

SC's condemn on cow vigilantism - II

Click here for Part I

 $n\n$

What is the issue?

 $n\n$

Union government cannot remain silent over the violent activities in the name of cow protection, they should respond meaningfully.

 $n\n$

Why is the issue stressed?

 $n\$

\n

- Instances of groups beating up and even killing persons allegedly suspected
 of transporting cattle or bovine meat have become commonplace.
- The court had issued notices to the Centre and some states in April on a writ petition that demanded action against such cow protection groups.
- \bullet In the few months since then, more incidents of lynching have taken place. $\ensuremath{^{\text{h}}}$
- Villagers killed two persons transporting cattle in West Bengal less than two weeks ago.

\n

 \bullet Three persons were killed in the same State in June after they were accused of cattle theft, and so on. $\$

\n\n

What are the conduct of state over this issue?

 $n\n$

\n

• In more than one State, cow 'protectors' have legal recognition as local laws provide immunity to them if they were acting in good faith.

\n

• The validity of such provisions in laws aimed at banning or regulating slaughter of animals and protecting the cow may be decided in the course of these proceedings.

\n

• In most cases, police register cases against the victims for slaughter or theft of cattle.

\n

- Typically, the administration seems eager to determine if they were engaged in cow slaughter or transportation of bovine meat than in arresting the culprits involved in murder and violence.
- It is dubious that whether the Centre ought to take recourse to Article 256, which empowers it to issue directions to the States, to put an end to the activities of vigilantes.
- \bullet Instead of shirking its responsibility on the ground that this is essentially a law and order issue to be addressed by the States. \n

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: The Hindu

\n

