

Prohibition of Unlawful Assembly (Interference with the Freedom of Matrimonial Alliances) Bill

Why in news?

 $n\n$

\n

- The draft Prohibition of Unlawful Assembly (Interference with the Freedom of Matrimonial Alliances) Bill, 2011 was proposed by the Law Commission.
- \bullet It has long been pending, and the Supreme Court is now expected to frame guidelines on this. $\mbox{\sc h}$

 $n\$

What are the objectives?

 $n\n$

\n

- \bullet Community opposition to inter-caste, inter-community and inter-religious marriages have long been a social concern. \n
- The current penal law lacks direct application to the illegal acts of such caste assemblies.

\n

• The Bill is thus meant to penalise honour killings in the name of upholding community honour or family honour.

\n

- The legislation primarily aims at preventing the unlawful interference from caste panchayats.
- It is intended to uphold the right of consenting adults to marry persons of their own choice.

What are the key provisions in the Bill?

 $n\n$

\n

• **Definitions** - "Unlawful assembly" refers to a group of persons who condemn a marriage.

۱n

• This is particularly for alleged reasons that the marriage had dishonoured the caste or community tradition.

\n

• "Marriage", under the draft legislation, includes "proposed or intended marriage."

\n

• **Punishments** - The punishments are meted out in a phased manner.

 $n\$

\n

• All offences under the proposed Act will be cognisable, non-bailable and non-compoundable.

\n

• The offences include:

\n

 $n\n$

۱n

- i. participating in any unlawful assembly
- ii. making exhortations (persuasion, advice) that endanger the liberty of a couple

\n

iii. criminal intimidation of the couple or their relatives or supporters $\ensuremath{^{\backslash n}}$

 $n\n$

- The punishments for the offences range from 6 months to 7 years.
- The fine ranges from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 30,000.
- \bullet The maximum punishment of 7 years of imprisonment is in the case of actual harm or injury caused. $\mbox{\ensuremath{\backslash}} n$
- The provisions under the proposed law do not negate the offences under IPC but only adds to them.

\n

• **Special Courts** - The cases will be tried in Special Courts presided over by a sessions judge or additional sessions judge.

۱n

• The special courts will be set up by states in consultation with the High Courts.

\n

 \bullet It will have the power of a Sessions Court. $\ensuremath{\backslash n}$

• It can take cognisance of any offence upon receiving a complaint of facts, or upon a police report of such facts.

\n

It can also take suo motu cognisance of the cases.

ullet The court can take cases without the accused being committed to it for trial.

• **Authority** - The Collector or the District Magistrate is entrusted with the responsibility for the safety of the persons targeted.

• This is in case any illegal decision is taken by the khap panchayat.

• He/she shall take necessary steps to prohibit the convening of such illegal gatherings.

\n

 $n\n$

What are the Law Commissions' observations?

 $n\n$

\n

• **IPC** - The Commission has rejected the government's proposal to amend Section 300 of the Indian Penal Code.

\n

• The proposal was to include 'honour killings' within the definition of murder in IPC.

- However, Law Commission observed that the definition of murder in Section 300 of the Indian Penal Code would suffice.
- \bullet As, this would be adequate to take care of the situations leading to overt acts of killing or causing bodily harm to the targeted person. \n
- **Khap Panchayats** Nevertheless, the Law Commission proposed the fresh legislation.

\n

- It seeks to declare khap panchayats unlawful.
- As, khap panchayats have long been handing down punishment to couples who go for 'sagotra' or inter-caste marriage.
- In this regard, the Commission also observes that the Hindu Marriage Act did not prohibit 'sagotra' or inter-caste marriages.

 $n\n$

How has the bill progressed?

 $n\n$

\n

- So far, 23 States have responded to the Bill with suggestions.
- The other six states have not responded yet. n
- \bullet The Supreme Court has now stepped in to fill this legislative vacuum. $\ensuremath{^{\backslash n}}$
- The SC is expected to frame guidelines on this, in a judgment to protect adult couples from the fury of the mob.

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: The Hindu, Firstpost

