17

DEMYSTIFYING THE UNTRACED BLEMISHES IN THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

SHIVANI JOHRI

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR FROM SHARDA UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The making of the Indian Constitution was unparalleled in its scope — the well-being of a nation with a magnificent diversity of languages, faiths, customs, and differences of caste, creed ,ethnicity etc

The Constitution of India was framed by a Constituent Assembly set up under the Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946. The Assembly consisted of 389 members representing provinces (292), states (93), the Chief Commissioner Provinces (3) and Baluchistan (1). The Assembly held its first meeting on December 9, 1946, and elected Dr.Sachhidanand Sinha, the oldest member of the Assembly as the Provisional President. On December 11, 1946, the Assembly elected Dr Rajendra Prasad as its permanent Chairman. The strength of the Assembly was reduced to 299 (229 representing the provinces and 70 representing the states) following withdrawal of the Muslim League members after the partition of the country.

According to Granville Austin, the success of the constitution lies in having been framed by Indians and in the excellence of the framing process itself.[1] The assembly members applied foreign concepts in Indian setting with great pains and thus, evolved the doctrine of accommodation according to which accommodation was applied to the various principles embodied in the constitution. The Indian constituent assembly so elected was widely criticized by various eminent jurists like Jaya Prakash Narain said it was a "restricted and curbed assembly"; Churchill said it represented only one major community of India and Simons said it was a 'body of Hindus" Constitution being the Suprema-Lex, still suffers from a significant-lacunae both in framing and implementation.

CONSTITUTION UNFOUNDED N CLICH'ED

1. There is too much centralisation and the states have been reduced to the size of municiplaities and this strong bias towards centre in our federal structure is reflected in the recent case of Uttarakhand's govt being toppled to set in President's rule .
2. Privileges of the Parliament and State Legislatures are left upon then to decide which has not been codified till date and successive legislators have misused/interpreted these privileges to take on various voices of dissent. The MPs and MLAs are smart enough not to codify the privileges and people in general are not much aware of this anomaly in our Constitution.: Article 105 deals with. Parliamentary Privileges and there are similar privileges for the state legislators
3. The Constitution is too bulky and comprehensive and too complex for a layman to understand. In fact, it is considered a paradise of lawyers. This happened because our Constituent Assembly comprised of a very high number of eminent lawyers.
4. There is a high degree of protection to civil servants accorded under Art 311. This provision is more misused and abused than being used.
5. Anglo Indian community doesn't really require 2 seats in Lok Sabha anymore. The fears of 1950s are certainly gone and this provision may be repealed to uphold Right to Equality.
6. Schedule IX (read with Art 31B) which accords protection to a law vis-a-vis Fundamental Rights needs to be revisited and revised
7. There is no provision to maintain efficiency of Legislature like minimum number of working hours, minimum number of hours to be spent on legislation, budget etc. Further, the Speaker is a very powerful authority and there may be a case to revisit his/her powers.
8. Anti-Detection Law is also not a very good idea. It creates a paradox in which a voter is free to choose any candidate but a law-maker is not free to voice his opinion. This is antithetical to our democratic ethos.

The Anti-Defection Act, incorporated in the Tenth Schedule of the Constitution, has come into sharp focus ever since the Bharatiya Janata Party got a majority in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly with the help of defectors from other parties. The defector invites disqualification if he or she voluntarily gives up membership of his party or abstains from voting in violation of any direction issued by the party. Independent members too invite disqualification if they join a political party.

The law also recognises splits in and mergers of parties. A split is recognised if at least one-third of the total membership of the legislature party defects. If more than two-thirds of the number of legislators of a party decide to join another party, it is recognised as a merger; in that case, the remaining legislators of the parent party will not be disqualified, but it is argued that obtaining the assent of two thirds members of political party is not difficult and thus, it prevents the political party to save it's face. This law has been criticised on the grounds that it curtails the powers, privileges and immunities of members in regard to freedom of speech and freedom of action, including freedom of vote.

The law initially stated that the decision of the Presiding Officer is not subject to judicial review. This condition was struck down by the Supreme Court in 1992, thereby allowing appeals against the Presiding Officer's decision in the High Court and Supreme Court.[2] However, it held that there may not be any judicial intervention until the Presiding Officer gives his order.
In 2015, the Hyderabad High Court, refused to intervene after hearing a petition which alleged that there had been delay by the Telangana Assembly Speaker in acting against a member under the anti-defection law.[3]

THE MULTITUDINAL PROBLEM OF RESERVATION IN THE PRESENT SCENARIO- THE IDEALISM OF THE GRUNDNORM

Firstly, we need to understand that the reservation system which owes it's origin to the caste system only divides the society leading to discrimination and conflicts between different sections. It is really oppressive and does not find its basis in casteism.

Today, as per the government policy, 15% of the government jobs and 15% of the students admitted to universities must be from Scheduled castes and for the Scheduled tribes there is a reservation of about 7.5 %. Other than this, the state governments also follow their own reservation policies respectively based upon the population constitution of each state. So nearly 50% seats are reserved. The- 93rd Constitutional Amendment allows the government to make special provisions for "advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens", including their admission in aided or unaided private educational institutions. Gradually this reservation policy is to be implemented in private institutions and companies as well. This move led to opposition from non-reserved category students, as the proposal reduced seats for the General (non-reserved) category from the existing 77.5% to less than 50.5% (since members of OBCs are also allowed to contest in the General category).

Article 15(4) of our constitution empowers the government to make special provisions for advancement of backward classes. Similarly Article 16 provides for equality of opportunity in matters of employment or appointment to any post under the State.

"Clause 2 of article 16 lays down that no citizen on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any of them be discriminated in respect of any employment or office under the State."

However, clause 4 of the same article provides for an exception by conferring a certain kind of power on the government:

"it empowers the state to make special provision for the reservation of appointments of posts in favour of any backward class of citizens which in the opinion of the state are not adequately represented in the services"

Thus, two conditions have to be satisfied:

- **The class of citizens is backward**
- **The said class is not adequately represented**.

In a case- Balaji v/s State of Mysore it was held that 'caste of a person cannot be the sole criteria for ascertaining whether a particular caste is backward or not. Determinants such as poverty, occupation, place of habitation may all be relevant factors to be taken into consideration. The court further held that it does not mean that if once a caste is considered to be backward it will continue to be backward for all other times. The government should review the test and if a class reaches the state of progress where reservation is not necessary it should delete that class from the list of backward classes.'

What is surprising is that our constitution clearly is a reservation-friendly constitution but nowhere in the constitution is the term 'backward classes defined. The basic question which needs to be addressed is how can reservations be made for something that has not been defined?

Today when a student applies for an admission in any university, the admission forms are filled with questions like 'Are you SC/ST or OBC or General Category?' How does it matter which category does he belong to, what matters is his merit. A category cannot decide whether he is eligible for admission or not. There many economically worse off children belonging to the forward classes but they cannot get the fruits of such reservation merely by virtue of belonging to the 'general' category. Sometimes these children belonging to the backward classes do not even deserve and still possess the necessary merit as against a child who studied very hard for months to get a seat, thereby snatching away that seat just because he comes from a particular religion or caste for which our government provides reservation.

According to me reservation should not be purely made on the basis of the economical conditions of the applicant and nothing else. Further, granting of subsidies to low income groups is important rather than hindering and blocking seats for meritorious students who work day and night .The kind of reservation policy that our government currently follows does nothing but divide the society into different sections.

When the then HRD minister Mr. Arjun Singh introduced 27.5% reservation for OBC in centrally funded educational institutes including IIMs and IITs a petition was moved to the President and the Prime Minister stating that such a reservation will take India back from where she is today. Further "everyone understands the need for all sections of the Indian Society to get an opportunity to be a part of this economy but reservation based on caste is not an answer to this. These policies have been in India since the last 50 years and they have failed to meet their objectives. The government should go into the reasons of the failure. Many students don't make it to the institutes because of the economic reasons and those who do not fall in the reservation criteria don not get a fair opportunity too". However, it is unlikely that the recently passed Constitution (124th Amendment) Bill, 2019, creating a 10% quota for the economically weaker sections (EWS), will serve as anything more than a band-aid.

1. Some provision are contradictory of each other esp Fundamental Rights (Part III) and Directive Principles of State Policy (Part IV) which highlights this paradox.

2. No part of the Constitution represents the ancient policy of India, its genius and the spirit of its hallowed and glorious traditions.
3. Many provisions are Un Gandhian except few.

There can certainly be more provisions. One needs to ponder deeply upon the provisions of the Constitution to understand the needs to have such Articles. In my view they are still very much needed. Further, cited

- It doesn't represent the will of people of India because constituent assembly was chosen by indirect elections and only around 10% people in Country had voting rights on the basis of Education, Wealth and taxes they were paying, who had elected the electoral college for Constituent Assembly members.
- They spent too much time on it(2 years 11 months 18 days). US Constitution was created in around 4 months.
- They(Constituent Assembly Members) were too lazy to change few things, which were directly copied from GoIA-1935 and were irrelevant at that time and thus referring it as a"bag of borrowings"
- Article 370 was a big big failure.
- Our Constitution makes our system Socialist and upto some extent tending towards Communism (Probably Domino Effect).
- No substantial provision to encourage local languages or Hindi. There are articles like 343 or 351 but practically those have been useless.
- We are not direct democracy like Switzerland and our Constitution gives immense rights and benefits to Politicians. You can see in current scenario to find out who are the most powerful and rich people and undoubtedly those are politicians.
- Article 34 puts restriction on Fundamental Rights while martial law is in force in any area. Now, the problem here lies with the fact that nowhere in the constitution, the term Martial Law has been described. Of-course we know what it means but there are no provisions in the constitution which define and discuss it.
- Fundamental Duties: One look at the Fundamental Duties and you'll realise that they have been put haphazardly in the Constitution. There is no logical grouping and some of them are too vague. Although they are not enforceable unlike their counterparts, the way they have been put in the constitution as a list of 11 non related, non-cohesive duties makes the case of self-imposition pretty weak and a goal in itself to be realised

Emergency Provisions: The Labyrinth of Law in India

To criticise this provision, it's sufficient for you to know that no other country has it. If anything, they have been used more as a tool by political parties to fulfil their vendetta. The National Emergency has been used thrice, two times in case of external aggression, once because of "internal disturbance". The fact that we didn't need National Emergency after progressing a bit into mature democratic institution, tells how little relevance the provision of National Emergency holds. The Financial Emergency has never been invoked and the President's Rule has become nothing more than a political tool.

CONSTITUITION REVERSE ENGINEERED-Fundamental rights vs dpsp

Further, the fundamental rights are subject to excessive limitations, restrictions and qualifications. Hence the critics say that the constitution give fundamental rights from one hand and take away from the other. Jaspat Roy Kapur went to the extent of saying that the chapter on fundamental rights as "limitations on fundamental rights."-Indian Polity By M Laxmikanth, 4th Edition, Page 7.23

Fundamental rights are vague and ambiguous as regards the words like public order, minorities etc are not clearly defined. Further, the judiciary is entrusted with the opportunity to for defending and protecting these fundamental rights but the remedy is too long and expansive.

SOLUTIONS- CONSTITUTION- A FICTONAL IDEAL OR A WORKABLE REALITY

1. THE first indispensable constitutional requirement is the capacity of courts to define the constitution that is the time limits within which the different organs can legislate and perform their functions and exercise their powers. The verdict of judiciary shall be binding on all institutions
2. In England also the prerogative powers of the executive are subject to judicial review. Thus, legal realism is desirable so long it does not offend the political processes of this country. There is no sanction above the grund-norm and at the apex level it is a game of politics only.
3. Thirdly, no institution can excel if the people are selfish and unwilling to bring in development. The institutions being legal abstractions, it is the people who hamper development both at the apex level and the ground level. Strict penalties and fines should be kept for all those who violate or abet such acts.

Seervai , constitutional law of India, 59(1967)

Observed

SubbaRao,cj, may seem no distinction between erosion of fundamental rights by constitutional amendments and a violent revolution so far as these rights are concerned, there may be something to be said for this view. But, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and the eminent men who framed the constitution did not contemplate a violent overthrow of it, for they had not forgotten the events of 1947, and when law and order broke down under the orgy of violence, and they believed …that the "whole constitution is a creature of parliament. It would be strange irony if judgements which seek to preserve the cherished human rights not only fail to do so, but lead to destruction of the cherished judicial system.'

REMEDIES- SUMMING THE GREY AREAS

- Make education mandatory and free for all till age of 15. Population control should be practiced and an effort should be made to implement fundamental duties.

- Propose reservation based on economic status
- Provide opportunity to students to earn when they are studying.
- Instead of introducing reservations for these backward classes what is required is to bring about revolutionary changes in our education system at the grass-root level. When proper education is not provided to children belonging to such categories during the primary stage itself then on what basis are the reservations provided at a subsequent stage.

Reservations are nothing but means to prosper the vote banks of politicians. They are hindering the country's growth, development and competency in all aspects. On one hand the preamble of our constitution states that we are a free, democratic and sovereign nation and on the other hand reservation system is chaining all these aspects into its clutches. It is creating disparity and differences amongst the people. The constitution lays down that every child has a right to education and no where expresses that any child belonging to a backward class has a little more of this right than the general category. By reserving one category against another creates a feeling of division which is now resulting in a chaos with every small section of the society asking for it.

To cut the argument short, we can say that though Indian constitution is a huge patchwork of the different constitutions from all across the world, making it one of the most lengthiest constitutions with a maximum number of amendments, and though the Indian constitution includes many necessary provisions in order to establish a nearly ideal country in nearly all the aspects but the most important thing that the Indian constitution lacks is the effectiveness and the guarantee of the implication of the different articles that comprises the constitution.

The Indian constitution has created a sense of irony amongst the highly diverse Indian society, for example:

Thought it has mentioned about the prohibition of discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth u/a 15 of part 3 (fundamental right),but in reality, it is less effective as it does not includes any other provisions to mandate such human rights as these.

There are many other loopholes like these in the Indian constitution which actually requires a lot of time to be fixed, and hence it also proves that it is not the bulk of the constitution that makes it better one but it is the credibility and effectiveness that contributes towards its utility in the society.

Many a times some cunning lawyers/advocates/politicians etc try to justify/prove something by citing an article of constitution and in this process they successfully fool us by quoting out of context and misinterpreting the article/clause itself.

For example supreme court gave judgement in may 2010 that Narco test without permission of accused is unconstitutional citing clause number 3 of Article 20 in The Constitution Of India 1949.

Before 2010 supreme court judges and fraud petitioners (because of whom this case went to SC and Narco test without consent of accused was declared unconstitutional) were not aware of clause number 3 of Article 20 in The Constitution Of India 1949 but when Scams of UPA-2 were in starting phase in 2010 they went to SC.It was in fact UPA-2 that bribed SC judges/lawyers and other fraud petitioners to take this in court and banned Narco test without accused's permission.Else CBI would have done Narco test on A Raja and A Raja would have revealed everything about P Chidambaram,Sibal,Sonia and even Manmohan singh.

Before may 2010 when Narco test without accused's permission was legal :

1)Abdul telgi confessed in Narco test about two politicians in stamp paper scam

2)Kasab's narco test was done in 2009 some 4 months before this judgement came else for Kasab's narco test investigation agency would have required to take permission from Kasab for his Narco test.And had kasab denied for it we would have never came to know pakistan's(ISI) involvement in 26/11 attack.

Now, after this judgement was given in 2010 will any future or past corrupt/criminal agree for his/her narco test to prove himself/herself corrupt/criminal? Are criminals idiot to demand their narco test?Will any rapist demand his/her narco test to confess his/her crime?

What clause number 3 of Article 20 in The Constitution Of India 1949 actually meant was that a person should not be forced to accept his/her crime through torture by police or anybody else .If a person is not guilty why should he/she hesitate for his/her narco test? It never meant that person cannot confess his/her crime.It was just another excellent move by Govt and Judiciary to fool public in the name of Constitution.

SC and UPA-2 found narco test on accused more anti-constitutional and anti-human rights than third degree torture by police and investigation agencies.

MAPPING THE BRILLIANT MASTERPEICE OF SOCIAL ENGINEERING

Again, Loopholes in the constitution arise in the way the wordings are interpreted. For example, the supreme court had to formulate the doctrine of basic structure of the constitution for preventing the parliament to amend the constitution to its will. Constitution can only provide a framework for the state to function.. We can find a loophole in almost every article. It is for us to interpret it in the right sense and spirit

For example-Role played by Governor and qualifications to be a Governor: The Constitution must provide for a system where the post of Governor must not be used as a political junkyard. The failed or aging politicians are accommodated by giving them the post of Governor. They get this post as a favour and in result they act as political stooges. There must be some change in this.

UNMAPPING THE BLEMISHES FROM THE PAST

However, one of the most controversial amendments introduced in the Constitution -- during the emergency of 1975 -- tweaked this very characteristic of the Constitution.

It was then when the powers of the Constitution were curtailed in the Forty-second Amendment of the Constitution. Popularly known as the Constitution (Forty second Amendment) Act of 1977, the amendment to the Constitution was initiated by the Indira Gandhi-led Indian National Congress during the emergency period.

The amendment was considered the most controversial in the history of India as it called for restricting the power of the Supreme Court and the High Court in pronouncing judgments complying with constitutional validity.

The 59th clause of the amendment snatched away several powers resting with the Supreme Court making Parliament the Supreme authority.

The amendment equipped the Prime Minister with uncontrolled powers to amend any section of the Constitution without any judicial intervention.

It transferred more powers to the Central Government, reducing the authority vested with the state governments

Article 368 of the Amendment act restrained any constitutional amendment from being "called into question in any court on any ground". Also, it clearly stated the nature of (unlimited) powers offered to the Parliament allowing it to amend the Constitution at any given point.

The Act dismissed the powers of the courts in dictating any judgment for office for profit cases. It eroded the federal structure of the Constitution completely.

The Preamble was changed from "sovereign, democratic, republic" to "sovereign, socialist, democratic, republic"

Due to its utmost modifications of the Constitution, the amendment is often called "mini-Constitution" and the "Constitution of Indira".

The Supreme court in 1980 reverted these modifications calling two provisions of the 42nd Amendment as unconstitutional.

The Emergency era and its infamous Constitution amendment had been widely criticised as stated aforesaid.

Indira Gandhi had to face its consequences in the elections that followed which led to the first-ever downfall of the Indian National Congress in India.

THE ANTI-THESIS OF LEGALITY IS THE NEW LAW

Article 35A gives special rights to the Jammu and Kashmir's permanent residents while denying certain rights to people from outside the state.

Ahead of the August 6 hearing in the Supreme Court of the petitions challenging the validity of Article 35A of the Constitution, which grants special privileges to Jammu and Kashmir, separatists have called a shutdown on August 4 and 5 in protest against government's alleged move to tamper with the Article.

The petition in the case has been filed by a Delhi-based NGO, We the Citizens, saying the state's autonomous status granted by Article 35(A) and Article 370 of the Constitution discriminate against fellow citizens from the rest of the country.

Article 35A gives special rights to the Jammu and Kashmir's permanent residents. It disallows people from outside the state from buying or owning immovable property there, settle permanently, or avail themselves of state-sponsored scholarship schemes. It also forbids the J-K government from hiring people who are non-permanent residents.

Article 35A was added to Article 370 by a Presidential order in 1954.

Article 370 of the Constitution grants special status to Jammu and Kashmir, while Article 35A empowers the state legislature to define the state's "permanent residents" and their special rights and privileges.

The provision in Article 35A that grants special rights and privileges to permanent citizens appears in the Constitution as an "appendix", and not as an amendment.

According to the NGO, Article 35A should be held "unconstitutional" as the President could not have "amended the Constitution" by way of the 1954 order, and that it was only supposed to be a "temporary provision". The Article was never presented before Parliament, and came into effect immediately.

The Jammu and Kashmir government has contested the petition, saying the President had the power to incorporate a new provision in the Constitution by way of an order.

The 2018 Republic Day marks 69 years of the great Indian Constitution. The Constitution of India is the principal document that formulates the rights, duties and powers of citizens, governments and its officials. The constitution came into force on 26 January 1950, took nearly three years to complete, and is regarded to be the world's most extensive Constitution.

OUR BROKEN CONSTITUTION-PRESENT SCENARIO

Voting age reduced from 21 to 18 (1989)

The then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi explained it as an expression of the government's full faith in the youth of the country. The youth are aware and informed and thus, lowering of the voting age would provide an opportunity to the unrepresented youth of the nation to vent out their feelings and motivate them to become a part of the political process eventually.

Allowed the government to pass laws relating to reservations to socially, economically backward classes, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in public and private higher educational institutions (2014):

Scheduled castes and scheduled tribes have been the most neglected and exploited people in India. The curse of untouchability has always been a dark spot on Indian civilisation and culture. Despite the constitutional declaration of its abolition under Article 17, it was still quite prevalent in many subtle and not so subtle ways. Therefore, for the very integrity, survival and the nation's unity the amendment to pass laws relating to such reservations were quite a need of the hour.

Introduction of the Goods and Services Tax (GST), to present the idea of One Nation, One Tax (2016):

The most recent important amendment came with the implementation of the GST, where consumers would not be subjected to double/ multiple taxations. All taxes that are imposed while purchasing goods will include both the central government's taxes as well as the state government's taxes. The introduction of GST has deterred the state governments from randomly increasing taxes in January 26, 2015, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting issued an advertisement in several dailies to mark the holding of Republic Day. The advertisement included a picture with the text of the original Preamble of India's Constitution as adopted in January 1950. This text did not include the words "secular" and "socialist" as these terms were introduced into the Preamble through the 42nd Constitutional Amendment by the Indira Gandhi government in 1977. Although the original Preamble did not contain these specific words, several provisions in the Constitution, especially those relating to "Fundamental Rights" and "Directive Principles of State Policy" entrenched particular variations of secularism and socialism in keeping with the vision of the framers.

More fuel to the already raging fire was added by a Member of Parliament of the Sh Upendra Baxi, who wrote an op-ed that helps clarify the legal issue at hand. Baxi first noted that:

"In 1973, the judgment on Kesavananda Bharati vs State of Kerala articulated the doctrine of basic structure and the essential features of the Constitution, laying down that "secularism", "socialism" as well as the Preamble to the Constitution (which may not be amended unless it was according to prescribed constitutional procedure) were integral to them. With effect from January 3, 1977, the Constitution (Forty-second Amendment) Act amended the Preamble and India was declared a sovereign, secular, socialist, democratic republic. Although the 42nd amendment was reversed in key aspects by the post-Emergency 44th amendment, which took effect from June 20, 1979, the amended Preamble was not changed. It has remained unchanged since 1977."

Baxi went on to assert that

"[g]oing strictly by constitutional law, there is nothing called an original Preamble. True, when it was adopted, the Constitution did not include the terms "socialist" and "secular" as it now does. And it does so because the Supreme Court of India willed it before Parliament and the political executive did. Today, there is only one Preamble, which is enforced by the amendment that came into force in January 1977. No ministry at the Central or the state level is legally competent to say otherwise. The Constitution may not be amended by the executive. Only Parliament has the legal power to amend and even this would be valid if the justices of the Supreme Court were to hold that the amendment did not offend the basic structure or the essential features of the Constitution."

The Prime Minister's intervention in the wake of the controversy

The controversy over the Preamble advertisement has embarrassed the BJP at a time when Prime Minister Modi had raised the stakes by inviting President Obama to attend the annual Republic Day parade as a guest of honour. Although much of the international and domestic media coverage focused on the bonhomie between the two leaders, even President Obama felt obliged to make a veiled reference to the BJP's track record on minority rights by invoking the constitutional provision on freedom of religion in his last public speech in Delhi.

The most encouraging sign that the BJP may have registered this message came in the form of a public speech by Prime Minister Modi on February 17, 2015. Speaking at a Catholic celebration, the Prime Minister made clear:

"My government will ensure that there is complete freedom of faith and that everyone has the undeniable right to retain or adopt the religion of his or her choice without coercion or undue influence. My government will not allow any religious group to incite hatred against others, overtly or covertly. Mine will be a government that gives equal respect to all religions."

Whatever be the cause, if the result is that a primary constitutional value of Indian constitutional democracy is reaffirmed at this critical juncture, then that is certainly cause for celebration.

BR AMBEDKAR-"IT DOES NOT SUIT ANYBODY."

"WE BUILT A TEMPLE FOR GOD TO COME IN AND RESIDE, BUT BEFORE GOD COULD BE INSTALLED ,IT WAS OCCUPIED BY THE ASURAS;BUT IT WAS INTENDED FOR THE DEVAS. THAT IS THE REASON THAT I WOULD LIKE TO BURN IT.

REFERENCES

(1) Constitution of India, Lok Sabha Secretariat

(2) Constituent Assembly Debates

(3) India Code, Ministry of Law and Justice.

(4) All India Reporter (A.I.R)- Supreme Court Judgements

(5) Making of Constitution, Lok Sabha Secretariat, 2016

(6) 50th Anniversary of The Republic of India, Select Proceedings of the Constituent Assembly relating to the Adoption and Signing of the Constitution, Lok Sabha Secretariat, 2000

(7) Granville Austin, The Indian Constitution—Cornerstone of a Nation, Oxford, 1966.

(8) D.D Basu, Introduction to the Constitution of India, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

(9) D.D Basu, Commentary on the Constitution of India, LexisNexis.

(10) M Laxmikanth, Indian Polity, McGraw Hill Education (India) Private Limited,

Fifth Edition, 2017.