

# Wild Life (Protection) Amendment Bill 2021

#### Why in news?

The expeditious passage of the Wild Life (Protection) Amendment Bill, 2021 in the Rajya Sabha this winter session needs comment.

#### What is the amendment about?

- The Wildlife Protection Act (WPA) 1972 has safeguarded numerous species of wild animals and plants by
  - 1. Prohibiting all forms of hunting and,
  - 2. Creating inviolate areas where wildlife conservation may be carried out.
- The amendment further invests in this conception of protected areas and species by bringing in newer species to be protected, augmenting the penal repercussions.
- The aspects of protecting species from the wildlife trade, in line with international standards, have received thoughtful scrutiny by civil society, MPs and the Parliamentary Standing Committee.
- But, the impact of the criminal legal framework adopted by the WPA is less known.

### What is the need for criminal laws in wildlife conservation?

- The need for criminal laws to assist wildlife conservation has remained unchallenged since its conception.
- The State and Forest Department control over forests won't have been possible without criminal law. This is seen in the provisions like,
  - 1. Regulated hunting to complete prohibition and
  - 2. The creation of 'Protected Areas (PA)' where conservation can be undertaken without the interference of local forest-dwelling communities,
- In this context, pitting wildlife species against communities as human-animal conflict has eluded the true cost of criminalisation under the WPA.
- **Penalty** The WPA Amendment Act has made a move to increase penalties for general violations from ₹25,000 to ₹1,00,000, and for animals receiving the most protection from ₹10,000 to ₹25,000.
- This move should raise questions about the nature of policing that the WPA engenders.

### What does the Study by CPA reveal?

• A study by the Criminal Justice and Police Accountability (CPA) Project examined arrest records, FIRs, offence records of the police and Forest Department in Madhya

Pradesh.

- It was found that persons from oppressed caste communities such as Scheduled Tribes and other forest-dwelling communities form the majority of accused persons in wildlife-related crimes.
- The Forest Department was found to
  - 1. Use the threat of criminalisation to force cooperation, and
  - 2. Devise a system of using community members as informants and draw on their loyalty by employing them on a daily wage basis.
- Cases that were filed under the WPA did not pertain solely to the comparatively serious offence of hunting; collecting wood, honey, and even mushrooms formed the bulk of prosecution in PAs.
- Over 95% of the cases filed by the Forest Department are still pending.

## What is the relationship between WPA and FRA?

- Forest rights, individual and collective, as part of the Forest Rights Act (FRA) were put in place to correct the injustice meted out by forest governance laws in recognising forest-dependent livelihoods.
- The natural overlap of recognising forest rights in intended-as-inviolate PAs was quickly resolved by making the **FRA subservient to the WPA**, thereby impeding its implementation.
- In the field work carried out, it was noticed that while individual forest rights in buffer zones of the Kanha National Park of Madhya Pradesh were recognized.
- But, the same cannot be said of collective rights over usage of forest resources, fishing, and protecting forest resources.
- Fishing, which forms an important part of subsistence for tribal communities, has come to be regularly criminalised as part of the WPA.
- In cases recorded by the Forest Department, the very fact that these occurred in PAs led to the offence becoming punishable by 3 to 7 years.

## What is worrisome?

- Criminal cases filed by the department are rarely compounded since they are meant to create a 'deterrent effect' by instilling fear in communities.
- Fear is a crucial way in which the department mediates governance in protected areas, and its officials are rarely checked for their power.
- Unchecked discretionary policing allowed by the WPA and other forest legislations have stunted the emancipatory potential of the FRA.
- Any further amendments must take stock of wrongful cases and resultant criminalisation of rights and lives of forest dwelling communities.

### Reference

1. <u>The Hindu | A conservation Bill that endangers forest rights</u>





A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative