

Law of Contempt

Why in news?

The proceedings for criminal contempt of court against lawyer-activist Prashant Bhushan have been initiated.

What are the proceedings about?

- Mr. Bhushan is no new to the art of testing the limits of the judiciary's tolerance of criticism.
- The latest proceedings concern two tweets by him,
 - 1. One comments on the role of some Chief Justices of India in the last six years, and
 - 2. Another one targets the current CJI based on a photograph.

What do these proceedings highlight?

- They have brought under focus the **necessity for retaining the law of contempt** as it stands today.
- The social media are full of critics who deem it necessary to air their views in many unrestrained and uninhibited ways.
- So, the higher judiciary should not really be expending its time and energy invoking its power to punish for contempt of itself.
- But, a wide latitude should be given to publicly voiced criticism and strident questioning of the court's ways and decisions.

What is the law of contempt?

- There is a dilemma about how India's highest court should react to its outspoken critics.
- The origin of this dilemma lies in the part of contempt law.
- This law **criminalises anything that scandalises** or tends to scandalise the judiciary or lowers the court's authority.
- It may be time to revisit this clause.

Why contempt law should be retained as such?

- Only few would disagree that contempt power is needed to punish wilful disobedience to court orders, as well as interference in the administration of justice and overt threats to judges.
- The reason why the concept of contempt exists is to **insulate the institution** from unfair attacks.
- It will prevent a sudden fall in the judiciary's reputation in the public eye.
- However, each time the offence of scandalising the court or lowering its authority is invoked, some believe that the court is hiding something.
- In contemporary times, it is more important that courts are seen to be concerned about accountability, and processes are transparent.
- But, the fear of scandalising the judiciary restrains much of the media and public from a more rigorous examination of its functioning.

Source: The Hindu

