2.1. PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, 2002

2.2 UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES (PREVENTION) ACT, 1967

2.3. THE MAHARASHTRA CONTROL OF ORGANISED CRIME ACT

CHAPTER -3

3. SPECIAL ACTS AND OTHER LAWS – CRIMINAL PROCEDURE CODE, 1973 AND INDIAN EVIDENCE ACT, 1872

3.1. CRPC AND PMLA

3.2. CRPC AND UAPA

3.3. CRPC AND MCOCA

4. CONCLUSION

LIST OF CASES

1. Manish Sisodia V. Union of India, AIR 2023 INSC 956
2. Pankaj Bansal V. Union of India, AIR 2023 INSC 866
3. Anoop Bartaria vs Dy. Director Enforcement, SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (Crl.) No. 2397-2398 OF 2019
4. Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 929
5. State of Maharashtra vs. Bharat Shanti Lal Shah & Ors.
6. Union of India vs. K.A. Najeeb
7. NIA vs. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali
8. Gautam Kundu vs. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India
9. Fakhrey Alam v. State of Uttar Pradesh
10. Bharat Shantilal Shah v. State of Maharashtra
11. E.P.Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu
12. Zameer Ahmed Latifur Rehman Sheikh v. State of Maharashtra

PREFACE

This dissertation embarks on an exploratory journey into the intricate web and the astonishing similarities existing between the laws of bail provided under the Special Acts, *namely,* Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 and Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999, shedding light on its multifaceted dimensions, legal frameworks, and the societal impacts that echo before the judicial realm. At the outset, it is imperative to acknowledge the stringent landscape of acts and omission which holds a person liable, to be prosecuted under the aforesaid acts. This work is rooted in the urgency to understand, analyze, and propose measures to combat this growing menace.

Chapter 1 of this Dissertation, states a comprehensive view of the PMLA, UAPA & MCOCA Acts, and the landscape of origin of the aforesaid Acts. It delineates key terminologies and definitions that are critical to understanding the scope of offense and bail thereto. The detailed classification, coupled with a comprehensive precedential ruling of the Indian Judiciary, sets the stage for a deep dive into the mechanisms, implications, and countermeasures associated with the aforesaid acts. This chapter serves not only as an introduction but as a bridge to the intricate discussions that follow, encapsulating the complexity and dynamism of Laws of Bail in the present.

Chapter 2 traces the origins and transformations of PMLA, UAPA and MCOCA, highlighting the pivotal moments that have shaped the current landscape. The narrative spans from the emergence of each aforesaid Act, the historical perspective, and the evolution that has emerged till the present writing.

Chapter 3 explores India’s legislative framework that marks a critical juncture in this Dissertation, offering a comprehensive analysis of the legal instruments and policies designated to combat offences under the aforesaid Acts. This Chapter meticulously examines the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Indian Evidence Act, 1872 and other pertinent legislations, shedding light on their efficacy, limitations and nuances of the legal interpretation in the context of rapidly increasing offences under PMLA, UAPA & MCOCA. This discussion extends to mechanism and strategies employed by Offenders.

Chapter 4 talks about the judiciary's role in interpreting and enforcing the framework laid down under the Acts. This chapter presents a critical analysis of landmark cases in India, drawing insights into the judicial perspective on various facets of PMLA, UAPA and MCOCA.

Chapter 5 synthesizes the insights gained throughout the dissertation, reflecting on the complexity, challenges, and stringent implications by the PMLA, UAPA and MCOCA Act. The chapter culminates in forward-looking suggestions that aim to bolster India's resilience against such offences.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENERAL OVERVIEW

A complex web of legal complexities, the concept of retrospective application emerges as a central theme that casts a shadow over the contours of crimes and their consequences. At the heart of this maze is the complex area of money laundering, unlawful activities and unorganized crimes, where the interplay of retroactive effects, interweave a number of legal issues under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as PMLA), Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (hereinafter referred to as UAPA) and Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999 (hereinafter referred to as MCOCA).

1.2 TERMINOLOGIES AND DEFINITIONS UNDER PMLA

Understanding key terminologies and definitions is crucial for delving into the realm of Money Laundering in India. This provides clarity on various concepts and terms essential for comprehending the nuances.

1.2.1 Scheduled Offences

In summary, scheduled offenses under the PMLA represent a comprehensive and dynamic framework for identifying and addressing a wide range of criminal activities that pose risks to the integrity of the financial system and society at large. Scheduled offenses under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) refer to a list of specific criminal activities that are deemed to generate

proceeds of crime. These offenses are outlined in the Schedule of the PMLA, and they encompass a wide range of illegal activities.

1.2.2 Proceeds of Crime

Proceeds of Crime encompass any property, assets, or funds obtained through criminal conduct. This includes profits generated from activities such as drug trafficking, terrorism, fraud, corruption, human trafficking, smuggling, and other offenses listed in the Schedule. It further includes Concealment and Transformation, Confiscation and Asset Recovery, Disruption of Criminal Enterprises etc.

1.2.3. Attachment

Attachment under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) refers to the temporary seizure or freezing of property suspected to be proceeds of crime during the course of an investigation. It is a preventive measure aimed at preserving assets that are believed to be derived from money laundering or linked to scheduled offenses. The Enforcement Directorate has the authority to attach properties including bank accounts, real estate, vehicles, and other assets, based on reasonable grounds.

1.3 TERMINOLOGIES AND DEFINITIONS UNDER UAPA

Understanding key terminologies and definitions is crucial for delving into the realm of Unlawful Activities in India. This provides clarity on various concepts and terms essential for comprehending the nuances.

1.3.1 Unlawful Activities

Unlawful Activities under UAPA encompass actions and associations that pose a threat to the sovereignty, integrity, and security of India. These activities include acts intended to disrupt public order, promote secessionism, challenge the authority of the government, or instigate violence and terrorism. The UAPA defines unlawful activities broadly, covering a range of actions aimed at destabilizing the nation or undermining its democratic institutions.

1.3.2. Confiscation of Property

The assets, funds, or properties believed to be linked to unlawful activities or terrorism are seized and forfeited by the government. This provision empowers authorities to disrupt the financial infrastructure of terrorist organizations and unlawful associations by depriving them of the resources necessary to sustain their activities. Confiscation aims to deter individuals and groups from engaging in unlawful conduct by imposing significant financial penalties and depriving them of the economic benefits derived from criminal activities.

1.4 TERMINOLOGIES AND DEFINITIONS UNDER MCOCA

Understanding key terminologies and definitions is crucial for delving into the realm of Organised Crimes in India. This provides clarity on various concepts and terms essential for comprehending the nuances.

1.4.1. Organised Crimes

Criminal activities carried out by an organized group or syndicate with the aim of committing serious offenses such as extortion, smuggling, drug trafficking, arms trafficking, or terrorism.

1.4.2. Organized Crime Syndicate

A group of individuals or associations involved in organized crime activities, characterized by a hierarchical structure, division of labor, and systematic coordination of criminal operations.

1.4.3. Continuing Unlawful Activity

Any unlawful activity undertaken by an organized crime syndicate that is of a continuing nature, involves multiple participants, and poses a threat to public order and security.

1.4.4. Wiretapping

The interception and monitoring of telephonic conversations, electronic communications, or other forms of communication by law enforcement agencies with the authorization of the designated authority, for the purpose of gathering evidence and intelligence related to organized crime activities.

1.4.5. Witness Protection:

Measures taken by law enforcement authorities to ensure the safety and security of witnesses, informants, and their families who provide crucial testimony or information in cases related to organized crime. This is crucial for encouraging witnesses to come forward without fear of retaliation.

1.4.6. Controlled Delivery:

A law enforcement tactic where illegal goods or substances are allowed to proceed under surveillance to track and gather evidence against the perpetrators involved in organized crime activities.

1.4.7. Criminal Gang:

A group of individuals, usually three or more, who collaborate to commit criminal acts. These acts may include but are not limited to extortion, intimidation, murder, drug trafficking, and other illicit activities.

1.5 PMLA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) in India was enacted to combat money laundering, which is the process of concealing the origins of illegally obtained money, typically by means of transfers involving foreign banks or legitimate businesses. Here's a detailed overview of the origin and evolution of the PMLA Act in India. Money laundering became a matter of global concern in the late 20th century as criminal organizations and individuals found ways to disguise the origins of their illicit funds through complex financial transactions. Recognizing the need for international cooperation to tackle this issue, various countries, including India, started enacting laws to address money laundering. The PMLA Act in India is a response to international commitments made by the country to combat money laundering. India became a member of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in 2010, an intergovernmental organization established to combat money laundering and terrorist financing. Joining

FATF necessitated the enactment of stringent anti-money laundering laws, leading to the introduction of the PMLA Act.

Pursuantly, The PMLA Act was passed by the Parliament of India in 2002 and came into force on July 1, 2005. It was subsequently amended multiple times to strengthen its provisions and align them with international standards, particularly those set by the FATF, with the primary objective to prevent money laundering and to provide for confiscation of property derived from, or involved in, money laundering. It also aims to deal with issues such as attachment, seizure, and confiscation of proceeds of crime. Overall, the PMLA Act in India is a comprehensive legislation aimed at preventing and combating money laundering, aligning the country's efforts with international standards and commitments in this regard.

The Key provisions of PMLA Act includes criminalizing money laundering activities and provides for stringent penalties, including imprisonment and fines, for those found guilty. It also establishes authorities such as the Enforcement Directorate (ED) to enforce the provisions of the Act and investigate cases of money laundering. However, the Act has been amended several times, to strengthen its provisions and enhance its effectiveness in combating money laundering. These amendments have expanded the scope of the Act, introduced new offenses, and enhanced the powers of enforcement authorities.

One of the key feature of PMLA includes facilitation by International Cooperation: The PMLA Act facilitates international cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of

money laundering offenses by providing mechanisms for mutual legal assistance, extradition, and cooperation with foreign authorities.

1.6. UAPA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The UAPA traces its origins to the early years of independent India when the government felt the need for legislation to effectively combat activities that threatened the sovereignty, integrity, and security of the nation. Over time, the rise of terrorism and insurgency prompted the enactment of stricter laws to address these threats. The UAPA replaced the older Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA), which was enacted in 1985 but allowed to lapse in 1995 due to widespread allegations of misuse and human rights violations. The Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA), enacted in 2002, also faced similar criticism and was repealed in 2004. The UAPA was then enacted as a comprehensive law to address the shortcomings of its predecessors.

The Act was passed by the Parliament of India in 1967 and came into force on December 30, 1967. It was subsequently amended multiple times to strengthen its provisions and align them with evolving security challenges. The primary objective of the UAPA is to prevent unlawful activities that threaten the sovereignty and integrity of India. It empowers law enforcement agencies to take proactive measures to combat terrorism, insurgency, and other forms of unlawful activities, with Key Provisions including declaration of certain organizations as unlawful if they are found to be involved in unlawful activities. It also defines various offenses related to terrorism, including raising funds for terrorist activities, conspiracy, and supporting terrorist

organizations. The Act prescribes stringent penalties, including imprisonment and fines, for those found guilty of these offenses.

However, over time, the UAPA has been amended several times to strengthen its provisions and enhance its effectiveness in combating terrorism and unlawful activities. These amendments have expanded the scope of the Act, introduced new offenses, and enhanced the powers of law enforcement agencies. It is imperative to mention here that the UAPA Act, like its predecessors, the UAPA has also faced criticism for alleged misuse and violations of human rights. Civil rights groups have raised concerns about its broad definitions of terrorism and its provisions for detention without charge. However, supporters argue that the Act is necessary to protect national security and combat terrorism effectively. For Instance, Mr. Shashi Tharoor, with his eloquent writing and detailed explanation, highlighted the cons of the UAPA Act, under its very Statement of Objects and Reason, which is summed up as under:

The Unlawful Activities Act, 1967 (UAPA) has opened the door to abuse of power which violates the standards laid down in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution and anti- international threat. The 2019 UAPA amendments provide that states have the power to designate individuals as "terrorists". Previously, this was sufficient to designate a group as a "terrorist organization." The UAPA violates the provisions of the law that protect against intrusions or intrusions into a person's privacy, while at the same time attacking their independence and freedom. The law also allows for search, seizure and seizure based on "personal knowledge" by police without written confirmation from law enforcement authorities. It also nullifies the presumption of innocence and gives

the government unlimited power to declare anyone a terrorist. The UAPA also violates several fundamental rights, including general rights such as the right to protest, the right to a reputation, and the right to access the Internet. Nikesh Tarachand Shah v. In a landmark Union of India case, the Supreme Court held that laws that "infringe the fundamental right to personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21" cannot be repealed, as "the Government has a strong desire to do heavy work "crime." Correct. However, the UAPA does not discriminate in any way.

The United Nations has also emphasized the importance of protecting and protecting human rights and the rule of law when fighting terrorism. In 2020, eight UN special rapporteurs expressed concern about the 2019 UAPA reforms. They found the law inconsistent with international human rights standards, \including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Human Rights. According to international law, three elements must be met for a crime to be considered "terrorist". In other words, the methods used must be lethal. The intent behind the action is to create fear among the public or to force a government or international organization to take or stop an action. And the goal is to achieve ideological goals. They argued that the UAPA does not provide a clear and precise definition of what constitutes a "terrorist threat" and that states can use the law broadly and freely, often in violation of human rights. The UAPA allows the government to take action against individuals for actions that are "disturbing" or "potentially threatening to the public," and this concept of "potential threat" means that punishment increases the proportion of crimes. The death of Father Stanislaus Lourduswamy, a

public figure well known for his decades of work while in legal custody after being denied bail, and the indefinite imprisonment of journalist Siddique Kappan is ironic. The meaning of this method.

The UAPA has also been criticized for punishing the practice. For example, according to the National Crime Records Bureau, between 2014 and 2016, more than 75% of cases under the UAPA ended in dismissal or dismissal. The data also shows that between 2014 and 2020, 985 cases were registered under the UAPA each year, increasing the number of pending cases by 14.38% per year. In seven years, approximately 10,552 Indigenous people were arrested under the UAPA, but only 253 were convicted, which is only 2.4%. At the same time, only 40.58% of investigated cases were brought to court and only 4.5% of those cases were concluded. These statistics show the enormous lapses of justice allowed by the UAPA, many times.

Several senior judges of the Supreme Court, including Justice DY Chandrachud,

Justice Madan B. Lokur, Justice Deepak Gupta, Justice Aftab Aslam, Justice Gopala Gowda, Justice RF Nariman expressed concern over the UAPA and their capabilities.

For misappropriation and illegal imprisonment. Likewise, senior politicians and civil society leaders have criticized the law, holding it responsible for atrocities and calling for its powers to be reduced or abolished altogether. Over the years, the UAPA has become a weapon, a weapon that binds people to the legal system and imprisons them when the government wants to. The government has a duty to care for its citizens, and fear of dissent and opposition should not be a reason to violate fundamental rights and natural liberties. Behind the facts, figures and analysis lies the human cost at the heart

of evil and dangerous practices like the UAPA. Those laws, weapons of violence and oppression, have no place in a democracy.

Therefore, it is imperative that this bill be repealed.

1. 7 MCOCA – BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

MCOCA represents a significant legislative effort by the state of Maharashtra to combat organized crime and uphold the rule of law. Its implementation requires a balance between strong law enforcement measures and safeguards to protect individual rights and liberties. The need for legislation like MCOCA arose from the growing menace of organized crime in the state of Maharashtra, particularly in cities like Mumbai. Organized crime syndicates engaged in activities such as extortion, drug trafficking, arms smuggling, and contract killings posed a significant threat to public safety and security. Before the enactment of MCOCA, Maharashtra had various laws to deal with organized crime, including the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Ordinance (MCOCA Ordinance) of 1999. The ordinance was promulgated following the recommendations of the Vohra Committee Report, which highlighted the nexus between organized crime and politics.

The MCOCA was enacted by the Maharashtra state legislature in 1999 as a special law to provide for the control of organized crime and prevention of its control. It was subsequently reenacted as an Act in 1999, and came into force on April 24, 1999. MCOCA was designed to empower law enforcement agencies with special provisions and procedures to effectively combat organized crime syndicates. The primary objective of MCOCA is to curb organized crime by targeting criminal syndicates and

their activities. It aims to dismantle organized crime networks by providing law enforcement agencies with enhanced investigative and prosecutorial powers. MCOCA contains provisions for the definition of organized crime, formation of special courts, admissibility of intercepted communications as evidence, witness protection, and forfeiture of property derived from organized crime activities. It also prescribes stringent penalties for those found guilty of organized crime offenses.

Since its enactment, MCOCA has undergone amendments to strengthen its provisions and address shortcomings. These amendments have been made to enhance the effectiveness of the law in combating organized crime and keeping pace with evolving criminal tactics. MCOCA has been used by law enforcement agencies in Maharashtra to target and dismantle organized crime syndicates effectively. It has resulted in numerous convictions and seizures of assets derived from organized crime activities. However, there have been concerns about its potential misuse and violations of human rights, leading to calls for greater oversight and accountability in its implementation.

1.8. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – PMLA

It is being realised, world over, that money-laundering poses a serious threat not only to the financial systems of countries, but also to their integrity and sovereignty. Some of the initiatives taken by the international community to obviate such threat are outlined below:—

(a) the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, to which India is a party, calls for prevention of laundering

of proceeds of drug crimes and other connected activities and confiscation of proceeds derived from such offence.

(b) the Basle Statement of Principles, enunciated in 1989, outlined basic policies and procedures that banks should follow in order to assist the law enforcement agencies in tackling the problem of money laundering.

(c) the Financial Action Task Force established at the summit of seven major industrial nations, held in Paris from 14th to 16th July, 1989, to examine the problem of money-laundering has made forty recommendations, which provide the foundation material for comprehensive legislation to combat the problem of money laundering. The recommendations were classified under various heads. Some of the important heads are—

(i) declaration of laundering of monies carried through serious crimes a criminal offence;

(ii) to work out modalities of disclosure by financial institutions regarding reportable transactions;

(iii) confiscation of the proceeds of crime;

(iv) declaring money-laundering to be an extraditable offence; and

(v) promoting international co-operation in investigation of money laundering

(d) the Political Declaration and Global Programme of Action adopted by United Nations General Assembly by its Resolution No. S-17/2 of 23rd February, 1990, *inter alia*, calls upon the member States to develop mechanism to prevent financial

institutions from being used for laundering of drug related money and enactment of legislation to prevent such laundering.

(e) the United Nations in the Special Session on countering World Drug Problem Together concluded on the 8th to the 10th June, 1998 has made another declaration regarding the need to combat money laundering. India is a signatory to this declaration.

1.9. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – UAPA

As per the 2011 Bill of UAPA, the following objectives of the Act were laid down:

(1) Increase the period of declaration of an association as unlawful from two years to five years as specified under section 6;

(2) Amendment in Section 15 of the principal act with a purpose of enlarging the ambit of 'terrorist act' by incorporating the 'economic security' of the country and to protect the monetary stability of India by way of production or smuggling or circulation of high-quality counterfeit Indian paper currency, coin or of any other material. The

international/intergovernmental organizations have been covered explicitly;

(3) To bring the cohesiveness in the legal framework, the provision of section 16A is

proposed to be brought as clause (d) after clause © of the section and the existing 16A is being deleted;

(4) Amendments are based on IMG recommendations in order to explicitly criminalise high quality counterfeiting. Amendments are based on FATF recommendations to meet the international commitment. All the nine Treaties annexed to the International

Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (CFT) specifying various types of terrorist acts which constitute an offence are now to be listed in Second Schedule to this Act;

(5) Enlarging the scope of Section 17 of the Act relating to punishment for raising funds for terrorist act and include within its scope, raising of funds, both from legitimate or illegitimate sources, by a terrorist organization or by terrorist gang or by an individual terrorist;

(6) Insert new sections 22A, 22B and 22C in the aforesaid Act to include within its scope, offences by companies societies or trusts and provide punishment therefor;

(7) Insert a new section 24 in the aforesaid Act so as to enlarge the scope of proceeds of terrorism to include therein any property intended to be used for terrorism; and

1.10. STATEMENT OF OBJECT AND REASONS – MCOCA

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, emphasized on the Statement and Object of MCOCA in the judgment titled as ***"State of Maharashtra vs. Bharat Shanti Lal Shah & Ors."***, which is highlighted as under:

"Organised crime has for quite some years now come up as a very serious threat to our society. It knows no national boundaries and is fueled by illegal wealth generated by contract killings, extortion, smuggling in contrabands, illegal trade in narcotics, kidnapping for ransom, collection of protection money and money laundering, etc. The illegal wealth and black money generated by the organised crime is very huge and

has serious adverse effect on our economy. It is seen that the organised criminal syndicates make a common cause with terrorist gangs and foster narco terrorism which extend beyond the national boundaries. There is reason to believe that organised criminal gangs are operating in the State and thus, there is immediate need to curb their activities. It is also noticed that the organised criminals make extensive use of wire and oral communications in their criminal activities. The interception of such communications to obtain evidence of the commission of crimes or to prevent their commission is an indispensable aid to law enforcement and the administration of justice.
According to its preamble, the said Act was enacted to make specific provisions for prevention and control of, and for coping with, criminal activity by organised crime syndicate or gang and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

The Hon'ble Court was pleased to observe that We consider that a person who is on bail after being arrested for violation of law unconnected with MCOCA, should not be denied his right to seek bail if he is arrested under the MCOCA, for it cannot be said that he is a habitual offender. The provision of denying his right to seek bail, if he was arrested earlier and was on bail for commission of an offence under any other Act, suffers from the vice of unreasonable classification by placing in the same class, offences which may have nothing in common with those under MCOCA, for the purpose of denying consideration of bail. The aforesaid expression and restriction on the right of seeking bail is not even in consonance with the object sought to be achieved by the Act and, therefore, on the face of the provisions this is an excessive restriction.

CHAPTER -2

2.1 PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, 2002

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) is the cornerstone of India's legal framework that seeks to combat the scourge of money laundering and related financial crimes. As the financial environment continues to evolve, it is important to critically evaluate the effectiveness and trends of those legal systems. This critical review aims to analyze and assess the challenging aspects of the PMLA and explore its weaknesses and wider implications. From the main objectives to the complexities of legal definitions, enforcement mechanisms and international cooperation, this review aims to provide an analysis of the key mechanisms that can govern standards in common terms.

By examining decisions, amendments and new challenges, this study aims to highlight key provisions of the PMLA and their impact on the delicate balance between preventing financial crime and protecting individual liberties. Through these critical insights, we strive to contribute to a deeper understanding of Indian anti-money laundering laws and their challenging impact on the broader regulatory environment.

The bill requires banking companies, financial institutions and intermediaries to be responsible for verifying and maintaining complete records about the identity and transactions of all customers. Notable aspects of the law include bail bonds, arresting people without an incident report, not informing them of the reason for the arrest, and the release of alleged personal information during the trial. Evidence was investigated during the trials and the law includes comprehensive definitions of money laundering

and the consequences of the crime. Critics argue that the changes in the law have not resulted in the expected improvements in prosecutions. Instead, they argue that the amendment creates a legal framework that infringes on individual liberties, depriving individuals of their legal guarantees and due process of law set out in the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC).

Despite the ban, money laundering is still widespread and technological advances are exacerbating the problem by reducing perceived risks. Preventing money laundering requires changes in methods and approaches. Despite the implementation of various control measures, launderers are still able to innovate and circumvent control measures, demonstrating the continued need for adaptation.

Efforts to prevent money laundering are being strengthened, especially at the level of bank offices. The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has successfully established coordination mechanisms, rules, regulations and international applications. It is important to analyze the impact of demonetisation in the context of technological developments. The development of international standards is helping the financial sector to integrate with the commercial sector.

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) was enacted by the then National Democratic Alliance government in 2002 and came into force in 2005. Its primary goal was to prevent money laundering, providing for the confiscation of property derived from or involved in money laundering and punishing those who commit money laundering offences. The Act was India's attempt to align with global efforts to curb drug trafficking proceeds used to finance terrorist activities. The Vienna Convention in

1988 had exhorted countries to adopt national laws to combat the menace of drug trafficking. The intention was to block the "laundering' of such ill-gotten funds to buy property. At the G7 Summit in 1989, the Financial Action Task Force was established to combat the scourge of money laundering. Later, in 2002, the Palermo Convention similarly urged nations to adopt legislative measures to criminalise the proceeds of crime.

The PMLA went through several amendments, the last of which was in 2019. This amendment proposed to close gaps in the earlier provisions of money laundering and make the regulations more stringent and better equipped to identify questionable transactions. The amendment was to address a major ambiguity which existed in the clause concerning what constitutes 'proceeds of crime'. To plug such gaps, the amended Act amplified Section 3.

Over 240 petitions were submitted in different courts, arguing that the amendments passed in recent years have widened the scope of the Act and undermined the initial intention of the legislature. The challengers claimed the amendments violated personal liberty, procedures of law and the constitutional mandate and that the process itself was the punishment under the PMLA. They contended that the powers of the Enforcement Directorate (ED) are akin to that of the police and must be subject to the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC). It was maintained that the PMLA, unlike other penal statutes, does not require the ED to adhere to procedures for arrest and investigation as stated in the CrPC. Thus, it allows the ED to operate without

procedural safeguards to protect the rights of accused persons and thereby compromises fundamental rights as enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

A major ground for the challenge was against the 2019 amendment to clarify the scope of Section 3 of the Act. It was also argued that the original intent of the Act was against the projection of tainted money as untainted and that its integration into the economy constituted an offence. However, the ED was booking cases solely based on original crimes without any proof that the money was laundered. Further, the amendments to the PMLA, introduced through the Finance Act 2019, brought a whole gamut of offences under the ED's purview, whilst the PMLA was created to prevent and punish a narrow set of offences which mostly dealt with large-scale money laundering. Thus, the Parliament's widening scope of the PMLA facilitated a more rampant use of the ED's powers, regardless of the gravity of the offence. It had also been contended that the amendments introduced to the PMLA in 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2019 were made through the Finance Act where these amendments do not qualify as a money bill, as defined under Article 110 of the Constitution.

The efficacy of the use of the PMLA needs to be analysed in the context of the number of people who have actually been successfully prosecuted under the Act. Till 31 March 2022, the ED recorded 5,422 cases under the PMLA, attached proceeds of crime approximately worth ₹1.05 trillion (S$18.5 billion) and filed prosecution complaints (charge sheets) in 992 cases. These cases resulted in the confiscation of ₹86.9 billion (S$1.5 million) and the conviction of 23 accused as per the written response of the

Union Minister of State for Finance Pankaj Chaudhary in the Lok Sabha. This implies that the remaining ₹1.04 trillion (S$18.3 billion) worth of assets which has been wrongfully attached would have to be released. The rate of conviction in PMLA is thus barely 0.5 per cent. In light of such miniscule rate of conviction, there has been widespread concern over the use of the ED's powers under the Act. It has been seen as a weapon to intimidate the voice of the opposition.

Whilst the verdict of the Supreme Court has drawn comments depending on which side of the political divide the commentator lies; it is a fact that all parties are complicit in framing and making the law more stringent. None of them desired to relinquish the arbitrary power that the state could exercise. However, it is also true that the use of the law in the last eight years has increased dramatically.

While there have been many legislations passed by the Parliament which seemed to transgress on the fundamental rights of the citizen, it was always the Supreme Court which emerged as the protector of such rights and declared such laws as violative of fundamental rights. By the verdict of July 2022, legal experts maintain that the Supreme Court seems to have lowered the bar by permitting the state to encroach upon a citizen's fundamental rights.

2.2 UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES (PREVENTION) ACT, 1967

Although it fell under the purview of the terrorist act, the recent death of Stan Swamy after a long wait for justice following arbitrary arrest, according to the NCRB Crime in India Report 2019, as was the Unlawful Activities Act, 1967. UAPA). The Law moves in the direction of fomenting human rights tragedies in the name of national

security. Provisions like sections 13, 15 and 43 (D) of the Act not only restrict the freedom of Indian citizens and non-citizens in a participatory democracy, but also ensure that prisoners or prisoners tried in the criminal context lose all their rights cause Judicial administration.

In India, the failure of these anti-terror laws to maintain the integrity and reasonableness of enforcement and protect the rights of innocent people from the harms of terrorism is not new, but a work-in-progress of old works.

Previous repealed laws like TADA , MISA and POTA , all laws were repealed due to rampant misuse of mechanisms to suppress legitimate protests against government policies. Passed by the Indian Parliament in 1967, the UAPA was implemented and empowered the central and state governments to control riots and other anti-social activities by illegal and terrorist groups. Until its revision in 2004, this law was only a new tool in the framework of the fight against all kinds of anti-social activities of legal associations. However, the 2004 and 2008 amendments changed the entire function of the UAPA from preventive to preventive and gave the same powers to TADA and POTA by introducing temporary provisions and too many rules. It authorizes investigative powers and severely limits the scope of rehabilitation or rehabilitation of people in prison. Enacted in 1967, the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act was laid down for the purpose of serving as an effective tool of prevention against certain unlawful and terrorism activities of individuals as well as associations. In simple words, the Act was enacted to keep a constant check upon the terrorist or anti-social activities in the country. Further, on TADA and POTA being successively repealed in 1995 and 2004,

there was a necessity felt by UPA Government to increase the strength of UAPA and its provisions not only to combat against any forms of terrorism but also to correct the errors of predecessor Acts in this context. As a result, from time to time, several amendments were passed in 2004, 2008, 2013 and latest in 2019 with an aim to widen the scope of this Act beyond any reasonable barriers.

With the draconian nature and limitless scope of the UAPA Legislation existing in force, the nation witnesses its large-scale abuse by dragging the lawful protests and criticism of the innocent citizens as well as human rights activists under the purview of terrorist and unlawful acts. Delving deeper into the real time scenario, the impact of UAPA in the context of prison justice is summarized as follows:

(A) **Increasing rate of arrests under the Act:** A bare reading of the NCRB 2019 Crime in India report portrays a total number of 1226 cases registered under the Unlawful Activities(Prevention) Act 1967 or UAPA. However, while comparing the records since 2015, the data available with Ministry of Home Affairs as per a Lok Sabha Proceeding reflects a sharp increase of 72% reported in respect of the arrests made under the Act, in the sense that at least 1948 arrests were made under 1226 UAPA cases in 2019 as against 1128 arrests in 2015. At the same time, the data presented by Ministry of Home Affairs in a Rajya Sabha Proceeding also represents that out of all the registered cases under UAPA during 2016-2019, only a minuscule 2.2% cases resulted in conviction which undoubtedly showcase a stark reality of all the possibilities ranging between arbitrary arrests, prolonged incarceration without trial or

pending trial and a long wait for justice to be served. Such possibilities are also supported from the facts that a person arrested under UAPA can be detained for an extended period of 180 days with the Court's permission and without filing any chargesheet. The Home Ministry in response to an Unstarred Rajya Sabha Questionnaire, expressly stated that NCRB does not have any data with regard to persons detained in judicial custody by virtue of Section 43D(2)(b) of the Act. Further, in the same Questionnaire, it was also replied that there is no comprehensive data maintained by NCRB with regard to list of detainees and undertrial prisoners under the

UAPA legislation.

(B) **A Tool for Suppression of Dissent:** As analyzed earlier, the words used to define an

unlawful activity or a terrorist act, such as 'disclaims' or 'questions' or 'dissatisfaction' or 'overawes' or 'show of criminal force' etc. are such nature so as to create an unbridled scope, resulting to criminalizing all forms of dissent - criticism - lawful protests against the arbitrary government policies. Thus, the Act often is misused as a tool to contract the scope of fundamental right to free speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India. For instance, in 2014 one cultural activist group named Kabir Kala Manch who were engaged in musical campaign and skits against the caste-based violence was arrested under UAPA on the ground of having connection with Maoist. The chargesheet was filed in 2013 however even after languishing 4 long years in judicial custody, trial was not completed. The Apex Court

while granting bail to them in 2017, observed that there was hardly any witness examination conducted in the trial during such long period.

(C) **Large-scale Violation of Tribal Rights**: A news report published by Hindustan Times in 22nd September 2020 highlights the sad state of tribal affairs in India and fate of 120 tribal citizens arrested in connection with Burkapal attack hanging on the thread for the past 3 years. In 2017, as a response to killing of 25 CRPF personnel in a Maoist attack in Burkapal, the country within next few days of the attack witnessed the arrests of at least 120 tribal villagers from 6 villages under the UAPA and Indian Penal Code. Such arrests were made based on a rough presumption of the villagers who were present at the day of attack in those 6 villages and not on the basis of real identification of the perpetrators. Such presumption was further proved with the fact that the villagers working in other cities were excluded from the list of arrested persons, thereby taking a mere chance over corroboration. Further, as the news report stated that even after a passage of 3 years, neither bail was granted to any of them nor their trial was constituted till that date. This example is not an isolated incident and many a times, the tribal communities are often suspected with Maoist links and arrested without a valid ground under the Act and thereafter, kept in a prolonged detention in prison.

Recent Judicial Decisions: Since 2017 onwards there has been an increasing trend of

judicial activism portrayed by the Supreme Court and High Courts to prevent the gross human rights violation taking place under the various draconian provisions of UAPA Legislation. Although several cases pending for trial under the Act still exist far away from the close watch of Constitutional Courts, the judicial efforts reflected in certain

UAPA cases led to increase a hope for defeating the autocratic legislation in near future. In a recent case of ***Fakhrey Alam v. State of Uttar Pradesh***, the Apex Court while dealing with a case under Section 18 of UAPA, granted default bail to the detainee under Section 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and held that the right to default bail as per Section 167 is a fundamental right and hence, shall be applicable to persons arrested under the UAPA Act. Therefore, the states cannot misuse the provision of 180 days' extension period for the purpose of filing any supplementary chargesheet. Besides as discussed earlier, in **Union of India vs. K.A. Najeeb** the Supreme Court encountered the excessive restriction on statutory bail under Section 43D(5) by declaring the bail granted by Constitutional Courts on grounds of fundamental rights to be prevailed over the said provision. ***In NIA vs. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali***, the Supreme Court while setting aside the High Court order, refused to grant bail considering the prima facie truth of accusation supported by the evidence.

Thus, to sum it up, while on one hand, the Constitutional Courts in India have been adopting a proactive role in upholding the fundamental right to lawfully protest and dissent in the cases concerning anti CAA student activists Natasha Narwal, Asif Iqbal Tanha, Debangana Kalita and Delhi Riots accused Safoora Zargar; on the other hand, the cases like Hathras journalist Siddique Kappan and thousands others are still miles away to receive access to basic justice at least. Further, despite the higher judiciary paying a considerable amount of attention upon the draconian nature of UAPA legislation, it is the legislature which ultimately requires to replace the arbitrary and pseudo-democratic provisions for the purpose of revamping the spirit of rule of law.

2.3. THE MAHARASHTRA CONTROL OF ORGANISED CRIME ACT

If we track down the India's path of history, states have been inclined to enact special security legislations in order to make a special class of offences as per the needs and patterns of the crime prevalent in that particular state, to which they are competent under the relevant entries of List II under the Schedule VII of the Constitution of India. But it has been observed that under the broad spectrum of "security" legislations, there have been glaring violations of human rights. These legislations have been contested on the basic premise of Article 14 of the Constitution being flouted. The Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime is one such legislation.

The points which become pertinent in this aspect to observe are the basic philosophy and objective behind these special statutes and whether these legislations actually fulfil the purpose or become an instrument for oppression at the Government. On the basis of cases pertaining to MCOCA, the authors will try to see as to what is the attitude of courts when such cases come before it. The endeavour shall be to understand the methodology of court in deciding the cases which mainly pertains to terror related cases and to see if the judicial delineation is smacked with escapism. Through the cases pertaining to MCOCA, we would like to look at the broader issues of criminal jurisprudence and citizens, also whether the question of terrorism so vital that it may also lead to obfuscation of constitutional rights of citizens.

The Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999 enacted on April 24, 1999 broadly deals with the menace of organised crime. The Act also provides a definition of continuing unlawful activity as well. The constitutionality of the act was challenged

in the case of ***Bharat Shantilal Shah v. State of Maharashtra,*** mainly on two grounds. Firstly, on the bedrock of State Legislature's competence to create such a piece of legislature. That is to say the legislation (MCOCA) is made to effectively control organized crime within the state of Maharashtra and to facilitate collection of evidence by interception of the wireless or telegraphic messages. This being the object of the Act, the many entries in the List II of the Schedule VII of the Constitution, do not provide for any such field of legislation available to the state by recourse to which legislation could be made by the state under Articles 245 and 246 of the Constitution of India. The second aspect of the challenge is that the impugned legislation flagrantly violates the fundamental rights of the citizens. Even though the rules of interpretation suggest that the legislative competence of the legislature should be assumed, however, the provisions of the impugned legislature are void as they infringe the Fundamental rights of the citizens, thus making the act void in totality. As Article 13 prohibits making of such legislation it is contended that it is ultra-wires for the legislature to do so.

The petitioner also contested the vires of section 2(1) (a) (d) (e) (f) on the grounds that these

Sections are vague and arbitrary. The word 'abet' used in the MCOCA is quite vague and

confusing. The word 'abet' itself is not defined and only that is defined which by this enactment includes within the definition of the word 'abet'. It is an inclusive definition without defining what the word 'abet' means. The challenge therefore is that any

communication or association whatsoever, with any person known to be or believed to be a person engaged in organized crime or assisting any organized crime syndicate would be abetting an offence mentioned in the MCOCA. The court held that the word abet shall mean same as is provided in Section 107 and Section 109 and includes i, ii and iii. The words, ‘communication’ or ‘association’ must be read to mean aid or assistance to anything done by organized crime syndicate as an organized crime, the definition must be interpreted with respect to the objects for which they are made, legislature never intended and the provision can’t be interpreted to mean that a criminal should be segregated from a society for all the time to come i.e., he would have no interest and legal of the General Clauses Act, 1897, that unless there is anything repugnant to the subject or context, the word “abet”, with all of its variations and different cognate expression shall have the same meaning as in the IPC. The court here constructed the meaning of word abet in consonance to what is given under Section 107 and Section 109 of the Indian Penal Code, also interestingly the court in this particular point restricted to the question that whether the particular section is fulfilling the object of the act or not.

It is submitted that Section 3 and Section 4 were also attacked on account of arbitrariness. It was contended that the provision under impugnity were negating the aspect of requisite mens rea required for harbouring, concealing or attempt to harbour and conceal, it may have adverse effect as a person who unknowingly or unintentionally harbours a person may find himself landing in a soup thus the provision having capability to use as a tool of oppression. However, the court held that unless the

legislature expressly does away with the aspect of mens rea, it shall be presumed that the provision is instilled with requisite mens rea required for the commission of an offence. The court held that the word ‘intentionally’ when read into Section 3 (3) and word knowingly is read into Section 3(5) then the said anomaly could be corrected.

It should also been seen that the court had similar approach when it was confronted with the questions of similar nature in the case of ***Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab,*** in this case Section 5 of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act famously known as TADA was under question, under this section if someone was found in possession of any such specific arms and ammunition notified under the act then that particular person will be charged with a substantive offence, provided that such possession was pertaining to any terrorist activity. Court through the interpretation of statute read in the element of mens rea so that the offence does not turn out to be a strict offence.

In case of PUCL v. UOI which was related with the constitutional vires of Prevention of Terrorist Activities (POTA), the court read into S.4 of the Act the requirement of knowledge, which dealt with the same issue of possession of arms. The Court also held that the requirement of *mens rea* must also be read into Sections 20, 21 and 22, POTA dealing with certain associative crimes.

In ***Zameer Ahmed Latifur Rehman Sheikh v. State of Maharashtra***, issue was regarding the constitutionality of the statutory provision of Section 2(1)(e) of the MCOCA, the main bone of contention was that, whether is it feasible to challenge it as the matter had already been challenged in the previous case of State of Maharshtra v.

Bharat Shah. It was contended that Section 2(1)(e) lack legislative competence, this section talks about insurgency. It was contended that insurgency is a condition of political revolt against the government with the means of arms and violence and that the crime 'promoting insurgency' does not lie under Entry1 of the State List or under Entry 1 of the Concurrent List of the Schedule VII or in any other entry of the above said State List and Concurrent List. It was submitted that Entry 1 in the State List pertains to public order is a disorder of much lesser gravity and insurgency cannot be covered by public order. It was also contended that 'insurgency' relates to security of the country and finds its place in the Union List, to be more precise Entry 1 of the Union List talks about defence. If Article 248 of the constitution is looked upon and read with Entry 97 of the Union List then one can see that the law under impugnity does not possess the requisite legislative vires, therefore, it was unconstitutional on the part of the Maharashtra Government to make a law which pertains to 'insurgency' and thus encroaching upon the powers of the Union Government.

Thus, If we unfold the methodology which was adopted by the courts then we can see a seeming biasness towards the legislature, the biasness almost transfigures into reverence thereby tilting the scales in favour of the legislature and inflicting invisible blows to the civil rights of the people. Instead of judging the law on the touchstones of arbitrariness which was evolved in the famous case of ***E.P.Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu***, and dismissing the draconian law in totality, the court chose to play to the gallery. By brushing the matter inside the carpet by terming it as a 'policy matter' the court validated a bad law. When it comes to defending adjudication pertaining those general laws which tend to violate the fundamental rights of the people then the court

defends those rights as zealously as in the Greek mythology the three headed dog Cerberus guard the gates of the underworld. This approach of 'running with the hare and hunting with the hounds only creates confusion and disbelief in the psyche of the common man.

One of the trend that can be picked by the analysis is that law has been used as a 'political instrument', thus sabotaging and undermining the basic tenets of rule of law. The courts by such minimal interpretations give fillip to the legislation to come up with more stringent and draconian varieties of law which has minimal respect for the civil and fundamental rights of the individual. Such non interference by the judiciary creates a doubt in the psyche of the common person, they start seeing institutional wheels of democratic setup as manifestation of organised authority, domination, and power of the possessing classes over masses, and the most flagrant and complete negation of humanity and universal solidarity.

Such kind of legislations also conceals those weak areas which are in need of immediate reforms such as proper investigation of crimes, speedy disposal of cases and long delays. These are the real areas which can result in efficient working of the system and consequent strengthening of the state as a whole.

CHAPTER -3

3. SPECIAL ACTS AND OTHER LAWS – CRIMINAL PROCEDURE CODE, 1973 AND INDIAN EVIDENCE ACT, 1872

While each law serves distinct purposes, there are overlaps and interconnections between them, especially concerning organized crime and terrorism. Money laundering often accompanies organized crime and terrorist financing activities. Therefore, PMLA can be invoked in cases involving the proceeds of crime under UAPA or MCOCA. While PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA are specialized laws addressing specific categories of crimes, they are interconnected with CrPC, which provides the overarching procedural framework for the administration of criminal justice in India.

The Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) serves as the procedural backbone of India's criminal justice system, providing guidelines for the investigation, trial, and adjudication of criminal offenses. While PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA are specialized laws targeting specific types of crimes, they are interlinked with CrPC in several ways, which are highlighted as under:

(a) Investigation Procedures:

CrPC lays down the procedures for the investigation of criminal offenses by law enforcement agencies. This includes the gathering of evidence, conducting searches, making arrests, and interrogation of suspects.

PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA investigations also adhere to the procedural requirements outlined in CrPC. For instance, while investigating offenses under these laws, law

enforcement agencies must follow the protocols for search and seizure prescribed in CrPC.

(b) **Arrest and Detention:**

CrPC provides guidelines for the arrest and detention of suspects, including provisions for bail, remand, and preventive detention.

In cases falling under PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA, the procedures for arrest and detention outlined in CrPC are followed. However, these specialized laws may have specific provisions regarding bail, remand, and preventive detention, which may override certain CrPC provisions in exceptional circumstances.

(c) **Trial Procedures:**

CrPC sets out the framework for conducting criminal trials, including the examination of witnesses, presentation of evidence, and pronouncement of judgments.

Cases prosecuted under PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA are subject to the trial procedures stipulated in CrPC. However, there may be certain deviations or additional provisions specific to these laws, such as the admissibility of intercepted communications or the establishment of special courts.

(d) **Appeals and Reviews:**

CrPC governs the process of filing appeals, revisions, and reviews against trial court judgments in higher courts.

Cases adjudicated under PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA are subject to the appellate procedures prescribed in CrPC. Appeals against convictions or acquittals in cases under these laws would follow the appellate process outlined in CrPC, unless specific provisions in these laws provide otherwise.

(e) **Enforcement and Coordination:**

CrPC facilitates the coordination between different law enforcement agencies and courts involved in the investigation and prosecution of criminal cases.

In cases involving offenses under PMLA, UAPA, and MCOCA, effective enforcement often requires coordination among various agencies, including specialized investigation units and special courts established under these laws, within the framework provided by CrPC.

3.1. **CRPC AND PMLA**

The realm of law is a mosaic of intricacies, often leading to intersections and conflicts between various statutes. In the domain of bail matters, the dance between the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) unveils a complex yet intriguing narrative. A pivotal juncture in this legal landscape emerged when the apex court, in the case of ***Gautam Kundu vs. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India,*** affirmed the overriding effect of the special law of PMLA over the general provisions of CrPC in bail matters.

The clash between CrPC and PMLA in the realm of bail matters is a conundrum that seeks resolution. While the CrPC provides a general framework for the grant of bail,

the PMLA introduces its specialized conditions under Section 45. This duality presents a dilemma when bail applications are brought forth, requiring a delicate balance between the two statutes. The proviso to Section 45 of the PMLA adds another layer to this conflict, offering a respite in specific circumstances. This exception allows a Special Court to exercise discretion in granting bail when the accused is under the age of 16, is a woman, or is suffering from illness or infirmity. This proviso highlights the nuanced approach that the legislature adopts, recognizing that certain situations warrant a departure from the stringent conditions laid down in Section 45.

In the case of ***Gautam Kundu vs. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India***, the Apex Court delivered a pronouncement that echoes through the corridors of legal interpretation. The court affirmed that Section 45 of the PMLA wields an overriding effect on the provisions of CrPC in the event of a conflict. This proclamation underscores the legislative intent of the PMLA to establish a specialized framework for bail matters, trumping the general provisions of CrPC when the two clash.

The court's pronouncement succinctly highlights the crux of the matter. Section 45A of the PMLA, which delineates the conditions for bail, carries the weight of a special law that takes precedence over Section 439 of the CrPC. This emphasis on the special law's dominance underscores the importance of maintaining a balanced approach in the application of legal provisions.

The relationship between the PMLA and CrPC in bail matters transcends a mere legal debate; it underscores the need for harmonization. Legal systems evolve to address the

nuances and complexities of society. In this evolution, the delicate dance between specialized legislation and general provisions finds its significance.

As the legal landscape continues to evolve, the interplay between PMLA and CrPC in bail matters remains an ongoing journey. The verdict in Gautam Kundu vs. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India, stands as a milestone, guiding the trajectory of legal interpretation. It underscores the importance of recognizing the overriding effect of a special law in cases of conflict and encourages a nuanced approach to legal harmonization. In this delicate balance lies the essence of a just and equitable legal system that navigates the intricate corridors of justice.

3.2. CRPC AND UAPA

The inter-linkage between the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA) and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) constitutes a pivotal aspect of contemporary legal discourse. The UAPA, designed to combat terrorism and unlawful activities, intersects with the CrPC, which provides procedural guidelines for criminal justice administration in India. This nexus underscores the nuanced balance between security imperatives and safeguarding individual rights within the criminal justice system. Through provisions governing investigation, arrest, detention, and trial procedures, the UAPA and CrPC mutually influence the trajectory of counter-terrorism efforts while ensuring adherence to due process and fair trial standards. However, the confluence of these statutes also poses challenges, including potential conflicts between their provisions and the need to reconcile exceptional security measures with constitutional guarantees of liberty and justice. Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the

inter-linkage between the UAPA and CrPC is indispensable for navigating the complexities of counter-terrorism enforcement while upholding the rule of law and protecting fundamental freedoms in a democratic society.

3.3. MCOCA AND CRPC

The interlinkage between the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act (MCOCA) and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) is a critical aspect of contemporary legal analysis. MCOCA, enacted to combat organized crime in Maharashtra, intersects with the CrPC, which provides procedural guidelines for criminal justice administration across India. This connection highlights the complex interplay between specialized legislation targeting organized criminal activities and the broader framework of criminal procedure. By incorporating provisions governing investigation, arrest, detention, and trial procedures, MCOCA and the CrPC jointly shape the landscape of law enforcement and adjudication concerning organized crime. However, this interlinkage also poses challenges, such as ensuring coherence and consistency between the provisions of MCOCA and the procedural safeguards enshrined in the CrPC. Moreover, balancing the imperatives of combating organized crime with protecting individual rights and ensuring due process remains a constant challenge. Therefore, comprehensively understanding the interplay between MCOCA and the CrPC is essential for navigating the complexities of addressing organized crime while upholding the principles of justice, fairness, and the rule of law.

Given the objective that MCOCA aims to tackle, it was inevitable that it would contain watertight provisions to be applied in a highly regulated regime, that would conflict

with the concerns of liberty, which remains a consideration in the mechanism of ordinary criminal law and in that sense, MCOCA is a sui generis mechanism of substantive as well as procedural law, i.e., Criminal Procedure Code, 1973

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, examining the PMLA, UAPA, and MCOC reveals a striking convergence in their overarching objectives and operational strategies. These legislations, while ostensibly designed to combat distinct forms of crime, share fundamental similarities in their approach towards tackling issues of national security and organized criminal activities. Through an analysis of their provisions, enforcement mechanisms, and impact on civil liberties, it becomes evident that these laws constitute significant pillars of the state's response to contemporary challenges. However, their broad scope and potential for abuse underscore the importance of robust oversight mechanisms and safeguards to prevent undue infringement upon individual rights. Moreover, the convergence of these laws highlights the evolving nature of transnational threats and the imperative for adaptive legal frameworks. As such, further scholarly inquiry and public discourse are necessary to navigate the delicate balance between security imperatives and safeguarding democratic principles in an increasingly complex global landscape.

REFERENCES

1. Manish Sisodia V. Union of India, AIR 2023 INSC 956
2. Pankaj Bansal V. Union of India, AIR 2023 INSC 866
3. Anoop Bartaria vs Dy. Director Enforcement, SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (Crl.) No. 2397-2398 OF 2019
4. Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 929
5. State of Maharashtra vs. Bharat Shanti Lal Shah & Ors.
6. Union of India vs. K.A. Najeeb
7. NIA vs. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali
8. Gautam Kundu vs. Manoj Kumar, Govt. of India
9. Fakhrey Alam v. State of Uttar Pradesh
10. Bharat Shantilal Shah v. State of Maharashtra
11. E.P.Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu
12. Zameer Ahmed Latifur Rehman Sheikh v. State of Maharashtra
13. Taxmann's Your Queries on Law Relating to Prevention of Money Laundering | Investigation | Confiscation | Prosecution