

OFFENCES RELATED TO DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES IN INDIA

Nikitha Dutt,

*Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Center for Management Studies, JAIN
(Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India
Email id- nikithadutt@cms.ac.in*

Abstract

The use of medications and psychotropic substances appears to be ubiquitous, although a wide variety of substances are abused worldwide. India has a large number of customers, most of whom are abusers. In terms of morbidity & mortality, this indicates a serious impact. The 1985 Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act (NDPS) provides for the federal monitoring and regulation of activities related to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. Some NDPS Act irregularities are corrected by the Bill 2011 on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment). The Indian judicial system regulating the use of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances has made India a complicated but well-placed concern, as the obligation relating to the use of drugs and psychotropic substances falls within the domain of medical purposes, as the country is obliged to comply with the framework of the UN conventions. Also 'The Convention on Psychotropic Substances-1971' and also 'The Convention on Illegal Trade in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988' as India remains one of the signatories of 'The UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs-1961'. These conventions collectively recommend a range of controls aimed at achieving the dual goal of restricting the usage for medicinal and scientific purposes of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, as well as preventing their abuse. On a global level, multiple countries, similar to India, have gained control over the administrative and legislative framework in the field of narcotics in accordance with the aforementioned attributes that come under UN conventions.

Keywords: *NDPS; narcotic drugs; psychotropic; substances; and UN conventions.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The view of India in addressing the increasing concern for narcotics and psychotropic substances could be effectively enshrined in Article 47 of the Indian Constitution, which requires: The State shall strive to prohibit the consumption of intoxicating drinks and drugs that are hazardous to health, with the exception of medicinal purposes. India has exercised legislative control over narcotic drugs through various Central and State Actions. In the case of the main features of the

Central Acts, mostly consisting of the Opium Act of 1857 & 1878 and the Hazardous Drugs Act of 1930, which were passed over a long time ago. With the increasing passage of time, changes in the field of illegal drug trafficking and drug addiction at national/international level followed with many shortcomings in laws that were successful in place pursuant to the Acts that have been initiated to date [1].

With respect to legislation operating in compliance with substantive legislation, narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances shall, inter alia, have a consolidated effect, accompanied by amendments to existing narcotic drug legislation. Thus, by providing guidelines for the enforcement of international conventions on narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Bill 1985, popularly addressed as the NDPS Act, the law further promotes the exercise of effective control over psychotropic substances [2]. As specified under the Act, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, is a central law regulating the production, consumption and transport of such harmful substances. It was enacted in order to guide the population away from illicit substances that are capable of hampering an individual's physical well-being. It applies to all residents outside the territorial jurisdiction of the country or to individuals on ships or aircraft registered in India, as well as to areas outside India. Exhaustive meanings of all the significant terms under the scope of the Act have been provided by the legislation. It stressed the authority of the Central Government over the provisions of the Act and how much power they have to enforce the legislation [3].

II. NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES ACT

The term 'narcotic' is somewhat different from the word used in the medical stream in the court language, meaning a sleep-inducing agent. Legitimately, an opiate drug that may be a sedative is a valid opiate, cannabis is a non-opiate, and because it is an energizer, cocaine is the absolute opposite of an opiate. For example, Lysergic Corrosive Diethylamide (LSD), Phencyclidine, Amphetamines, Barbiturates, Methaqualone, and architect drugs, the term 'psychotropic substance' implies mind-changing drugs (MDMA, DMT, and so forth.). Most of the recorded cannabis usage goes back to the Vedic time frame. Two or three hundred years ago, Atharvaveda recorded the use of cannabis [4].

Cannabis and its subordinates (bhang, charas, and ganja) were legitimately sold and were normally used for recreational purposes in India until 1985. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961), proposed by the United States under the law against all medicines, was contradicted by India. In this way, the show was a great choice to give India a 25-year 'Beauty Period' to make cannabis available for logical and clinical reasons and not for some other explanations. Since it was a politically delicate issue, India got committed to world-wide designations. This constrained the Indian government to dispose of ethnically profound placed use of cannabis. The NDPS Act

was thus approved on 14 November 1985, limiting all opiates or sedatives in India. Under the 1985 Act, the primary arrangement for non-clinical social use was that drinks created using cannabis leaves were to be approved under Britto 1989 [5].

In 1985, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act prohibited the production, dealing, purchase, transportation and use of opiate drugs and psychotropic substances in India and in airplanes and boats registered in India. It was passed under the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances and the US Convention Against Illegal Trade in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances to fulfill India's pledge.

A. Strictness of the act: -

The 1985 Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act (NDPS Act) is considered to be one of the country's cruel or harshest rules. The minimum imprisonment for selling or dealing with narcotics is 10 years, as established by the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act), and can be added to a fine of up to 1 lakh rupees. On the other hand, the jail time for wicked crimes or crimes such as trafficking in human beings or rape is only seven years in prison. For those individuals charged under this act, no bail is provided. In addition, no relief can be arranged through suspension, reduction, and replacement of sentences passed by the drug convicts [6].

Surprisingly more dreadful, the Narcotic Medicines and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 endorses the death penalty for repeated wrongdoers in coping with narcotics despite the fact that the crime can't be termed as an extreme wrongdoing. It is felt that for violations of this nature, capital punishment is unreasonably cruel. In any case, by stating that even the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) has never protested the capital punishment offered to drug convicts, the legislature protects the provision of capital punishment [7].

B. Death penalty in India: -

India is one of the countries where there is capital punishment, but now only for the "rarest of uncommon cases." India holds the death penalty for various real crimes. In any case, in view of the probability of substitution to life imprisonment, the inconvenience of the death penalty is not continuously trailed by execution in any event when it is held on the claim. The number of people in India who have been hanged since independence in 1947 is a matter of conflict. Official government figures state that since independence, only about 60 people or individuals have been hanged [8]. India cast a ballot against the objectives of the United Nations General Assembly in December 2007, requiring a ban on capital punishment. India retained its position on the issue of the death penalty in November 2012 by casting a ballot against the draft objectives of the UN General Assembly aimed at boycotting capital punishment.

For the first time in 1898, the death penalty covered its way through the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) where a required passing honor was presented for more than one time for a person convicted for association in opiate wrongdoing. It is also important that nothing in the Indian Constitution keeps capital punishment as unconstitutional as a primary priority. Under Article 47 of the Indian Constitution, apart from restorative reasons behind consuming drinks and drugs that are detrimental to well-being, the state will strive to achieve denial of use. Therefore, for chronic medication culprits, the nation saw the consideration of a necessary capital punishment. In addition, the courts also found that an appeal for capital punishment must be approved for the rarest of cases, which may be decided by the Supreme Court after consideration of the circumstances of the case and the character of the individual as stated in *Bachan Singh V. Province of Punjab* [9]. The Court also noted, in any event, that capital punishment is intrinsically impermissible for killers who do not fall into the restricted class. According to worldwide recognition, 'most real wrongdoings' exclude opioid offenses for the honour of capital punishment. Through the 2014 Amendment, under Section 31A of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, capital punishment was fused with a long-term option of detention under Section 31 of the NDPS Act.

C. **The constitutional validity of the death penalty under the NDPS Act: -**

Currently, about 32 countries in the world implement the death penalty on substance dealers. Actually, for narcotic drug crimes, about 112 countries, including India, have mandatory capital punishment. In China and Iran, a significant percentage of those who are killed are drug suspects. Drug trafficking is worse than murdering anyone because drug addiction, the pro-death proponents hold, leads to long-term negative but psychological consequences. Though capital punishment has not been fully dismissed under global law, some criteria applicable to its implementation have been clarified by global human rights specialists. It should not be imposed on teens or pregnant ladies, for example. These guidelines also state that the death penalty should qualify for solitary such crimes or 'most genuine offenses', an articulation that has been interpreted to mean wrongdoings that involve the purposeful taking of life.

In any event, the activists point out that the abuse of drugs does not warrant that in the rarest of uncommon situations, capital punishment should be retained. In 1997, with a view to its extreme repeal, the United Nations Human Rights Commission (currently the Board) asked India to limit the number of crimes conveying capital punishment to the most genuine misconduct. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Violence has comprehensively administered medical prevention programs and has reviled the death penalty as a means of containing human trafficking [10]. In circumstances where a person has been convicted for the commission of a crime to commit any of the offenses including theft of opium from an authorized cultivator, illicit exchange and outside control of opiate products and psychotropic substances financing illegal trade and holding of guilty parties and for the offenses including the offenses, Section 31A of the Act is taken from the simple

perusing of Section 31A of the Act Subsequently, the character of the wrongdoer needs to be adapted by an appointed authority. The sentence must remember each of these circumstances with the conditions, circumstances and the response of the general population and to choose the proper phrase of the rule.

III. CONCLUSION

The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, made with the aim of freeing the nation from the endless circle of drug addiction, is regularly referred to as an Act that is a product of a hurried bit of demand emerging because of political weight and that forces cruel discipline for crimes. An obstacle to the Act was the inadequacy of restoration offices and the growing speed of drug maltreatment among young people. Under such circumstances, sympathy for the guilty parties, particularly the individuals who have previously contributed to the illegal abuse of opiates, poses a danger to the people of India and to the administration of the State. About the fact that Amnesty International does not view opioid crimes as a justification for the death penalty, India wants to see the honor based on the interconnection between the numerous breaches that opiates graciously have with the commission.

IV. REFERENCES

- [1] *Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2016*. 2017.
- [2] "Convention against illicit drugs and psychotropic substances," *Med. War*, 1989, doi: 10.1080/07488008908408885.
- [3] N. Malhotra, R. Goel, and S. Goel, "The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985," in *Manual on Doctors and Law*, 2013.
- [4] A. Cecinato, P. Romagnoli, M. Perilli, C. Patriarca, and C. Balducci, "Psychotropic substances in indoor environments," *Environ. Int.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2014.06.008.
- [5] A. Lande, "The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961," *Int. Organ.*, 1962, doi: 10.1017/S0020818300011620.
- [6] S. Vogliardi, M. Tucci, G. Stocchero, S. D. Ferrara, and D. Favretto, "Sample preparation methods for determination of drugs of abuse in hair samples: A review," *Analytica Chimica Acta*. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.aca.2014.06.053.
- [7] M. Kleiman, J. Hawdon, and G. Klantschnig, "International Narcotics Control Board," in *Encyclopedia of Drug Policy*, 2012.
- [8] K. K. Aggarwal, "Capital punishment," *Medico-Legal Updat.*, 2010, doi: 10.5840/philstudies19641301.
- [9] AIR, *Bachan Singh vs State Of Punjab*, vol. SC. 1980, p. 898.
- [10] "United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights," in *Applied Ethics: A Multicultural Approach: Sixth Edition*, 2017.