



# HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS' ALERT - INDIA

NATIONAL SECRETARIAT

No. 555, West Cross 4th Street, K.K.Nagar, Madurai - 625 020, Tamil Nadu, India.

Mobile: 99943-68540

E.mail: [hrda.india@gmail.com](mailto:hrda.india@gmail.com) Web: [www.hrdaindia.org](http://www.hrdaindia.org)

**HRDA/NHRC-SM/North/HR/33/02/2024**

February 24, 2024

To

Justice (retd.) Mr. AK Mishra,  
Chairperson,  
National Human Rights Commission,  
Manav Adhikar Bhawan,  
Block-C, GPO Complex, INA,  
New Delhi –110 023  
Email: [chairnhrc@nic.in](mailto:chairnhrc@nic.in)

Respected Justice Mishra,

**Subject: Requesting to initiate Suo moto Proceedings in the case of killing of farmer protestor farmer Shubhakaran Singh; and 177 farmer protestors injured due to excessive use of force by Haryana police**

We are writing to you in bring to your attention that on the morning of February 21, 2024, the Haryana police used lathi charge, tear gas, rubber bullet and heavy force on the farmers who were protesting for assured floor prices or Minimum Support Price (MSP) for crop production.

As a result a young farmer and protestor Mr. Shubhakaran Singh (21) was killed at the Khanauri border near Punjab's Patran town in Patiala district. The preliminary inquiry by doctors at Patiala's Government Rajindra Hospital noted the suspicion that his death occurred due to a bullet injury.

According to media reports the Deputy Inspector General (DIG) Patiala range, Mr. H.S. Bhullar told reporters that Shubhakaran was suspected to have died from injuries sustained when security forces had fired rubber bullets at farmers. They did his, the DIG said, because farmers had tried to create a smokescreen to break the Haryana police's barricade.

This incident has been widely reported in the media and a link is shared here for your reference-<https://thewire.in/agriculture/farmers-protest-haryana-police-shubhakaran-singh>

This takes the number of farmer protestors injured in police excesses to 177. The Patiala district civil surgeon has said that most of the injuries were from dropping of tear gas shells or rubber bullet firings.

We believe the use of force, rubber pellets and tear gas and firing by police against peacefully protesting farmers is an act of reprisal against the protestors.

This amounts to a violation of a host of rights, which includes the right to life, the right to protest and the suppression of freedom of speech and expression.

The Right to protest is recognized under several international instruments, including:

- The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Article 8),
- Article 5 (a) of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders 1998 states that “For the purpose of promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, everyone has the right, individually and in association with others to meet or assemble peacefully”.

The Right to protest is an essential element of the right to participate in any democratic dispensation, and restrictions imposed on this right must be closely scrutinized with respect to their necessity and reasonableness (A/61/312, para. 56)

Human rights defenders working for the preservation of the environment become even more vulnerable because of the remoteness of the areas in which they are active. (A/HRC/4/37/Add.2, para. 23).

Human rights defenders play a pivotal role in ensuring that protest and criticism are expressed in a peaceful and constructive manner. States should legitimize and empower human rights defenders in this role and encourage defenders to take full ownership of this role (A/62/225, para. 102).

**The Supreme Court in Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan v. Union of India, (2018) 17 SCC 324: 2018 SCC Online SC 724 at page 366** held that: -

“54. The right to protest is, thus, recognised as a fundamental right under the Constitution. This right is crucial in a democracy which rests on participation of an informed citizenry in governance. This right is also crucial since it strengthens representative democracy by enabling direct participation in public affairs where individuals and groups are able to express dissent and grievances, expose the flaws in governance and demand accountability from the State authorities as well as powerful entities. This right is crucial in

a vibrant democracy like India but more so in the Indian context to aid in the assertion of the rights of the marginalised and poorly represented minorities.”

**Supreme Court in Ramlila Maidan Incident, In re, (2012) 5 SCC 1: (2012) 2 SCC (Civ) 820: (2012) 2 SCC (Cri) 241: (2012) 1 SCC (L&S) 810: 2012 SCC Online SC 186 at page 99** held that: -

“245. Freedom of speech, right to assemble and demonstrate by holding Dharnas and peaceful agitations are the basic features of a democratic system. The people of a democratic country like ours have a right to raise their voice against the decisions and actions of the Government or even to express their resentment over the actions of the Government on any subject of social or national importance. The Government has to respect and, in fact, encourage exercise of such rights. It is the abundant duty of the State to aid the exercise of the right to freedom of speech as understood in its comprehensive sense and not to throttle or frustrate exercise of such rights by exercising its executive or legislative powers and passing orders or taking action in that direction in the name of reasonable restrictions. The preventive steps should be founded on actual and prominent threat endangering public order and tranquillity, as it may disturb the social order. This delegated power vested in the State has to be exercised with great caution and free from arbitrariness. It must serve the ends of the constitutional rights rather than to subvert them.

309. Privacy and dignity of human life has always been considered a fundamental human right of every human being like any other key values such as freedom of association and freedom of speech. Therefore, every act which offends or impairs human dignity tantamount to deprivation pro tanto of his right to live and the State action must be in accordance with reasonable, fair and just procedure established by law which stands the test of other fundamental rights. (Vide Francis Coralie Mullin v. UT of Delhi [(1981) 1 SCC 608]).

In **Anita Thakur v. State of J&K, (2016) 15 SCC 525** it was observed the Supreme court that: - “12...holding peaceful demonstration in order to air their grievances and to see that their voice is heard in the relevant quarters is the right of the people. Such a right can be traced to the fundamental freedom that is guaranteed under Articles 19(1)(a), 19(1)(b) and 19(1)(c) of the Constitution. Article 19(1)(a) confers freedom of speech to the citizens of this country and, thus, this provision ensures that the petitioners could raise slogan, albeit in a peaceful and orderly manner, without using offensive language. Article 19(1)(b) confers the right to assemble and, thus, guarantees that all citizens have the right to

assemble peacefully and without arms. Right to move freely given under Article 19(1)(d), again, ensures that the petitioners could take out peaceful march. The “right to assemble” is beautifully captured in an eloquent statement that “an unarmed, peaceful protest procession in the land of “salt satyagraha”, fast-unto-death and “do or die” is no jural anathema”. It hardly needs elaboration that a distinguishing feature of any democracy is the space offered for legitimate dissent. One cherished and valuable aspect of political life in India is a tradition to express grievances through direct action or peaceful protest. Organised, non-violent protest marches were a key weapon in the struggle for Independence, and the right to peaceful protest is now recognised as a fundamental right in the Constitution.”

15. Thus, while on the one hand, citizens are guaranteed fundamental right of speech, right to assemble for the purpose of carrying peaceful protest processions and right of free movement, on the other hand, reasonable restrictions on such right can be put by law. Provisions of IPC and CrPC, discussed above, are in the form of statutory provisions giving powers to the State to ensure that such public assemblies, protests, Dharnas or marches are peaceful and they do not become “unlawful”. At the same time, while exercising such powers, the authorities are supposed to act within the limits of law and cannot indulge into excesses. How legal powers should be used to disperse an unruly crowd has been succinctly put by the Punjab and Haryana High Court in *Karam Singh v. Hardayal Singh* [*Karam Singh v. Hardayal Singh*, 1979 Cri LJ 1211: 1979 SCC Online P&H 180] wherein the High Court held that three prerequisites must be satisfied before a Magistrate can order use of force to disperse a crowd:

First, there should be an unlawful assembly with the object of committing violence or an assembly of five or more persons likely to cause a disturbance of the public peace. Second, an Executive Magistrate should order the assembly to disperse. Third, in spite of such orders, the people do not move away.”

The United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Defenders 1999 states the following:

- Article 12 (2) and (3) "The State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection by the competent authorities of everyone, individually and in association with others, against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure, or any other arbitrary action as a consequence of his or her legitimate exercise of the rights referred to in the present Declaration. In this connection, everyone is entitled, individually and in

association with others, to be protected effectively under national law in reacting against or opposing through peaceful means, activities, and acts, including those by omission, attributable to States that result in violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as acts of violence perpetrated by groups or individuals that affect the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

- Article 9 (1): "In the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the promotion and protection of human rights as referred to in the present Declaration, everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to benefit from an effective remedy and to be protected in the event of the violation of those rights".

We urgently appeal to you to exercise Section 12 (a) of the Protection of Human Rights (Amendment) Act, 2019, and take *Suo moto* cognizance of the death of farmer Subhakaran Singh and injuries of 177 farmers and initiate an independent inquiry through NHRC's investigation wing.

We hope and expect that the NHRC will intervene in this case impartially and in a time bound manner.

We urgently appeal to you to exercise Section 12 (a) of the Protection of Human Rights (Amendment) Act, 2019, and take *Suo moto* cognizance of this incident and initiate an independent inquiry through NHRC's investigation wing.

We hope and expect that the NHRC will intervene in this case impartially and in a time-bound manner.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Henri Tiphagne', with a horizontal line underneath it.

(Henri Tiphagne)  
National Working Secretary