

Rights of Prisoners in India

Amit Verma
Department Of Law
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT: *Our nation is famed for its independence and its rich culture, but it is really sad that there are no codified and clear rules on the rights of prisoners in developed countries like India. However, this fact cannot be rejected because through their judgments and interpretations, our Honourable Judiciary has not ignored the prisoners and recognized different rights for them; In addition, in recent decades, the rights related to prisoners have undergone a drastic change as an increased awareness of the desperate need for prison reform dawned on the people. The prisoner is a person who, as a penalty of offence, is restraint to enjoy his liberty and capture under the jail or imprisonment. The need for civil rights for survivors and the safety of life is not denied by becoming a guilty citizen or being on trial. This paper discusses the present legislative and legal system in India to protect the interests of inmates and also clarifies the different executive and judicial directives provided from time to time with regard to the needs and treatment of inmates. Several universal legal instruments have made an enormous contribution to the gradual advancement of the human rights of prisoners. This paper explores the instruments available and compares them to the laws existing in India to provide guarantees to preserve their civil dignity and legal rights. In order to acquaint them with the rights they deserve as human beings, the final section of the paper provides numerous recommendations for refining the prevalent condition of prisoners in India.*

KEYWORDS: *India; Offence; Prisoner; Penalty; Rights.*

INTRODUCTION

In India, the legal system plays an important role as it carries down the rules to be compulsorily obeyed by the country's people. The judiciary has a duty and a constitutional position to protect citizens' human rights in every country. Because each government has the judicial power to protect its national residents, it is obliged to make prison laws and regulations applicable to people that are in conflict with the law[1].

But that does not indicate that the Constitution of a country would not give inmates any rights. The inmates have their civil and fundamental rights as well. The Supreme Court of India interpreted the scope of Article 21 of the Indian Constitution and established jurisprudence on human rights to include protection and rights to uphold the human dignity of prisoners. If the rights of prisoners are breached by any person or authority, they are in violation of the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution, which provide for preservation of the right to freedom and equal protection of the law[1].

A legal remedy to protect their civil rights through prosecution or conviction for any crime is provided by the Principle of Legal Aid. In every case, *M.H. Wadanrao Hoskot v. Maharashtra State,* the Court held that the right to legal aid is one of the components of a fair procedure, i.e. the Supreme Court, reading Articles 21 and 39-A, read in conjunction with Article 142 and Section 304 of the Cr.PC, recognized that the Government was obliged to provide the accused with legal services'[2]

In the instance of R. Rajagopal, aka R.R. Gopal and Another v. State of Tamil Nadu and Others,' The petition asks a question of freedom of the press with respect to the right of the people of this country to privacy. The court held that, even without his permission or sanction, the petitioners have the right to print what they say to be Auto Shankar's life-story/autobiography as long as it exists from public records. Similarly, the publishing cannot be prohibited or confined by the State or its officials[2].

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution sets down the right of a convict to a speedy trial as a constitutional right. This article maintains equitable, fair and rational practices. For the convicted person, the fact that the guarantee of a speedy trial is a socio-legal right to protect the citizen makes it necessary. It is in the interest of those involved that the perpetrator is proven guilty or innocent in the circumstances as soon as possible[3].

The fundamental motive in the criminal justice system is to allow for a speedy prosecution of the convicted. If the court has taken cognizance of the allegation, the tribunal must be held rapidly and figure out who is guilty or who is innocent and discharge the innocent individual. It is necessary to note that if there was a delay, a miscarriage of justice that is said to be "justice delayed is denied justice" is explicitly constituted[3].

The interests of inmates have not only been recognised to protect them personally from physical distress or torture, but also to shield them from emotional abuse. The right to life and personal liberty protected in Article 21 need not be restricted to the nature of animals alone. This suggests more than just physical life[4].

Whether a person is arrested and held in detention at a police station or other property, he shall have the freedom to do so if he asks that a friend or family who is known to him or who is likely to be involved in his wellbeing be told, as soon as possible, that he has been arrested and is being detained, except to the degree allowed by this provision[5].

The literal sense of pay is that. "An amount of money that is paid to someone for the job he has done." Remuneration must not be less than the minimum salary set and must be paid to the person assigned to the state as a worker or service. There is no distinction in society between a prisoner completing a sentence behind the jail walls and a freeman[5].

DISCUSSION

A prisoner is a person who, against his/her will, faces deprivation of liberty. That may be through incarceration, servitude, or through coercive restriction. Prisoners are equipped with protections as a citizen while they are in jail to some degree, and these basic rights should not be withheld from them. The fundamental rights include the value of sustenance and water, the choice to defend a lawyer, immunity from torment, abuse, and racial discrimination[6].

The justice system plays an integral role in India because it carries down the rules to be practiced by the people involved. It is the fundamental responsibility of every nation's judiciary to uphold the civil rights of its people. In addition, they are expected to establish jail laws and policies for the prisoners that are imprisoned there. That does not mean, though, that the Constitution will deprive inmates their most fundamental rights[6].

The Supreme Court of India refers to Article 21 of the Indian Constitution and to the existing human rights statute for the protection and protection of the human dignity of prisoners. Where a person or an authority wishes to infringe certain rights, it shall infringe the protections of Article 14 of the Constitution upholding the right to freedom and equal treatment of the law.

While the Right to Legal Assistance is not something expressly guaranteed by the Law, the legal executives sometimes demonstrate compassion to prisoners who cannot afford it or actually willingly communicate with the legal attorney. The 42nd Amendment Act, 1976, provides Free Legal Assistance as one of the State Policy Directive Principles under Article 39A. While it is the most relevant and straightforward Article of the Constitution that addresses Free Legal Aid, this Article is not exactly enforceable by the courts. Even, these guidelines are essential to the enforcement of effective laws. Article 37 of the Constitution orders the implementation of these principles by the Executive.

By comparison, Article 38 provides for advancing government assistance to persons by ensuring and establishing a socioeconomic order in which all institutions and national law will be illuminated by justice, physical, monetary and democratic. The Parliament passed the Legal Services Authority Act of 1987, which provides for valid assistance, while numerous state governments have formed lawful advisory boards and plans for Free Legal Aid and unexpected problems to give force to the Constitutional Command of Article 39-A. Legal aid is of great significance under Indian human rights law, and it is not only available in criminal matters[7].

Human rights are an integral part of the equality of humanity. In numerous occasions, the Supreme Court of India correctly acknowledged the gratuitous abuse of inmates and enacted suitable prisons and police experts to protect the rights of detainees. The right to torment was adopted by the Supreme Court into Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution. "The treatment of a human being that offends human dignity, imposes preventable torture and reduces man to the level of a beast would certainly be arbitrary and could be challenged in accordance with Article 14"[8]

The courts have reinforced their view of solitary confinement and have held that the inconvenience of solitary confinement has an especially corrupting and dehumanizing effect on inmates. However, under rare cases where the inmate was a clear threat to others, the courts made an exception; he/she could then be removed from the other inmates. In the Sunil Batra case, the Supreme Court commented on the validity of such imprisonment[9].

The Supreme Court has also vigorously opposed to the introduction of bar shackles to inmates. The Court found that keeping a prisoner in shackles day and night still transformed the detainee from person to creature, and such punishment was so cruel and unnatural that the use of bar chains was against the soul of India's Constitution[9].

One of the basic aims of the criminal equity conveyance system is the swift trial of crimes. If the Court understands the accusation, the defence must be immediately led to rebuff the person who is guilty and to exonerate the guiltless one[10].

Under section 309 of Cr.PC, the right to a speedy trial is given. If CrPCs arrangements were pursued in their letter and spirit, there will be no doubt of any complaint at that point. These rules are not, however, properly enforced. It is important that the provisions of the Code shall

properly reflect the constitutional guarantee of a speedy trial, with the exception of Article 21[10].

CONCLUSION & IMPLICATION

A convict (prisoner) has been observed to be a citizen who is depressed against his or her will by rights. This can be by detention, capture, or forceful restraint, but it violates his civil rights as well as his jail rights. They have also offered all the privileges offered by a citizen in society, albeit with certain fair limitations. Being an inmate does not mean that they are guilty of seeking fundamental rights. He will enjoy all his fundamental rights even though he is confined in jail. In compliance with the protocol defined by statute, inmates still have all their civil rights after they are accused of a felony and stripped of their freedom.

The Supreme Court has taken corrective action and has given important directions to the executive and the legislature. From the analysis of the contribution alluded to above, it is clear that the Indian judiciary was very sensitive and keen to uphold the human rights of the people. The rationale, however, remains that the police and jail authorities need to be educated and accommodated in order to take the interests of prisoners seriously.

It could as well be argued that when they are behind bars, the inmates are entitled for all their basic rights. The Indian Constitution does not expressly accommodate the rights of the prisoners, but Articles 14, 19 and 21 definitely assured the privileges of the prisoners and the arrangements of the Prisons Act, 1894 included the arrangements for the assistance and insurance of the inmates by the state. Where existing rights or constitutional relief are breached for the disability of the inmate, the Court has determined that it should intercede with prison organisations.

By and wide, the Supreme Court held that the convict is a person, a distinctive individual and, moreover, a valid individual. Being an inmate does not disqualify you from being a citizen. Conviction for misconduct does not transform the prisoner to a non-individual whose interests rest on the impulse of the prison institution, and in this sense, in the lack of legal protections, it serves as a burden on prison officials and others.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Kaushik and K. Sharma, "Human rights of women prisoners in India: A case study of Jaipur central prison for women," *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 2009, doi: 10.1177/097152150901600205.
- [2] S. Nambi and J. Srinivasaraghavan, "Mentally Ill Prisoners: Indian Perspective," 2013.
- [3] S. Bhaumik and R. Mathew, "Health and beyond...strategies for a better India: using the 'prison window' to reach disadvantaged groups in primary care," *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 2015, doi: 10.4103/2249-4863.161304.
- [4] P. Nayar, "Postcolonial Affects: Victim Life Narratives and Human Rights in Contemporary India," *Postcolonial Text*, 2010.
- [5] M. Bandyopadhyay, "Competing masculinities in a prison," *Men and Masculinities*. 2006, doi: 10.1177/1097184X06287765.
- [6] A. Kaushik and K. Sharma, "Human Rights of Women Prisoners in India," *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 2009, doi: 10.1177/097152150901600205.
- [7] E. Ketzer and A. Crescenzi, "Addressing the Psychosocial and Mental Health Needs of Tibetan Refugees in India," in *Trauma, War, and Violence: Public Mental Health in Socio-Cultural Context*, 2006.



-
- [8] J. Malik, "Letters, prison sketches and autobiographical literature: The case of Fadl-e Haqq Khairabadi in the Andaman Penal Colony," *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 2006, doi: 10.1177/001946460504300104.
- [9] K. D. Gaur, "Criminal law & criminology," *Criminal law & criminology*. 2002.
- [10] G. Calder, "Health and human rights. Ownership rights and the body.," *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 2006.