

A Comprehensive Review of Sedition Laws in India: Analysis of Section 152 Of BNS and Section 124 A of IPC

Akksharra P V

1st Year BBA.LLB.HONS, School of Law, SASTRA Deemed to be University, Thanjavur, India

Article History

Received: 15-Jan-2025
Revised: 20-Jan-2025
Accepted: 24-Jan-2025
Published: 27-Jan-2025

Keywords

Sedition
Subversive Activities
Sovereign Authority
Dissent
National Security

Abstract

Sedition refers to actions or behaviors that encourage rebellion against the governing authority or sovereign authority. In India, sedition laws were introduced during British rule to suppress opposition to the colonial government. Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) punished individuals who voiced dissent or protested against the British. After India gained independence, the sedition law continued to be in place, despite growing concerns over its misuse. The United Nations Human Rights Committee has raised objections, urging the repeal of sedition laws in India to align with international human rights standards. These concerns were particularly highlighted during protests such as those against the Citizenship Amendment Act in 2019, where sedition charges were perceived as a tool for silencing dissent. In December 2023, the Indian government passed a new act replacing the IPC with a new code, the BNS. This revision introduced significant changes to sedition laws, including broader definitions and more severe punishments. Critics argue that while the law aims to protect national security and unity, it also poses risks of misuse, particularly in curbing free expression. Provisions like "subversive activities" remain vague, contributing to ongoing debate and calling for greater clarity in its application. The law continues to attract criticism for its potential to stifle legitimate dissent under the guise of national security.

Corresponding Author:

Akksharra P V

1st Year BBA.LLB.HONS, School of Law, SASTRA Deemed to be University, Thanjavur, India

This article is under the [CC BY- NC-ND](#) licenses

Copyright © Journal of Law and Legal Research Development, available at www.jllrd.com



1. INTRODUCTION

Sedition, a term that refers to actions inciting rebellion against the state's authority, including the monarch, the government, or any supreme ruling body, holds significant importance in the legal framework of many nations, including India. This paper examines the development and consequences of sedition laws in India, with a particular focus on two major legal reforms: Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code and Section 152 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The IPC, introduced in 1870, had been amended nearly 75 times before its eventual repeal. On July 1, 2024, the Indian Penal Code was substituted by the new act

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, marking a shift in how sedition is legislated in India. Historically, Section 124A of the IPC was enacted by the British to suppress Indian freedom fighters and patriotic citizens opposing colonial rule. It was widely used to detain leaders and activists who challenged British policies, often leading to significant legal battles, such as the cases of Queen Empress v. Jogendra Chunder Bose¹, Ram Nandan v². State of Uttar Pradesh, and Kedar Nath Singh V. State of Bihar³, among others. The controversial application of this law continued to spark debates, particularly in cases like Balwant Singh v. The State of Punjab, where the law was enforced in connection with

¹ Queen-Empress v. Jogendra Chunder Bose and Others, (1892) ILR 19 Cal 35.

² Ram Nandan v. State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1959 All 101.

³ Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar, AIR 1962 SC 955.

the Khalistan movement. These instances led to growing concerns over the misuse of Section 124A, prompting the government to draft a new law. The enactment of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita in 2024 brought significant changes to sedition law in India. Section 152 of the BNS replaced Section 124A, introducing stricter penalties for acts threatening the nation's security, unity, and integrity. This new legislation reflects a shift in the government's approach, moving towards more stringent punishments for sedition while attempting to balance national security concerns and individual freedoms. The Supreme Court's decision in 2022 to put Section 124A on hold until a more balanced framework is developed further highlights the need for a reform that addresses the evolving concerns regarding sedition in India. This paper will examine these key legal reforms and their impact on the nation's legal and political landscape.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND RELATED CASES

The Indian Penal Code (IPC) of 1870, was formulated by Thomas Babington Macaulay. James Fitzjames Stephen, a counsel and British politician, proposed section 124A IPC, 1870⁴. Initially, the IPC enacted in 1860 did not contain any laws specifying sedition. It was subsequently introduced by the IPC (Amendment) Act, of 1870. The British colonial government enacted it to limit and suppress the nationalist movement. Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak a renowned Indian freedom activist, teacher, and social reformer was arrested twice for sedition by the British colonial government for publishing articles against the British government which later led to the portrayal of violence by the citizens in the provinces of Bombay against the government⁵. Later in 1922 the well-known lawyer and freedom fighter also known as the father of the nation Mahatma Gandhi was convicted of sedition for his article against British governance⁶. Bhagat Singh a prominent freedom fighter was convicted under the same act for his revolutionary activities. Bhagat Singh and B.K.Dutt threw a bomb in the Central Legislative Assembly building to protest against the Bill regarding public safety and Trade disputes. This led the British to file a petition under section 124A of IPC for sedition against Bhagat Singh and B.K.Dutt⁷. In 1942 the Federal Court of India defined sedition as an act that leads to public disorder. In 1947, the Privy Council overturned the federal court's decision. In 1973, then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi made section 124A a criminal offense, resulting in sedition becoming a criminal offense under the new code of criminal procedure. It gave the police enough authority to arrest individuals without a warrant⁸. Recently in 2022, the Supreme Court of India questioned the operation of section 124 A, and there were questions of misuse of power under this section. The sedition laws were criticized to be a misuse of

political power. Many journalists, public activists, and silent protesters were arrested under this section. Queen Empress v. Jogendra Chunder Bose, this case gave a clear definition of disapprobation and disaffection thereby clearly differentiating them. The constitutional validity of section 124 A has been challenged many times in court⁹. Ram Nandan v. State of Uttar Pradesh¹⁰ was the first case to test the constitutional validity of section 124A. The Allahabad High Court, one of the 4 Charter courts ruled that section 124 A is ultra vires and violative of Article 19 (1) (a) of the constitution¹¹. In 1962 the constitutional bench of the Supreme Court, in Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar¹² it was held that a crime of sedition is not established unless and until the words spoken or written, the signs shown or the visual representation made have a potential to cause disturbance of some or other public order, thereby disturbing the peace of the nation. This judgment overturned the Allahabad High Court judgment made in the Ram Nandan case¹³. The Supreme Court stated that slogans do not constitute an act of sedition as there was no evidence that these violent acts continued in public even after the slogans were raised. This stance was held in the famous Balwant Singh and Anr v. State of Punjab case and was referenced in subsequent cases such as the Bilal Ahmed Kaloo case in 1997 and the Common Cause case in 2018¹⁴. In December 2019, the Citizenship Amendment Act, 2019, was passed by the Indian Parliament. The act provided a path to avail of Indian Citizenship for non-Muslim citizens in the neighboring nations of Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh who faced religious persecution. The law excludes Muslims and thus it has led to criticism and protests¹⁵. The protest began in 2019 and went till 2020 and gave rise to many questions concerning the secularism principles of the country. During the protests, the Indian government invoked sedition laws to arrest protesters under section 124 A of IPC to silence the protesters this was deemed to be a misuse of power as it intruded into the fundamental rights of the citizens to protest for a legal reform peacefully. Thus throughout the ages, sedition laws under section 124 A of IPC have faced much criticism mainly due to their misuse.

3. RECENT SCENARIO OF SEDITION LAWS IN INDIA

In 2022, the case of SG Vombatkere v Union of India dealt with the constitutionality of section 124 A of the IPC¹⁶. This case has been filed by a group of petitioners, including retired Army General S.G. Vombatkere, prominent figures such as the Editor Guild of India, political leaders, and former government officials. The petitioners contested the constitutional validity of Section 124A, asserting that it infringes on the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian

⁴ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/landmark-sedition-cases-in-india/>

⁵ <https://theleaflet.in/analysis/the-law-of-sedition-and-bal-gangadhar-tilak#:~:text=He was charged with sedition,had an anti%2DMuslim slant.>

⁶ <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/gk-current-affairs/story/mahatma-gandhi-arrested-under-sedition-charges-312601-2016-03-10.>

⁷ https://www.indialawjournal.org/archives/volume1/issue_3/bhagat_singh.html.

⁸ <https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/The-origins-and-validity-of-Sedition-Law-in-India.>

ISSN: 3048-5045; Vol 02 Issue 01; Jan-2024; Pg-09-14

⁹ *Queen-Empress v. Jogendra Chunder Bose and Others*, (1892) ILR 19 Cal 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid* (2).

¹¹ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/landmark-sedition-cases-in-india/>

¹² *Ibid* (3).

¹³ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/kedar-nath-singh-case-interpretation-of-sedition-with-regard-to-article-191a/>

¹⁴ *Balwant Singh and Anr v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1995 SC 1785

¹⁵

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizenship_%28Amendment%29_Act,_2019

¹⁶ *S.G. Vombatkere v. Union of India*, (2022) 7 SCC 433

Constitution. It was contended by the parties that the sedition law is used to stifle dissent and restrict legitimate criticism of the government, undermining the democratic spirit¹⁷. The Supreme Court held that section 124 A of the IPC will be temporarily suspended from operation and that the government must create a provision challenging the section's criticism. Cases previously filed under this section, New cases filed, ongoing trials, and appeals in this section were ordered to be put on hold.

3.1 *Need for section 152 of BNS*

In August 2023, Union Home Minister Amit Shah introduced the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita which was proposed to replace the Indian Penal Code to address issues raised by section 124 A of IPC and many other such provisions. The new provision, section 152 of BNS retains the soul of section 124 A IPC with changes like increasing the year of imprisonment from 3 years to 7 years, including electronic communication and financial means as scope for acts threatening the nation's security¹⁸. Section 152 expands its scope to encompass secession, armed rebellion, subversive actions, and separatist activities. The new law clarifies and sorts the major issues concerning the protection of the right to freedom of speech guaranteed to every citizen under Article 19 (1) (a) of the constitution. It clarifies by stating, "Comments expressing disapproval of the government, as long as they do not incite or attempt to incite hatred, contempt, or disaffection, do not qualify as an offense". The changes were incorporated to balance National security and freedom of speech. The effectiveness of this section can only be known depending on how the courts interpret and implement the section.

4. INTERNATIONAL VIEW ON SEDITION LAWS IN INDIA

Significant opposition to the misuse of sedition laws in India has come from civil rights groups, political groups, and academic circles. This has drawn the attention of International bodies or organizations that acknowledge and criticize the misuse of the law. Famous international organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch played crucial roles in criticizing the sedition laws of India, which were broad and easily prone to misuse¹⁹. The argument is such that these laws are frequently used to silence criticism against the government and silence criticism arising from the general public. Many International standards emphasize the importance of protecting freedom of speech and expression. Section 124 A of the IPC criminalizing dissenting acts and opinions is seen as incompatible with these standards²⁰.

4.1 *Call for reforms from various international boards*

Various international organizations have called for reformations or repeal of the sedition laws in India to align with

human rights norms. It is argued that such laws are to be put to use in cases of genuine public descent and not for legitimate concerns of the public²¹.

4.2 *Comparative analysis with other nations*

Section 124 A of the IPC played a crucial role in sedition-related laws in India. It makes criminal any actions that foster hatred, contempt, or disaffection toward the government. It is further criticized for being easily prone to being misused by authoritative figures or government officials²². To deal with this issue section 124 A of the IPC was replaced by section 152 of BNS to answer the problems that arose out of section 124 A of the IPC. In 2009, sedition laws were revoked in the United Kingdom. The laws were abolished to align with modern human rights standards²³. Section 2385 US Code criminalizes acts attempting to overthrow the government by force in the United States. However, it is rarely enforced due to strong protections for freedom of speech. In Canada, no specific laws for sedition exist as the focus is more on hate crime laws²⁴. Volksverhetzung is a legal concept in Germany that makes incitement of hatred against any race or religion a crime. It emphasizes protecting public order and preventing hate speech²⁵. The Crimes (Repeal of Seditious Offenses) Amendment Bill 2007 is a New Zealand law that resulted in the abolition of sedition as a crime in 2008²⁶.

4.3 *Impact of sedition laws on India's global image*

The loopholes and flaws of the sedition laws and their predominant misuse have led to question the concept of democracy in India which is the heart and soul of the nation. India has been known for its role in history as a leader in advocating common global causes such as non-violence, human rights, and freedom thus the country's stands in its sedition laws might damage the international image of the country. In conclusion, the sedition laws in India were criticized as being scope for misuse of power and as a violation of the right to speech and expression and other human rights by the international community. India considered this and thus brought a new set of rules under the new legislation Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita which replaced the Indian Penal Code. Section 152 of BNS thus attempts to bridge the gap and address the issues raised by the previous legislation.

5. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Section 124 A of IPC was first enacted by the British in 1870 to stifle dissent by the freedom fighters. Many famous freedom fighters like Mahatma Gandhi and Bal Gangadhar Tilak were charged under this section²⁷. Post-Independence the law was amended only to make it more stringent. According to the article in the Hindu Times, the three-member bench of the Supreme Court emphasized the importance of reviewing section 124 A of the IPC thereby highlighting the importance of

¹⁷ <https://lawbhoomi.com/s-g-vombatkere-vs-union-of-india/>

¹⁸ https://images.assettype.com/barandbench/2023-12/0b72810d-c136-4ceb-a550-222d9dadfafb/THE_BHARATIYA_NYAYA_SECOND_SANHITA_2023.pdf

¹⁹ <https://www.lawjournals.org/assets/archives/2020/vol6issue1/5-6-31-266.pdf>

²⁰ <https://ijlr.iledu.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/V3I212.pdf>

²¹ <https://blog.primelegal.in/the-sedition-law-in-international-perspective-status-quo/>

²² <https://www.lawjournals.org/assets/archives/2020/vol6issue1/5-6-31-266.pdf>

²³ <https://vidhi.org/comparison-of-sedition-law-in-india-and-international-jurisdictions/>

²⁴ <https://www.scoopwhoop.com/life/sedition-laws-in-different-countries/>

²⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volksverhetzung>

²⁶ <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9528-sedition-laws-in-india-a-critical-analysis.html>

²⁷ <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/the-sedition-story-complicated-history-of-sec-124a-101626370928612.html>

examining the evolution of the penal law since the pre-independence time as well as the interpretation provided by the country over the time. The validity of sedition law was tested in many cases some of the cases are: Ram Nandan v. State of Uttar Pradesh²⁸, Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar²⁹, Balwant Singh case³⁰, and Tara Singh Gopi Chand v. the State: The High court held that the section 124 A of IPC was undoubtedly a restriction on the freedom of speech and expression, and declared invalid in the grounds that it infringed on the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression protected under article 19(1)(a) of the Indian constitution³¹. Finally, in May 2022, the Supreme Court in the S.G.Vombatkere case³² suspended the use of section 124 A of IPC. The court observed that the provision was a relic of the colonial era and that it had been misused. It directed that the misuse of section 124 A of IPC should be curtailed until the government provides a comprehensive review. The court issued interim orders to suspend the filing of new FIRs under this section and to put existing cases on hold till a decision is reached³³. Section 152 of BNS addresses and attempts to make amends for the scope of misuse present in section 124 A of IPC. It was implemented to address the key issue of acts threatening the unity, sovereignty, and integrity of India³⁴. Section 152 of BNS covers all the aspects mentioned in section 124 A of the IPC and also incorporates different versions of crimes relevant to the present times. It also includes subversive activities and separatist sentiments. The punishment under this section includes life imprisonment for severe offenses and seven years' imprisonment for less severe offenses and monetary compensation is imposed alongside imprisonment. Despite all these changes, there is an ongoing debate regarding the section's clarity and potential vagueness. Recently on 16th December 2024, Hon'ble Justice Arun Monga of the Rajasthan High Court delivered an important judgment emphasizing the protection of genuine dissent. Justice Monga stated that legitimate and reasonable dissent should not be equated with sedition or acts against the nation. This judgment came in the context of a case where an FIR had been filed against Sikh preacher Tejender Pal Singh Timma. The court found no basis for the charges and dismissed the FIR. This case is Tajendhra Pal Singh v. State of Rajasthan.³⁵

5.1 Background of The Case

The Rajasthan High Court ruled that mere dissent should not be treated as an act against the nation. The court quashed the FIR filed against Sikh preacher Tejender Pal Singh Timma, who had been charged under Sections 152 and 197(1)(c) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) for allegedly undermining India's sovereignty and unity through posts on social media³⁶. The court held that for such charges to be valid, there must be a clear and direct connection between the speech and a real threat of rebellion or national security risks. In the end, the court acquitted the accused of all charges. The paper concludes that though section 124 A had been used for many years and had its fair share of misuse, section 152 of BNS even after expanding its

scope has a lot of potential for misuse and faces criticism. Despite these errors, both sections play a crucial role in understanding sedition laws and provide scope for future amendments.

6. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR PREVENTING MISUSE OF SEDITION LAWS

7.1 Accountability for Defaulting Officials in the Misuse of Sedition Laws

It is essential to establish clear provisions that hold public officials, law enforcement agencies, and legal authorities accountable for the misuse or abuse of sedition laws. These laws should include stringent measures to deter wrongful application, ensuring that officials face legal consequences if they arbitrarily or maliciously file sedition charges without proper grounds. This can include disciplinary actions, fines, or criminal charges against those who intentionally misuse the law to suppress dissent, intimidate critics, or settle personal or political scores.

7.2 Clear Definition of "Subversive Activities" to Avoid Ambiguity

To prevent misuse of sedition laws, there must be a precise and unambiguous legal definition of "subversive activities." The term should not be left open to broad interpretation. Still, it should specifically refer to acts that threaten the integrity, sovereignty, or security of the state, as defined by constitutional and legal standards. This clarity will ensure that sedition charges are only invoked in genuine cases of incitement to violence or attempts to overthrow the government, rather than being used to suppress political opposition or peaceful protest.

7.3 Provision of Specific Legal Relief for the Wrongfully Accused

There must be robust mechanisms for providing relief to individuals who are wrongfully accused under sedition laws. This includes the establishment of legal recourse for those falsely charged, such as automatic review of sedition cases by independent bodies or courts, and the provision of reparations or compensation for wrongful detention or harm caused by such charges. Additionally, individuals who have been acquitted or whose charges are dropped should have access to legal aid and support to clear their names, as well as a mechanism for seeking redress against the authorities who brought the charges without just cause.

7.4 Implementation of Specific Guidelines and Safeguards to Prevent Arbitrary Filing of Sedition Cases

To prevent arbitrary or wrongful application of sedition laws, there must be strict and specific procedural guidelines for the filing of sedition cases. These guidelines should require that sedition charges can only be filed after a thorough investigation, with adequate evidence showing clear intent to incite violence,

²⁸ Ibid (2).

²⁹ Ibid (3).

³⁰ Ibid (14).

³¹ <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/the-sedition-story-complicated-history-of-sec-124a-101626370928612.html>

³² Ibid (16).

³³ <https://lawbhoomi.com/s-g-vombatkere-vs-union-of-india/>

³⁴ <https://lawrato.com/bharatiya-nyaya-sanhita/bns-section-152>

³⁵ <https://blog.primelegal.in/rajasthan-high-court-says-section-152-of-bns-should-not-be-misused-and-legitimate-dissent-cannot-amount-to-sedition/>

³⁶ <https://blog.primelegal.in/rajasthan-high-court-says-section-152-of-bns-should-not-be-misused-and-legitimate-dissent-cannot-amount-to-sedition/>

rebellion, or the overthrow of the government. The law should mandate judicial oversight at the initial stages of such cases to ensure that they are not filed based on vague, politically motivated, or retaliatory reasons. Furthermore, penalties for officials who initiate baseless sedition charges should be established to deter misuse, ensuring that the law is not wielded as a tool of political persecution or suppression of free expression.

7. KEY GAPS AND ISSUES

8.1 *Ambiguity in law*

The BNS replaced the term sedition with subversive activities, this however is not clearly defined. Thus it gives space for ambiguity. This vague terminology provides space for varied interpretations, which can lead to inconsistent application and enforcement of the law. Without a precise and universally agreed-upon definition, the term can be used broadly to encompass a wide range of actions, potentially including non-violent protests, political dissent, or criticism of government policies. Such ambiguity undermines the rule of law by leaving room for arbitrary actions, creating uncertainty about what constitutes a punishable offense under the law.

8.2 *Possibility for misuse*

Despite judicial intervention concerning the sedition laws there still exists concerns regarding the misuse of the section. The broad and vague nature of sedition laws still allows for selective enforcement, where authorities can target individuals based on political, ideological, or social differences rather than legitimate threats to national security. Despite efforts to curb such misuse, cases of individuals being charged with sedition for merely expressing dissent or engaging in peaceful protest continue to surface. The law's potential for being wielded as a tool of political repression, intimidation, or silencing opposition remains a significant challenge, even with judicial safeguards in place.

8.3 *Absence of specific relief for the wrongfully accused*

Individuals who face sedition charges often endure prolonged trials, legal battles, and social stigma, even if they are ultimately acquitted or the charges are dropped. These individuals frequently experience irreversible harm to their reputations, careers, and personal lives. The prolonged nature of trials under sedition laws can lead to severe economic and emotional distress, with many individuals losing their jobs, facing family hardships, or experiencing lasting trauma. There is an urgent need for specific legal provisions that provide timely and efficient redress for those wrongfully accused, such as automatic reviews, compensation for wrongful detention, and mechanisms to help individuals restore their reputations.

8.4 *Regional Imbalance*

A noticeable issue with the enforcement of sedition laws is the regional imbalance, where certain states or regions, such as Assam, contribute disproportionately to the rising number of sedition cases. This regional disparity reflects localized tensions, political dynamics, or socio-economic conditions that lead to the higher application of sedition charges in some areas. For example, in regions with ongoing political unrest or ethnic tensions, sedition laws are often invoked more frequently,

sometimes resulting in the stifling of local voices and movements that challenge the status quo. The disproportionate application of sedition laws in certain regions highlights the need for a more uniform and fair approach to law enforcement, ensuring that the law is not used to target specific communities or groups based on their regional or political affiliations.

8. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the evolution of sedition laws, particularly Section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) to Section 152 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), highlights the ongoing challenges in balancing national security with individual freedoms. While section 124 A was originally a tool used by colonial authorities to suppress dissent, its misuse continued post-independence, leading to numerous legal battles. Despite the Amendments, the law continued to remain a tool for political repression and stifling the right to freedom of speech and expression, a reality that has led to increasing concerns about its broader application. Cases like the Ram Nandan case and the Kedarnath Singh case highlight the tension between the necessity to protect national security and the right to freedom of speech and expression protected by the constitution in 19(a)(1). The recent judgment by the Supreme Court in May 2022 in the S.G. Vombatkere case, which suspended the application of Section 124A, emphasized the need for a comprehensive review of the law. This suspension, along with the shift from sedition to subversive activities in Section 152 of BNS, reflects an evolving understanding of the law's potential for misuse. However, the ambiguity and vague definition of "subversive activities" in the BNS have raised concerns about its application in similar ways to sedition laws. Moreover, the case of Tajendhra Pal Singh v. State of Rajasthan, where the Rajasthan High Court quashed the sedition charges against a Sikh preacher, underscores the need to distinguish legitimate dissent from acts of rebellion or national threat. The court's decision reflects a growing acknowledgment that dissent, when non-violent and peaceful, should not be equated with sedition. This judgment could serve as a potential guiding principle for future applications of sedition and related laws. Despite these judicial interventions, significant gaps persist in the law's effectiveness and fairness. There remains ambiguity in the definition of subversive activities, which can lead to inconsistent enforcement. The possibility for misuse of the law continues, particularly when political or ideological motivations influence its application. The lack of specific provisions for relief for those wrongfully accused remains a key issue, as individuals subjected to sedition charges often face prolonged trials, reputational damage, and social stigma, regardless of the eventual outcome. The regional imbalance in the enforcement of sedition laws further compounds the issue. Certain regions, especially those facing political unrest or ethnic tensions, see a disproportionate number of sedition cases. This imbalanced application of the law highlights the need for a more uniform and just approach that does not target specific communities based on political affiliations or regional identity. In conclusion, while Section 124A of the IPC and Section 152 of the BNS serve to protect national security, their broad scope and potential for misuse warrant a critical re-examination. The introduction of more specific legal safeguards, clearer definitions, and accountability for wrongful accusations would ensure that sedition laws do not become a tool for political persecution. Both the law's interpretation and its application must evolve to strike a

balance between national security and the protection of fundamental rights, especially the freedom of speech.

Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest declared none.

Funding

The review presented in the article did not receive any external financial support.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge that no external funding or assistance was received for this research, and therefore, no acknowledgements are necessary.

9. REFERENCES

1. Queen-Empress v. Jogendra Chunder Bose and Others, (1892) ILR 19 Cal 35.
2. Ram Nandan v. State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1959 All 101.
3. Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar, AIR 1962 SC 955.
4. Balwant Singh and Anr v. State of Punjab, AIR 1995 SC 1785.
5. S.G. Vombatkere v. Union of India, (2022) 7 SCC 433.