



A Socio-Legal Study of Religious Communal Violence and State Accountability in India



Kirti Karothiya^{a,*}, , **Dr. Rekha Rani Sharma^{b,**}**, 

^aResearch Scholar (Law), Institute of Law (SOS), Jiwaji University, Gwalior, M.p. (India).

^bPrincipal, Gwalior Law College & Research Centre, Gwalior, Jiwaji University, Gwalior, M.p. (India).

KEYWORDS

Religious Socio-Legal Analysis, Constitutional Governance, Human Rights, Secularism, Minority Rights, Criminal Justice System, Public Order, Communal Violence, India, State Accountability.

ABSTRACT

Communal violence along religious lines is one of the most entrenched problems against the secular, equal, and rule of law aspects of the Indian constitution. Repeated episodes of communal violence have highlighted serious governance, law enforcement and institutional accountability gaps, leading to grave violations of human rights and social disintegration. This socio-legal study is an attempt to critically examine the nature, causes and consequences of the religious communal violence in India, especially the role and responsibility of the State in the prevention, control and response to religious communal violence. It examines provisions in the constitution, laws, judicial action and policies concerning communal disturbances and victim protection. Using a doctrinal and analytical approach to research, the paper examines key incidents of communal violence and assesses the effectiveness of the current legal frameworks in providing for justice, compensation, rehabilitation and prosecution of offenders. The study also examines the level of compliance of the state agencies, such as the police and the administration, in their constitutional duty to protect fundamental rights and public order. The results show that although India has a comprehensive legal and constitutional framework, state accountability is hindered by ongoing problems with political pressure, slow investigations, poor victim assistance, and poor law enforcement. The paper recommends the need for robust institutional protection, autonomous investigation proceedings, improved victim-centric justice frameworks, and comprehensive laws on communal violence. It is a conclusion that good state accountability is essential to build good democratic governance, safeguard minority rights and foster social harmony in a pluralist society.

1. Introduction

India is one of the most pluralistic societies across the globe with a variety of religions, cultures, languages, ethnicities. The Constitution of India is a secular democratic system based on equality before

the law, freedom of religion and protection against discrimination. Yet, in spite of all these constitutional pledges, religious communal violence has been witnessed from time to time which has disturbed the social harmony and put the state's

Corresponding author


*E-mail: kirtikarothiyacj1994@gmail.com (Kirti Karothiya).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53724/lrd/v10n3.5>

Received 12th Jan 2026; Accepted 20th Feb. 2026

Available online 30th March 2026

2456-3870/©2026 The Journal. Publisher: Welfare Universe. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9961-8533>



efforts to uphold the constitutional values to test. In the Indian context, a wider definition of communal violence as violent conflict between two or more religiously identified communities has become a common socio-political phenomenon with serious consequences for democracy, human rights and governance.

Communal violence in India dates back to the colonial era, when communal politics resulted in social polarization, which increased during and after the Partition of 1947 (Brass, 2003). Communal violence since Independence -- in 1984 during anti-Sikh riots, in 1992-93 during the Bombay riots, in 2002 in Gujarat, and in recent years in various parts of the country -- has caused great concern about the efficacy of legal institutions and administrative responses (Engineer, 2004; Varshney, 2002). Besides loss of life and property, such incidents are also leading to loss of trust in the institutions of the state by the people and affecting the vulnerable communities, thereby harming social cohesion.

Communal violence is not just an act of physical violence; it has a structural, institutional and legal dimension as well from a socio-legal point of view. Such violence often exposes underlying socio-economic disparities, political polarization and governance deficits. Law and order alone is not an adequate explanation for communal violence; communal violence must be viewed in a wider perspective that involves the role of the state, the accountability of its institutions and the safeguard of constitutional rights (Baxi, 2007). Indeed, the role of the state assumes an even greater significance as the Constitution places a positive duty on public authorities safeguarding the

enjoyment of life, liberty, equality and religious freedom under Article 14, 21, 25 and 29 of the Constitution of India.

State accountability in communal violence entails several aspects such as prevention, intervention, investigation, prosecution, victim rehabilitation and compensation. These responsibilities are largely dependent on the behaviour of law enforcement agencies, administrative authorities and the judiciary. There have been many inquiry commissions and judicial observations which have pointed to cases of slow responses, administrative apathy, partisan behaviour and inadequate investigations that have helped the violence to escalate and hindered access to justice for its victims (Government of India, 2005). These issues have led to widespread discussion about the effectiveness of current systems of law, and calls for more effective mechanisms to hold public officials accountable.

The legal architecture for communal violence in India is mainly based on constitutional provisions, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (also known as the Indian Penal Code, 1860), the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (formerly the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973), and several special laws concerning public order and human rights protection. The Supreme Court and High Courts have also been instrumental in judicial interventions through their efforts to resolve issues of impunity, victim compensation, and fair investigations. However, doubts remain about the extent to which these legal protections are being fulfilled and its impact on the multifaceted realities of communal conflict.

In this study, an attempt has been made to take a socio-legal approach to look at the aspect of religious communal violence and state accountability in India. The research explores how constitutional principles and laws, legislative steps, judicial pronouncements and selected episodes of communal violence are used to assess how well the current institutional arrangements are for the protection of the affected community and to hold those responsible for governance gaps to account. The study also examines the problems of justice delivery, victim rehabilitation and institutional reform. The paper is a contribution to the overall debate of constitutional governance, human rights protection and strengthening of democratic institutions in a pluralistic society.

2. Statement of the Problem

The communal violence against the religious minorities remains a huge challenge as well as a severe test to the constitutional vision of secularism, equality and social justice in India. Although the constitution has safeguards and the law has provisions to ensure that citizens will not be discriminated against or subjected to violence, there has been occasional communal violence involving loss of life, property destruction, and violation of the fundamental rights of citizens. The recurrent incidents of violence are significant in terms of the state's ability to prevent communal tensions and hold those responsible to account through state institutions, law enforcement agencies and judicial mechanisms.

Complications arise when claims are brought against the administration for failing to act, intervening too late, conducting biased

investigations, and rehabilitating victims poorly. The State has a constitutional responsibility to safeguard life and ensure public order, but the regular incidence of communal violence suggests a disconnect between law and practice. Thus, the socio-legal aspects of communal violence need to be explored and the responsibility of the State in the prevention, protection and the administration and delivery of justice needs to be assessed.

3. Literature Review

Paul R. Brass (2003) suggests that communal violence in India is not spontaneous, but it is the outcome of political and social process of organized mobilization and institutional failure. His research focuses on how political agents can be enlisted to mobilize local grievances into broader communal issues.

According to Ashutosh Varshney, (2002), inter-community civic networks play a crucial role in curbing communal violence. Varshney's conclusion is that in the cities with high levels of civic engagement that there is less communal conflict between religious groups.

Asghar Ali Engineer (2004) explores the socio-political and historical factors that led to the occurrence of communal riots in India and points out that some of the main factors are communalism, political manipulation and socio-economic inequalities.

Upendra Baxi (2007) speaks about human rights violations in communal conflicts and a constitutional duty of the State to safeguard vulnerable groups and provide justice.

While some like Brass, Varshney and Engineer have emphasized the causes and pattern of

communal violence, others like Baxi have dwelt upon the constitutionality of the obligations and State responsibility. But an integrated socio-legal analysis of the link between communal violence, governance failures, constitutional protections, and judicial responses is still needed.

4. Research Gap

There is a vast literature on the causes, consequences and political aspects of communal violence. Yet, there is a lack of research that thoroughly examines state accountability from a socio-legal perspective, and that takes into account constitutional duties, administrative accountability, criminal justice systems and judicial decisions.

The vast majority of studies examine either the sociological causes of communal violence or the laws of particular incidents. Communal violence is not adequately addressed in terms of the response of legal institutions and the effectiveness of existing accountability mechanisms for preventing impunity. This research aims at filling this gap by studying communal violence as a social phenomenon and a constitutional governance issue.

5. Research Methodology

The study is done based on the doctrinal and analytical research method.

Sources of Data

(1) Primary Sources:

- The Constitution of India.
- Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
- Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.
- Judicial rulings by the Supreme Court/High Courts.

- Reports from Commissions of Inquiry.
- Other important materials

(2) Secondary Sources:

- Books, journals, articles, reports, and scholarly publications.
- Annual reports of the National Human Rights Commission.
- International human rights instruments and publications.

Method

Qualitative analysis is used to analyse the legal provisions, judicial verdicts, commission reports, and academic literature on communal violence and state responsibility.

6. Purpose of the Study

The objective of the study is to analyse the link between religious communal violence and State accountability in India, in a socio-legal perspective. To assess if there are adequate legal and institutional mechanisms to protect citizens and to give effective remedy to the victims of communal violence.

7. Research Questions

- (1) Write the key socio-legal factors that are responsible for the outbreak of religious communal violence in India.
- (2) What are the constitutional and statutory duties of the State in preventing communal violence?
- (3) How effective are there existing accountability mechanisms to address state failures?
- (4) How has the Judiciary contributed to the Justice for Victims?

(5) What are the prospects for legal and institutional changes to improve state accountability?

8. Research Objectives

- (1) To discuss on the socio-legal factors of communal violence of religion in India.
- (2) To study the constitutional and statutory provisions concerning communal violence.
- (3) To assess the responsibility of state agencies in communal violence.
- (4) To evaluate the character of judiciary as protector of Fundamental Rights.
- (5) To recommend the changes for better prevention, accountability and rehabilitation of victims.

9. Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis (H0)

In India, existing legal and institutional framework is adequate to ensure state accountability in cases on religious communal violence.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1)

In India, there are no effective legal and institutional mechanisms in place to ensure state accountability in the event of communal violence against religious minorities.

10. Scope, Significance and Relevance of Study

10.1 Scope

The study concentrates on the religious communal violence in India and delves into the constitutional provisions, statutory laws, judicial interventions and administrative measures. Incorporates certain cases of communal violence as case studies.

10.2 Significance

The research offers a socio-legal perspective in

studying communal violence in the light of constitutional governance and state responsibility.

10.3 Relevance

In India, where it is a multicultural democracy, it is extremely important to have an understanding of state accountability to reinforce secularism, minoritarian rights and social harmony.

11. International Perspectives

Religious and communal violence is not limited to a country; it is a challenge to all countries to demonstrate their capability in the field of protecting human rights, maintaining social harmony and the rule of law. International law has increasingly come to differentiate between a governments' obligations to ensure that it does not violate rights and the positive obligations it has to take reasonable measures to prevent violence, to protect vulnerable communities, and to hold perpetrators of violence to account. This means that the question of state responsibility in light of religious violence is an important aspect of international human rights debate.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948 is the basis of International Protection against Religious discrimination and violence. The first article in the UDHR states that every human being is born free and equal in dignity, and all have certain rights that are incompatible with discrimination, while the eighteenth article ensures freedom of thought, conscience and religion (United Nations, 1948). While not legally binding, the UDHR has exerted an important impact internationally on national constitutions and international human rights instruments throughout the world.

These protections are also reinforced in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), 1966, which requires States Parties to respect and ensure civil and political rights without discrimination. Article 18 guarantees freedom of religion, while Articles 20 and 26 ban inciting discrimination, hostility or violence against a religion or religious belief (United Nations, 1966). Under ICCPR, the Human Rights Committee, which monitors compliance with the ICCPR, has stressed repeatedly that states are required to take concrete legislative and administrative steps to prevent communal and religious violence, and afford remedies to its victims.

At the international level, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, 1992, is also of concern to minority rights. The declaration acknowledges that minority populations are frequently at a higher risk of discrimination, exclusion and violence. It puts obligations on governments to establish conditions under which minorities are able to maintain their identity, exercise their religion and engage in public life on an equal basis (United Nations, 1992). This framework is especially pertinent to multicultural societies in which communal conflicts can pose a risk to social stability.

There are multiple democratic States which have established legal and institutional frameworks for dealing with violence motivated by religion and promoting accountability. The UK hate crime laws make hate crimes based on religious hostility an offence and give them increased sentencing. The legislation under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

and later, provides greater scope for authorities to investigate and prosecute religious hate crimes. Moreover, certain police forces and independent oversight bodies concentrate on instances of hate crimes and communal tension, and this aids to bolster the public trust in the police (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015).

The Canadian way of handling diversity and avoiding communal strife is based on multiculturalism. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988 helps to foster cultural inclusion and equal participation of all communities in society. The Canadian criminal code also includes sections on hate propaganda and religiously motivated crimes. Multiculturalism, along with robust anti-discrimination legislation, have been noted as helping Canada to have comparatively low rates of large-scale religious violence compared with many other plural societies (Kymlicka, 2012).

Furthermore, there is the example of South Africa, where constitutional provisions for equality and non-discrimination after the demise of apartheid have been a major factor. The South African Constitution protects the right to freedom of religion and bans religious discrimination. Legislation to address hate speech and discriminatory behaviour is available in the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, 2000. The case of South Africa shows the role of constitutional guarantees and independent institutions to deal with social cleavages and safeguard minority groups (Currie & De Waal, 2013).

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has built up significant case law at regional level on the

responsibility of States to prevent communal violence and to protect religious freedom. In recent years, the Court has consistently recognized states' positive responsibility to protect individuals from violence by non-state actors when authorities have knowledge or should have known that there is a real and imminent threat. These decisions have been able to consolidate the principle that governmental accountability can be held for failures to prevent and protect as well as for actual government action (Mowbray, 2004).

International experiences have shown that communal violence can only be addressed effectively when various legal, institutional, community and human rights protection measures are taken. Laws alone cannot change the situation without fair enforcement and independent investigations, and without access to justice. An analysis of international experiences reveals that specific laws against hate crimes, effective monitoring, victim assistance and advanced community-building efforts have great potential to substantially lower the likelihood of religious violence and boost confidence in the state.

These foreign points of view have lessons for India. The Indian Constitution offers comprehensive safeguards for religious freedom and equality, but the challenge lies in implementing these provisions effectively, requiring a responsive governance, impartial law enforcement, and timely judicial intervention. The lessons learnt from other countries can help to articulate a more holistic approach to prevent communal violence and increase state responsibility in a diverse democratic country.

12. Conceptual and theoretical frameworks

A theoretical framework is needed as the underpinning for comprehending the complex relationship between religious communal violence and state accountability. Communal violence is a multi-dimensional phenomenon with its legal, political, social and human rights aspects; thus, no single theory can explain the causes and consequences of communal violence. Hence, the research will be conducted in an interdisciplinary perspective by combining Constitutionalism Theory, Rule of Law Theory, Human Rights Framework, State Accountability Theory and Social Conflict Theory. All these theoretical aspects enable to analyze State's duties, institutional responsibilities and legal responses towards communal violence in India in a comprehensive manner.

12.1 Theory of Constitutionalism

The principle of constitutionalism is one of the core principles of modern democratic governance, which is based on the greatest limitation of the power of government by constitutional laws, by the establishment of constitutional checks and balances and by the inclusion of fundamental rights. The concept of constitutionalism is aimed at guaranteeing the execution of state power according to the Constitution and not to political will (Sartori, 1987).

The concept of constitutionalism in the Indian context is manifested in the supremacy of the Constitution and its dedication to concepts of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. The Constitution provides a secular democratic system in which all citizens are treated equally with no discrimination based on religion. Articles 14, 15,

19, 21 and 25-30 of the constitution of India provide us with fundamental rights and the State is legally bound to protect citizens from discrimination, violence, and any arbitrary action.

Religious communal violence is directly at odds with the constitutional values as it violates the equality, religious freedom and social harmony. Under the constitutionalist paradigm, it is the duty of the State to take positive action to prevent communal conflicts, to preserve public order and protect the rights of the impacted communities. Failure to take action by the state, administrative negligence and discriminatory actions during communal disturbances may be termed as failure of constitutional governance.

The theory of constitutionalism is especially relevant to this study as it allows for an evaluation of the consistency of the actions of governmental institutions in response to communal violence with the constitutional mandate. It also emphasises the importance of judicial review as a way of keeping executive and legislative powers within the bounds of the Constitution.

12.2 Rule of Law Theory

The Rule of Law is a fundamental concept in democratic societies, in which every person and institution, including the government, is held accountable and bound by the law. Dicey (1885) has considered the Rule of Law to be based on three main principles: supremacy of law, equality before the law, and protection of the individual and his rights by laws.

This is especially relevant in the context of communal violence, where a failure of law enforcement and governance may be evident. The

Rule of Law requires fair and equal treatment by the state authorities and equal legal protection for all communities without discrimination on religious bases.

The Supreme Court in India has also consistently held the Rule of Law as being a part of the basic structure of the constitution. The principle involves the need to ensure that law enforcement agencies prevent violence, investigate fairly, prosecute impartially and that they offer effective remedies to victims. Selective enforcement of the laws, political pressure on investigations and impunity for perpetrators has a negative impact on the Rule of Law and trust in the state.

In the context of this research Rule of Law Theory is used as an analytical instrument to check whether the state institutions fulfil their legal mandate in communal conflicts. It also serves as a benchmark to evaluate the legitimacy and effectiveness of governance mechanisms aimed at addressing communal violence.

12.3 Human Rights Framework

The Human Rights Framework is derived from the idea that every person has dignity and equal rights which must be respected and protected by the State. International human rights law provides legal and moral responsibilities for governments to protect civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights free from discrimination (Donnelly, 2013).

Religious communal violence often leads to the violation of a number of basic human rights such as right to life, personal security, equality, freedom of religion, freedom of movement and protection from discrimination. The victims suffer from distress,

lack of employment opportunity, psychological trauma and also lack of access to justice.

International frameworks, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966) and the United Nations Declaration on Minority Rights (1992), stress the importance for States to avoid religious discrimination, and for the protection of minority communities against violence.

Thus, the human rights perspective moves the focus from merely law and order matters to that of what kind of responsibility do states have to ensure human dignity. It does not only call on governments to respect rights, but also to take proactive measures to prevent violation by private entities.

The Human Rights Framework in this study serves as a benchmark for assessing the state response to communal violence, and for determining if the existing legal and institutional frameworks have sufficient provisions to safeguard vulnerable populations and access to justice.

12.4 State Accountability Theory

State Accountability Theory is the study of how governmental institutions are held accountable for their deeds and omissions. Accountability is an integral part of the democratic governance as it ensures that the public officials use their power transparently, lawfully and in the public interest (Bovens, 2007).

The theory makes a distinction between legal accountability, political accountability, administrative accountability and social accountability. Legal accountability means scrutiny

by the courts and legal penalties for wrong-doing. Political accountability is ensured by means of elections and parliamentary control. Administrative accountability is the within-the-system monitoring and disciplinary process and social accountability is the level of public participation, media scrutiny and civil society involvement.

State responsibility in relation to communal violence refers to responsibilities in relation to prevention, protection, investigation, prosecution, rehabilitation and compensation. The State can be liable for both actions that are directly involved in violence and for failures to avert reasonably anticipated violence or to safeguard communities that are known to be vulnerable.

This theoretical framework is especially applicable due to the fact that allegations of administration negligence, police inaction and political interference are common after incidents of communal violence. The State Accountability Theory offers a framework to measure institutional performance and the gaps in governance mechanisms.

The theory also helps the case that accountability is a must for the maintenance of public trust, protection of constitutional values, and effective redress for victims of communal violence.

12.5 Social Conflict Theory

Social Conflict Theory, as proposed by Karl Marx and other sociologists, attributes social phenomena to the competition, inequality and power struggles among various groups in society (Coser, 1956). According to the theory, conflicts emerge where there are discrepancies in access to resources,

political power, social status, or cultural recognition among groups.

Communal violence may manifest itself in religious terms, but many scholars believe that socio-economic inequalities, political competition, and the mobilization of groups on the basis of religion or religious identity often help explain the origins of communal tensions. Religious identities can be used as tools for mobilisation and collective action by political actors or social groups.

In a multi-ethnic communities like Indian society, historical grievances, economic inequalities, social marginalization and political polarization can sharpen the communal differences. Social Conflict Theory can be used to answer the question as to why communal violence takes place in certain socio-political situations and why some communities are more prone to violence during conflict situations.

This theory also emphasizes the function of institutions in handling or intensifying social conflicts. Limited governance, unfair administrative processes and unequal access to justice can exacerbate social inequalities and help foster cycles of violence.

Social Conflict Theory gives this study a valuable sociological context and perspective that complements legal and constitutional analysis. It enables a better understanding of the structural dynamics that can explain communal violence and highlights the need to focus on addressing the root causes as well as addressing the law.

12.6 Synthesis of the Theoretical Framework

The study is provided with an overall analytical base of Constitutionalism Theory, Rule of Law

Theory, Human Rights Framework, State Accountability Theory and Social Conflict Theory. Constitutionalism and Rule of Law reflects on legal obligations and institutional governance, Human Rights Framework on protection of individual dignity and freedoms, State Accountability Theory on governmental responsibility and oversight, and Social Conflict Theory on the more complex socio-political conditions that play into communal violence.

These theories combined can help in examining religious communal violence from multiple perspectives and can help critically analyse the role of the Indian State in meeting its constitutional, legal and human rights commitments in preventing communal violence and holding people accountable.

13. State accountability and governance

A fundamental principle of democratic government and the rule of law is state accountability. As a part of religious communal violence, accountability means the responsibility of the state institutions and public authorities to prevent violence, protect citizens, ensure impartial police action, offer remedy to the victims and respect constitutional and human rights obligations. Communal violence frequently leads to gross abuses of life, liberty, equality and dignity, and the state accountability mechanisms play an important role in determining justice and social stability. The Constitution of India, the various laws, precedents, and international human rights standards establish a template under which the State can be held responsible for failures of action or the action itself

during communal violence.

13.1 The Constitutional Obligation of the State

The Constitution of India lays down the basic principle of holding the State accountable by ensuring fundamental rights and duties of the public authorities. The concept of constitutional governance is that the State should do its actions as per constitutional values that are secularism, equality, liberty, justice, etc.

All people, regardless of religion, caste or community, are equally entitled to the guarantees of Article 14 – equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Article 15 bars the discrimination on the basis of religion, race, caste, sex or birth. The right to live with dignity and security is an integral part of the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21. The Constitution of India (1950) safeguards the religious freedom (Articles 25-28) and the cultural and educational rights of the minorities (Articles 29-30).

Thus, in situations of communal violence, the State has a positive constitutional duty not only to abstain from discrimination, but also to take pro-active steps to safeguard vulnerable communities from violence. Supreme Court of India has insisted many a times that a fundamental part of the duty of the State is to ensure the protection of fundamental rights. A lack of prevention of foreseeable violence and an inability to provide effective remedies could be a breach of constitutional guarantees (Baxi, 2007).

The doctrine of constitutional morality also mandates that public institutions and officials do not act in a partisan manner, but are committed to

secular principles. Thus, state responsibility for communal violence is not just in relation to criminal prosecution, but also in terms of general responsibilities for governance, prevention and protection.

13.2 Administrative Accountability

Administrative accountability is the obligation of public officials and other public institutions to carry out their functions in an efficient, impartial and lawful manner. In times of communal violence, district administration, executive magistrates and other civil authorities have an obligation to take preventive and remedial steps to ensure public order and protect citizens.

Inadequate administration can be a major factor in the intensification of communal conflicts. A lack of intelligence gathering, delays in response, poor coordination between agencies and lack of implementation of prevention measures can exacerbate violence. Communal disturbances have been investigated by a number of commissions of inquiry in India, which have pointed to a common thread of failure in administration systems that have led to large-scale communal violence (Government of India, 2005).

Administrative accountability serves to be effective when there is transparency, timely decision making, and statutory compliance. Those officials who fail to fulfill their responsibilities or who engage in discriminatory practices should be held accountable through disciplinary and/or legal action. Judicial review, departmental investigations and independent commissions are crucial in providing a measure of accountability to administration.

Good governance principles also require

administrative authorities to give relief, rehabilitation and compensation for affected persons. The State's obligation is not simply to restore law and order, but also to rebuild trust and help communities to recover from communal violence.

13.3 Police Accountability

One of the most significant aspects of state responsibility for communal violence is police responsibility. The police, the first point of contact for any law enforcement, is the body mainly tasked to prevent violence, ensure safety of lives and property, investigate offences and maintain public order. Therefore, the police's effectiveness and impartiality in their actions has a significant impact on the outcome of communal disturbances.

There have been several studies and inquiry reports which have pointed out concerns on delayed intervention, selective enforcement, over use of force, inadequate investigation and allegations of bias during communal conflicts (Engineer, 2004). Such shortcomings undermine public confidence in law-enforcement institutions and may contribute to a culture of impunity.

The Supreme Court has always stressed that there must be professional, independent and accountable policing. In *Prakash Singh v. Union of India* (2006), the Court gave detailed directions which were intended to remove the police from the influence of the political situations and make the police institutions more accountable. The aim of these reforms was to enhance operational autonomy and be subject to public oversight and transparency.

To improve police accountability, it is recommended to establish an independent

complaint authority, body-worn cameras, train officers on human rights and communal sensitivity, and have strict disciplinary measures for police misconduct. There is a critical need to have a professional and impartial police force for maintaining public order and providing equal protection of law in the event of communal violence.

13.4 Political Accountability

Political accountability is the accountability of the political actors, including elected officials and political institutions, to act within constitutional values and in a democratic way. Political elites have a pivotal role in defining political agendas, social attitudes and the policy response towards communal tensions.

It has been noted that communal violence can be sometimes intensified due to political polarization, inflammatory rhetoric and mobilization on the basis of identity (Brass, 2003). Failure by political leaders to condemn violence, misuse public power, or to engage in divisive practices can indirectly add to communal tensions and undermine democratic governance.

Political accountability is affected through different mechanisms in a constitutional democracy, such as elections, parliamentary, judicial, media and public scrutiny. Political leaders should foster social cohesion, uphold constitutional principles and not engage in conduct that could stir hatred or discrimination.

Also, the concept of collective responsibility calls on governments to be sure that public institutions operate impartially and effectively in crisis situations. A lack of means to prevent violence or to

protect vulnerable communities can lead to serious considerations about the legitimacy and accountability of political leadership.

To strengthen political responsibility, the government's operations must be transparent, ethical rules must be enforced, hate speech must be regulated and citizens must have more control over government actions. Democratic institutions need to guarantee the use of political power in a way that is compatible with constitutional values and human rights responsibilities.

13.5 Human Rights Accountability

Human rights accountability is what the State is responsible for respecting, protecting and fulfilling, namely those rights recognized by the international community. Religious communal violence often leads to abuses of fundamental rights, such as the right to life, the right to equality, the right to freedom of religion, the right to security, the right to property and the right to dignity.

International human rights law has negative and positive obligations for states. There are positive obligations and negative obligations, which respectively impose on governments duties to take reasonable steps to prevent rights from being infringed by private parties and to not infringe rights directly. Standards for the protection of minorities from discrimination and violence on the basis of religious identity are set in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), and the United Nations Declaration on Minority Rights (1992).

Effective investigation, prosecution of perpetrators of human rights abuses, compensation for victims,

and institutional reforms to stop human rights violations are all elements of human rights accountability. National institutions like the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) are significant in supervising the actions of the State and giving suggestions for rectification.

The judiciary has also played a very important role in promoting accountability for human rights violations through the conduct of fair investigations, witness protection and access to justice. But there are still some difficulties in terms of the effectiveness of accountability mechanisms: proceedings are still not prompt, support for victims is still insufficient, and there are still limits in terms of enforcement of recommendations.

A rights-based governance approach demands that the State give special attention to the protection of vulnerable communities, social inclusion and tackle structural issues that can lead to communal tensions. The enhancement of human rights responsibilities is a crucial component in maintaining democratic legitimacy, public confidence and preventing communal violence compromising constitutional values and social cohesion.

14. Legal Framework in India related to Communal violence

The legal framework on religious communal violence in India has been prescribed by the constitutional principles, criminal laws, judicial precedents and human rights mechanisms. India does not have a wide-ranging law specifically designed to deal with communal violence today, however there are a number of constitutional and statutory measures which impose obligations on the

State with respect to the prevention of communal violence, protection of affected communities and accountability in cases of violations of fundamental rights. The law upholds India's secular, equal, and religiously free society and the rule of law. But, frequent cases of communal violence have cast doubts on the effectiveness of existing laws and law enforcement.

14.1 Constitutional Framework

The constitution of India is the basic legal framework for dealing with communal violence and religious harmony. In the Preamble, India is described as a 'sovereign socialist secular democratic republic', whose aim is to secure justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. Secularism is a constitutional concept which implies the State to be neutral in its attitude and treats all religion equally, and protects all citizens equally under the law.

According to Article 14, there is equality before the law, and equal protection of the law, and Article 15 will not allow any discrimination based on religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth. The right to live with dignity and security is a part of the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution. Article 25-28 protect freedom of religion and Article 29, 30 protect minority and their cultural and educational rights. All of these constitutional provisions together create a framework of protection for individuals and communities against religious discrimination and violence. (The Constitution of India, 1950.)

Secularism has been a recurring theme in the Supreme Court's emphasis on constitutional principles. In *SR Bommai v Union of India, 1994*, the Court has declared that secularism is a part of

the basic structure of the constitution and the State cannot be identified or associated with any particular religion. The judgment was a major boost for constitutional safeguards against communal politics and religious discrimination. (1994 3 SCC 1)

14.2 Criminal Law Framework

The Indian response to communal violence is basically by general criminal laws. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (earlier the Indian Penal Code, 1860) has a number of provisions that seek to curb communal hatred and ensure public peace.

Section 196, of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (previously Section 153A IPC), is criminal against inciting enmity between different religion, race, language, or region groups. Likewise, under Section 299 (ex 295A IPC) punishments are imposed for deliberate and malicious acts that have the intent to outrage religious feelings. The laws pertaining to unlawful assembly, rioting, criminal conspiracy, murder, arson and destruction of property are also often deployed in the context of communal violence cases.

Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) gives powers to authorities to take preventive action for public order. The use of preventive arrest, prohibitory orders, curfews and security forces deployment is common means of regulating communal disturbances. Executive magistrates have the power to take urgent preventive measures if they are alarmed at the prospect of violence.

The Places of Worship (Special Provisions) Act, 1991 is another significant legislation. The Act attempts to maintain the religious character of

places of worship as they did on 15 August 1947 and is intended to avoid communal disputes due to conflicting religious claims over religious sites. Legislation to ensure communal harmony and to avoid religious conflict is reflected by its enactment.

14.3 Judicial Approach Toward Communal Violence

The judiciary has been very important in the interpretation of constitutional safeguards and accountability in situations of communal violence. Courts have tried to correct administrative shortcomings, defend victims, and enhance the criminal justice system, using judicial review and constitutional interpretation.

In *Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2004)*, popularly referred to as the Best Bakery Case, the Supreme Court stressed the need for fair investigation and fair trial as a part of justice. The Court remanded the case for retrial outside Gujarat as it had noted the serious deficiencies in the investigation and prosecution of the case. The judgment has pointed to the role of the State in protecting the "impartial justice" in communal violence cases. ((2004) 4 SCC 158)

Likewise, in *National Human Rights Commission v. State of Gujarat, (2009)*, the Supreme Court expressed its concern to investigate Gujarat violence of 2002 and emphasized the importance of independent and effective criminal proceedings. The Court's action was motivated by the judicial anxiety on the issue of accountability of the State and protection of fundamental rights. ((2009) 6 SCC 767)

In *Mohd. Haroon v. Union of India, (2014)*, which

came up in the wake of the communal violence in Muzaffarnagar, Supreme Court again reiterated that it is a constitutional mandate of the State to safeguard life and liberty. The Government's responsibility towards the victims of communal violence was highlighted and the Court gave directions to ensure rehabilitation, compensation and protection of affected persons. ((2014) 5 SCC 252)

Yet another significant case before the Supreme Court is *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v Union of India (2018)*, which involved a case of mob violence and vigilantism. The Court has laid down detailed preventive, remedial and punitive directions to the state governments, including the designation of nodal officers, taking steps to prevent hate-based violence and conducting speedy investigation and prosecution. The court ruled that mob violence poses a "grave danger" to the values of the Constitution and the rule of law. ((2018) 9 SCC 501)

14.4 Human Rights and Institutional Mechanisms

In addition to constitutional and criminal law provisions, some institutions also play a role in the legal framework on communal violence. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) has done a significant work in monitoring communal disturbances, recommending investigations and calling for compensation and rehabilitation of the victims. The NHRC has time and again highlighted the responsibility of the governments to safeguard vulnerable groups and take action against human rights violations.

India has also signed various international human rights conventions such as Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966). These instruments commit the State to ensuring freedom of religion, equality before the law, and freedom from discrimination and violence. International human rights standards have been a factor in judicial interpretation of constitutional rights and reinforced accountability system surrounding communal violence.

14.5 Proposed Legislative Reforms

Although there are several laws in place, there is still an issue of the lack of a separate law on communal violence. The Government responded to the recurring communal disturbances by proposing Communal Violence (Prevention, Control and Rehabilitation of Victims) Bill, 2005 and later Prevention of Communal and Targeted Violence (Access to Justice and Reparations) Bill, 2011. These proposals included measures for accountability, frameworks for compensation for the victims, special courts, and preventative measures. But neither measure was passed because of political and constitutional issues.

Because there is no comprehensive legislation, measures have been taken in the general criminal law provisions which are often unable to account for the unique nature of communal violence, such as organised targeting, mass displacement, victim rehabilitation and institutional accountability. Accordingly, a good number of scholars and legal experts still call for a legal system that would integrate preventive, prosecutive, rehabilitative, and accountability measures.

15. Socio-Legal Dimensions of Religious Communal Violence

Communal violence is not just a single event of religious group conflict, but is a complex socio-legal problem. It is about how things happen between social structures, political processes, economy, law and culture. Communal violence can be seen as a result of the transformation of religious differences into social and political mobilisation in pluralistic societies like India. This kind of violence is not only a danger to the public order but also an attack on the secularity, equality and fraternity enshrined in the constitution. Communal violence, in a socio-legal context, must be viewed as a challenge to social cohesion as well as to the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies that have a role in protecting fundamental rights and ensuring justice (Brass, 2003; Varshney, 2002).

Law exists in society and the socio-legal analysis of communal violence is an understanding of this. Institutions, constitutional provisions and legal norms operate on top of social orders which are historically, power and culture inflected. The outbreak of communal violence is therefore not only a sign of police ineptitude, but also a reflection of underlying tensions in society as a result of identity-based polarization and conflicting political interests. The nexus between society and law becomes even more salient in the context of the role of state institutions in preventing violence and vulnerable communities (Cotterrell, 1998; Baxi, 2007).

15.1 Political aspects of communal violence are explored

One of the most important aspects of religious

communal violence is political aspect. It has been suggested that tensions between communities often boil over in political mobilisation along religious lines. Political leaders can harness religious feelings to consolidate votes, build group unity or to rally people away from socio-economic issues. This kind of mobilisation can lead to the formation of collective identities which highlight difference and which do not focus on common citizenship, which can heighten the risk of communal polarization and conflict (Brass, 2003).

Communal violence has been linked to periods of high political competition in many cases. Political statements which cast religious groups as opponents can lead to distrust and hostility between groups. When religion is used as a political instrument, it undermines secular democratic institutions and can pave the way for communal violence being used as a means to assert political influence. Thus, political responsibility and observance of constitutional guidelines of secularism and equality are necessary to prevent communal violence (Engineer, 2004; Wilkinson, 2004).

15.2 The social and cultural aspects are considered

Religious communal violence is entrenched in social and cultural dynamics that create group identities and communal relations. Communal tensions are often developed through historical memories, stereotypes, social prejudices and narratives of victimhood. Such factors can further serve to sustain feeling of difference, and can lead to the creation of clear-cut group boundaries which can have a negative effect on social integration (Varshney, 2002).

Where there is a threat to cultural traditions or beliefs, the symbols of culture and religious practices and collective identities may become a source of conflict. Sometimes, rumours, misinformation, or symbolic clashes over places of worship, religious processions, or cultural practices have led to communal disturbances. The socio-cultural aspect of communal violence underscores the need for dialogue, understanding and community involvement as preventative measures against communal violence (Pandey, 1990).

Additionally, the presence of social segregation and the lack of contact between different religious groups can help reinforce communal stereotypes. Research has shown that communities with high levels of inter-community networks and civic engagement are less likely to have communal violence than communities with social isolation and distrust. Thus, promoting social cohesion is a key part of preventing religious conflict (Varshney, 2002).

15.3 Economic Dimensions

Various economic disparities and competition for resources often combine with religious identities to produce an environment that is ripe for communal violence. Communal clashes are usually in religious terms, but often economic grievances play a significant part in the occurrence and severity of the communal clashes. Tensions can be communalized in the form of political and/or social mobilization due to competition for jobs, land, public resources and economic benefits (Horowitz, 2000).

Marginalized communities may be even more vulnerable in times of communal violence, since they have less economic means to protect

themselves, move, or to recover. The loss of businesses, homes and livelihoods can result in longer term economic consequences for those affected, especially minority populations. Social inequality can also be exacerbated and feed into ongoing cycles of communal tensions by the phenomenon of economic exclusion and discrimination (Engineer, 2004).

The socio-legal view focuses on the importance of tackling structural inequalities, in addition to law and order, in effective governance. Policies that foster inclusive development, equitable access to opportunities and economic justice have the potential to play a major role in mitigating the conditions that foster communal conflict (Sen, 2006).

15.4 The Legal and Institutional Dimensions

The legal aspect of communal violence is about how legal institutions can prevent communal violence, hold perpetrators accountable and bring justice to the victims. The Constitution of India provides equal protection of the law, freedom of religion and protection against discrimination. But the efficiency of the constitutional guarantees relies on the effectiveness of their implementation by administrative bodies, police departments and the courts (Constitution of India, 1950).

Communal violence frequently exposes the weakness in law and administration. Failure to act quickly, to conduct thorough investigations, or to prosecute cases effectively, as well as lengthy court delays may erode public trust in the justice system. If the law is not effective, victims can be denied justice and perpetrators go unpunished. This undermines the rule of law and helps to perpetuate

communal violence (Baxi, 2007).

These problems have been often attempted to be resolved through judicial interventions. The Judiciary has played its part in ensuring that there is a fair investigation and that the victim is not treated inhumanely, as well as using its power to make the perpetrator accountable for their actions, as seen in *Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat (2004)* and *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India (2018)*. These judgements provide an example of how the courts can confirm constitutional protections and safeguard the rights of affected communities when the other institutions are not working effectively.

15.5 Human Rights Dimensions

Religious communal violence is a serious violation of human rights since it impacts several rights at once – life, liberty, equality, security, property and freedom of religion. The victims often suffer from physical injuries, loss of livelihood, psychological trauma and social exclusion. Thus, communal violence is not just a matter of criminal law, but also a human rights issue (Donnelly, 2013).

International human rights documents, like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), lay down duties for governments to prevent people being discriminated against or subjected to violence on the basis of religion. These tools acknowledge that governments need to take proactive steps to prevent violations and ensure that there are effective remedies available for the victims. Positive Obligations involve more than just refraining from violating rights, but also protecting the individual from harm caused by private persons

(United Nations, 1948; United Nations, 1966).

The human rights-based approach to communal violence is based on the need to protect victims, provide access to justice, hold perpetrators to account, rehabilitate victims and prevent discrimination. This acknowledges that responses need to be both immediate and structural in addressing the harm that is occurring amongst people. Thus, human rights accountability is a key to the democratic governance and social justice (Baxi, 2007).

15.6 Media and Digital Communication Dimensions

With the growth of information dissemination technology, the nature of communal violence has grown into new aspects. The impact of traditional media and social media on public perceptions, political discussion and community relations is significant. Media can help spread misinformation, hate speech, and inflammatory narratives that can help spread communal tensions (Chadha & Guha, 2017).

There is a growing threat of rumours and false narratives spreading quickly via digital channels, the result of which is a greater risk of violence breaking out. The recent communal incidents have shown how the content online will fuel the existing social divide and mobilize groups to take action. As such, the balancing exercise between freedom of expression and the prevention of hate speech and incitement to violence (Udupa, 2018) has become a challenge for legal and regulatory frameworks.

Democratic freedoms and free expression must be respected, and effective regulation, digital literacy programs, responsible journalism and transparent

content moderation policies are needed to mitigate the negative impacts of misinformation. Hence, the media as a part of communal violence cannot be ignored in sustaining social harmony in the contemporary societies.

Socio-legal understanding of religious communal violence shows that religious communal violence is influenced by the political, social, cultural, economic, legal and human rights aspects. In order to come up with effective legal and policy answers, it is important to understand these interconnected dimensions. Simply a law enforcement response is inadequate, as communal violence is often a symptom of underlying structural inequalities, identity-based divisiveness and institutional weaknesses. Improving the constitutional management of the country, strengthening social cohesion, demanding accountability, safeguarding human rights and reducing the underlying socio-economic disparities are essential to stop communal violence and build a more inclusive and democratic society.

16. Comparative Analysis

Comparative legal analysis is an important research method in socio-legal studies because it enables an evaluation of different legal systems, governance mechanisms, and institutional responses to similar social problems. In the context of religious communal violence, comparative analysis helps identify best practices, institutional deficiencies, and legal reforms that can strengthen state accountability. While India's constitutional framework provides extensive protections for equality, secularism, and religious freedom, several countries have developed specialized mechanisms

to address hate crimes, religious discrimination, and identity-based violence. A comparison with the United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa provides valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of the Indian approach (Glenn, 2014).

16.1 India and the United Kingdom

India and the United Kingdom are both constitutional democracies that recognize religious freedom and prohibit discrimination. However, their legal approaches to addressing religiously motivated violence differ significantly. In India, communal violence is generally addressed through constitutional provisions, criminal law statutes, and public order regulations. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 contains provisions penalizing acts that promote enmity between religious groups, outrage religious feelings, and incite violence. Nevertheless, India does not have a comprehensive statute exclusively addressing communal violence or religious hate crimes (Constitution of India, 1950).

In contrast, the United Kingdom has developed a more specialized legal framework for addressing religiously motivated offences. The Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 and the Criminal Justice Act, 2003 provide enhanced penalties for crimes motivated by religious hostility. The Public Order Act, 1986 criminalizes incitement to racial and religious hatred and empowers authorities to intervene before violence escalates. The existence of specific hate-crime legislation enables law enforcement agencies to identify, investigate, and prosecute religiously motivated offences more effectively (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015).

Institutionally, the United Kingdom has established

independent bodies and monitoring mechanisms to track hate crimes and discriminatory practices. Police agencies maintain detailed records of religiously motivated offences, which facilitates evidence-based policymaking and accountability. In contrast, critics argue that India's responses to communal violence often remain reactive rather than preventive, with accountability mechanisms becoming active only after violence has occurred (Wilkinson, 2004).

The comparison suggests that India could benefit from adopting specialized legislative measures and comprehensive data collection systems for religiously motivated violence while maintaining its constitutional commitment to secularism and diversity.

16.2 India and Canada

Canada presents another useful model because of its multicultural approach to managing religious and cultural diversity. The Canadian Constitution, particularly the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, guarantees equality, freedom of religion, and protection against discrimination. Canada's legal framework recognizes multiculturalism as a core constitutional value and encourages the inclusion of diverse cultural and religious communities within public life (Kymlicka, 2012).

Unlike India, where communal conflicts frequently arise within the context of historical religious tensions, Canada emphasizes preventive policies aimed at reducing social exclusion and fostering intercultural dialogue. The Canadian Human Rights Act and Criminal Code contain provisions addressing hate speech, hate propaganda, and crimes motivated by religious prejudice. Law

enforcement agencies collaborate with community organizations to address grievances before they develop into broader conflicts (Moon, 2018).

A significant difference between the two countries lies in the institutionalization of multiculturalism. Canadian public policies actively promote social integration through education, community engagement, and anti-discrimination programs. In India, despite constitutional guarantees of equality and secularism, social and political divisions occasionally undermine efforts toward inclusive governance. Consequently, Canada's experience demonstrates the importance of combining legal protections with broader social policies aimed at strengthening inter-community trust (Kymlicka, 2012).

The comparative analysis indicates that legal measures alone are insufficient for preventing communal violence. Long-term social cohesion requires policies promoting inclusion, equal opportunities, and community participation.

16.3 India and South Africa

South Africa offers an important comparative perspective because of its history of institutionalized discrimination and subsequent constitutional transformation. Following the end of apartheid, South Africa adopted a constitution that places strong emphasis on equality, dignity, human rights, and non-discrimination. The Constitution explicitly prohibits discrimination on various grounds, including religion, race, ethnicity, and culture (Currie & De Waal, 2013).

South Africa has also enacted the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, 2000, which provides legal remedies against

hate speech, discrimination, and prejudicial conduct. Independent institutions such as the South African Human Rights Commission monitor violations and promote accountability. These mechanisms reflect a rights-based approach that integrates legal enforcement with social reconciliation (Currie & De Waal, 2013).

India and South Africa share several similarities, including multicultural populations, constitutional commitments to equality, and histories of social division. However, South Africa places greater emphasis on restorative justice and reconciliation processes. Institutions established after apartheid sought not only to punish wrongdoing but also to address historical grievances and rebuild social trust. India's responses to communal violence have traditionally focused on criminal prosecution and administrative measures, often with limited attention to long-term reconciliation and community healing (Mamdani, 2001).

This comparison highlights the importance of incorporating restorative and rehabilitative approaches alongside conventional criminal justice mechanisms. Addressing communal violence requires not only accountability for perpetrators but also efforts to repair social relationships damaged by conflict.

16.4 Comparative Assessment of State Accountability

A comparison of India, the United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa reveals significant differences in approaches to state accountability. The United Kingdom emphasizes specialized hate-crime legislation and proactive policing. Canada focuses on multicultural governance and preventive

social policies. South Africa combines constitutional protections with restorative justice mechanisms and strong human rights institutions. India possesses robust constitutional safeguards but continues to face challenges relating to implementation, institutional coordination, and accountability.

One common feature across successful international models is the existence of independent oversight mechanisms that monitor government actions and ensure accountability. Another important feature is the adoption of preventive strategies rather than reliance solely on reactive law-enforcement measures. Effective responses to identity-based violence generally involve a combination of legal regulation, institutional accountability, community engagement, and human rights protection (Donnelly, 2013).

The comparative analysis demonstrates that India can strengthen its framework for addressing communal violence by adopting certain international best practices. These include specialized legislation addressing hate crimes, improved data collection systems, independent investigative mechanisms, stronger victim-support services, and community-based conflict prevention programs. Such reforms would complement existing constitutional guarantees and contribute to more effective protection of religious freedom and social harmony.

The comparative study demonstrates that while India has a comprehensive constitutional framework protecting equality, secularism, and religious freedom, its accountability mechanisms often face implementation challenges. The experiences of the

United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa illustrate that effective prevention of religious violence requires a combination of specialized legislation, proactive governance, institutional independence, human rights protection, and social inclusion policies. Comparative insights suggest that strengthening accountability mechanisms, enhancing preventive measures, and promoting community engagement can significantly improve India's response to communal violence and reinforce constitutional governance.

17. The Analysis, Discussion and Results

A study of the constitution, the law, court rulings, and international experiences shows that communal violence against religious minorities is not easily addressed, having legal, social, political, and institutional dimensions. Though the Indian Constitution provides for equality, secularism and religious freedom, communal violence shows weak points in the implementation of and adherence to these rights (Brass, 2003).

The study shows that communal violence is a phenomenon that can be triggered by a mix of factors like political mobilisation, socio-economic disparities, identity issues and institutional fragility. These elements play off each other, and communal tensions tend to spiral into violence. From the socio-legal point of view, it is emphasised that legal measures alone are not sufficient to prevent the outbreaks of communal violence without good governance and social cohesion (Varshney, 2002).

It is also noted that state accountability is a multi-level process – constitutional, administrative, police, political and human rights accountability. While the constitutional provisions mandate certain

obligations for the State, inquiry commission reports and observations by the judiciary often highlight the lack of preparedness of the administration, responsiveness of police, and impartiality of investigations. These deficiencies also create mistrust of institutions and help to foster feelings of impunity (Engineer, 2004).

Judicial interventions have been key in seeking and safeguarding a fair investigation, remand cases when required, providing for witness protection and initiating the process of compensation and rehabilitation. But so far, judicial intervention alone cannot replace the systematic institutional changes. To establish effective accountability, it is necessary to set up preventive mechanisms, to have independent institutions of oversight, and to have better coordination of governmental agencies.

Comparative analysis shows that other countries, including the United Kingdom, Canada and South Africa have developed more specific processes and procedures for responding to hate crimes, for promoting multicultural integration and for holding institutions to account. The experiences indicate that it is possible to be more effective with preventive measures, specific legislation and community-based programmes, rather than only reactive ones.

Results

The study results have aided in the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that the current legal and institutional frameworks are not adequate to secure a complete state responsibility in the event of religious communal violence.

The results indicate

- Constitutional safeguards are good but are not uniformly implemented.
- Administrative and police failures play a big role in the escalation of communal violence.
- Judicial involvement has been crucial in fostering accountability and for upholding victims' rights.
- The existing criminal laws do not directly cover communal violence and do not have a specialized accountability system.
- Mechanisms for the rehabilitation and compensation of victims are still unevenly developed for different incidents.
- Comparative international practices are evidence of the effectiveness of preventive and institution-based approaches.

18. Findings

Based on the analysis, the following findings emerge:

- The violence in religious communities is a legal challenge and a socio-political challenge to the constitutional governance.
- State accountability not only implies law and order but also prevention, protection, investigation, prosecution, compensation, and rehabilitation.
- While some legal provisions are in place to offer significant protection, implementation gaps are a major challenge.
- Political polarization and mobilization along identity lines continue to be factors in communal tensions.

- Significant improvements to police accountability mechanisms need to be made to ensure objective police action.
- Although judicial interventions have played an important role in improving access to justice, they cannot be substituted to systemic reforms.
- The role of human rights institutions is important, but is frequently restricted in terms of powers of enforcement.
- Experience in other countries is useful to learn from to enhance accountability and prevention processes.

19. Conclusion

The present study reflects that communal violence in the name of religion still poses a challenge to the constitutional guarantees of secularism, equality and rule of law in India. The Constitution is rather extensive in its coverage of rights to religious freedom and equal treatment of citizens. But the patterns of recurrent communal violence indicate the gap between the constitutional ideals and realities of the institutions.

The socio-legal analysis substantiates the fact that communal violence is not only a law-and-order problem. It is embedded in social, political, economic and institutional issues that impact inter-community relationships and governance systems. Effective responses thus need an integrated approach that includes legal accountability, administrative efficiency, human rights protection and social reconciliation.

The Judiciary has become a key player to enhance accountability and safeguard victims. However,

long-term solutions call for proactive governance, institutional change and preventative measures that are able to address the roots of communal conflict. Enhancing state accountability is not only important for safeguarding individual rights, but also for ensuring democratic legitimacy and social harmony in a pluralistic society.

20. Suggestions and Recommendations

The following recommendations can be made based on the results of this study:

- (1) Passing a comprehensive law against communal and hate violence.
- (2) Introduce legislation on victim assistance, victim rehabilitation and witness protection.
- (3) Tighten anti-hate speech and incitement to communal violence laws.
- (4) Establish early-warning mechanisms to detect and avert any communal tensions.
- (5) Enhance interaction between administrative agencies in communal disturbances.
- (6) Create separate monitor bodies to assess the Government's responses.
- (7) Carry out police reforms as recommended in *Prakash Singh v. Union of India* (2006) 8 SCC 1.
- (8) Provide state and district level independent police complaint cells.
- (9) Special trainings in communal conflict management and protection of human rights.
- (10) Establish quick trial courts for communal violence cases.

- (11) Enhance the protection of witnesses and support for victims.
- (12) Encourage judicial monitoring of investigations in serious communal violence cases.
- (13) Empower the National Human Rights Commission and give it more resources.
- (14) Encourage dialogue and community-building efforts among faith communities.
- (15) Create education initiatives which highlight constitutional values, tolerance and pluralism.
- (16) Improve collection and publication of data relating to communal violence.
- (17) Promote community-based approaches to preventing conflict.
- (18) Take up international good practices in the field of hate crime prevention and minority protection.

It is hoped that the implementation of these recommendations would make a significant contribution toward improving the state accountability, safeguarding the constitutional rights and promoting social harmony in the diversified democratic set-up of the Indian society.

References

Basu, A. (2021). Religious polarization and democratic challenges in India. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 80(4), 845–862.

Baxi, U. (2007). *Human rights in a posthuman world: Critical essays*. Oxford University Press.

Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>

Brass, P. R. (2003). *The production of Hindu-Muslim violence in contemporary India*. University of Washington Press.

Chadha, K., & Guha, S. (2017). The role of social media in

contemporary public discourse. *Media Watch*, 8(2), 145–158.

Chakraborti, N., & Garland, J. (2015). *Responding to hate crime: The case for connecting policy and research*. Policy Press.

Constitution of India. (1950).

Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Free Press.

Cotterrell, R. (1998). *The sociology of law: An introduction*. Butterworths.

Currie, I., & De Waal, J. (2013). *The Bill of Rights handbook* (6th ed.). Juta & Company.

Dacey, A. V. (1885). *Introduction to the study of the law of the constitution*. Macmillan.

Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Cornell University Press.

Engineer, A. A. (2004). *Communal riots in post-independence India*. Orient Blackswan.

Glenn, H. P. (2014). *Legal traditions of the world* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Government of India. (2005). *Report of the Justice Nanavati Commission of Inquiry*. Ministry of Home Affairs.

Government of India. (2006). *Report of the Sachar Committee on the social, economic and educational status of the Muslim community of India*. Prime Minister's High-Level Committee.

Horowitz, D. L. (2000). *Ethnic groups in conflict* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Jaffrelot, C. (2021). Majoritarian nationalism and democratic transformation in India. *Contemporary South Asia*, 29(1), 1–17.

Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, failure and the future*. Migration Policy Institute.

Mamdani, M. (2001). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton University Press.

Mohd. Haroon v. Union of India, (2014) 5 SCC 252.

Moon, R. (2018). *Putting faith in hate: When religion is the source or target of hate speech*. Cambridge University Press.

Mowbray, A. (2004). *The development of positive obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights by the European Court of Human Rights*. Hart Publishing.

National Human Rights Commission v. State of Gujarat, (2009) 6 SCC 767.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2022). Religious freedom, equality, and constitutional democracy in South Asia. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 48(5), 622–639.

Pandey, G. (1990). *The construction of communalism in colonial North India*. Oxford University Press.

Places of Worship (Special Provisions) Act, 1991.

Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993.

S.R. Bommai v. Union of India, (1994) 3 SCC 1.

Sartori, G. (1987). *The theory of democracy revisited*. Chatham House Publishers.

Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. W. W. Norton.

Shani, O. (2020). Citizenship, identity, and communal politics in contemporary India. *Asian Survey*, 60(5), 872–894.

Singh, P. (2023). Hate speech, communal violence, and constitutional accountability in India. *Indian Law*

Review, 7(2), 145–168.

Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India, (2018) 9 SCC 501.

Udapa, S. (2018). Digital media, hate speech and online publics. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 314–332.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. United Nations. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*.

United Nations. (1992). *Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities*. United Nations. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-rights-persons-belonging-national-or-ethnic>

United Nations. (1992). *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*.

Varshney, A. (2002). *Ethnic conflict and civic life: Hindus and Muslims in India*. Yale University Press.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, (1997) 6 SCC 241.

Wilkinson, S. I. (2004). *Votes and violence: Electoral competition and ethnic riots in India*. Cambridge University Press.

Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2004) 4 SCC 158.
