

Laws to Prevent Damage to Public Property

What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The J & K government has recently proposed a legislation, seeking monetary recovery for damages to public property, from protestors of the 2016 unrest.
- This consequently saw the opposition protesting against the alleged draconian clauses in the bill.

\n

\n\n

What brought up the legislation?

\n\n

\n

- J&K had witnessed violent, sustained street protests, in the Valley after the killing of Hizbul Mujahideen commander Burhan Wani in 2016.
- While several police stations and other public buildings were damaged, no official estimate of total damage has been presented yet.
- However, according to National Crime Records Bureau data, only eight cases were registered under the 1985 law that year.
- A new law for amending the “Jammu and Kashmir Public Property (Prevention of Damage) Act, 1985”, was introduced in the Budget session.
- It was subsequently referred to a Select Committee of the House due to opposition protests, who claimed that it had draconian provisions.
- Notably, an ordinance to that effect is already in place.

\n

\n\n

What is the law about?

\n\n

\n

- **Original law** - The J&K public property (Prevention of Damage) Act, 1985 - contains penal provisions against individuals who damage public property.
- The maximum sentence is five years in prison, along with a fine, which can extend up to 10 years in case of damage by fire or explosive substances.
- Bail is possible only after the prosecution gets a chance to oppose it in court.
- **Amendment** - The new law seeks to recover the market value of public or private properties damaged during the protests from protestors.
- It also states that all persons participating in protests would face imprisonment, even if they weren't directly involved in damaging properties.
- It also increases the minimum punishment from six months in jail to two years imprisonment and non recovery of damages could extent the term further.
- **Why** - The amendment is aimed at deterring protesters from indulging in violence and damaging property.
- Notably, the pelting of police stations with stones during the wave of protests were a strong provocation for bringing these clauses.
- **Prosecution** - Situations where damage to property is anticipated, can be videographed and submitted as proof in the court.
- For establishing a person as a protest organiser, additional proof is required.

\n\n

\n

- **Opposition** - The separatists and the opposition parties in the J&K assembly protested against the legislation, as it could be misused.
- They have stated that such laws have been opposed even in the parliament and other state assemblies as this could stifle even reasoned dissent.
- Additionally, it has been stated that J&K already has a multitude of laws in the same domain like - AFSPA and Public Safety Act.

\n

\n\n

What are the other significant developments in this domain elsewhere?

\n\n

\n

- Punjab and Haryana High Court recently ruled to recover damages from the “Dera”, whose followers were involved in vandalism.

\n

- In 2007, the Supreme Court took suo motu cognizance of issues related to damage to properties during public protests.

\n

- Two committees were constituted to look into the matter - headed by retired SC judge K T Thomas, and the eminent jurist Fali S Nariman respectively.

\n

- **Thomas Committee** - It recommended an amendment to the parliamentary law “Prevention of Damage to Public Property (PDPP) Act, 1984”.

\n

- The recommendation was to hold leaders of the agitating group guilty of abetment - but the parliament hasn’t tabled such amendment yet.

\n

- **Nariman Committee** - It had asked the apex court to “evolve a principle of liability, punitive in nature, on account of vandalism and rioting.

\n

- The liability should lie with the actual perpetrators of the crime as well as organisers of the event giving rise to the liability.

\n

\n\n

Source: Indian Express

\n

