

COMPILATION OF SELECTED ARTICLES ON LAW AND FILMS

OUTCOME OF
**2ND ARTICLE WRITING COMPETITION
ON LAW AND FILM**

ORGANISED BY
PROBONO INDIA

IN ASSOCIATION WITH
CHITRAPAT COMMUNICATION

SPONSORED BY
KAMENDU JOSHI AND ASSOCIATES

MARCH 2023



COMPILATION OF SELECTED ARTICLES ON LAW AND FILMS

AN OUTCOME OF 2ND ARTICLE WRITING COMPETITION ON LAW AND FILM

ORGANISED BY

PROBONO INDIA

IN ASSOCIATION WITH

CHITRAPAT COMMUNICATION

SPONSORED BY

KAMENDU JOSHI AND ASSOCIATES

MARCH 2023



EDITORS

DR. KALPESHKUMAR L GUPTA

Founder, ProBono India

BHUSHAN KANKAL

Co-Founder, Chitrapat Communication

“It's not what a movie is about, it's how it is about it.”

– Roger Ebert

March 2023

© ProBono India, Surat, Gujarat

Coverpage Designed by :-

Shree Ram Printers and Stationers
Sector 16, Gandhinagar Gujarat

Disclaimer

Organiser has compiled best articles for academic and research purpose only.

FOREWORD

Films based on courtroom drama:

NOT THE BUSINESS OF JUSTICE BUT THE BUSINESS OF LAW ***(dialogue from the film – Section 375)***

During the late 19th century, films, a new form of entertainment, began to gain popularity, and this trend continued well into the 21st century. Today, films serve as a means of entertainment, inspiration for thought, and a medium to convey a message. Films are made for various reasons worldwide, and the presence of struggle and conflict adds depth and allure to this art form.

Courtroom dramas in films or plays are a genre that offers a unique experience to viewers. In India, the history of courtroom dramas in films is long, and movies like 'Kanoon', 'Yaadein', 'Damini', 'Ek Ruka Hua Faisla', and others have captivated audiences with their dramatic and compelling plots. Today, Indian courtroom dramas not only entertain but also provide an opportunity to learn about legal procedures and the importance of evidence, thus raising awareness among the public.

Recently, various articles have been written about courtroom drama films based on legal claims. Films such as 'Section 375', 'Jai Bhim', and 'Pink' have gained popularity and have also been critically acclaimed for their relevance and significance. Simultaneously, classic courtroom drama films like '12 Angry Men' have also been revisited to highlight their cultural and historical importance.

The compilation of the works from the national-level essay competition organized by ProBono India and Chitrapat Communication sponsored by Kamendu Joshi & Associates presents various essays on the topic of law and films. These essays discussed how the format of a courtroom drama enables critics to analyze a film's legal validity and social relevance. It allows one to examine how writers separate the legal process from the film's message, where the film takes creative liberties, and how it affects social discussion. Such scrutiny provides an opportunity to minutely criticize the writer's knowledge and relevance to the law. Writing an essay on legally based films inspired by such legal claims is a unique experiment.

In recent years, social awareness about the law has increased. Film audiences are showing interest in topics such as women's rights, social and economic backwardness, the impartiality of the justice system, and human rights struggles. Films are no longer just entertainment stories but are also seen as documentaries of real-life struggles, which can be understood through examples like 'Section 375' or 'Pink'.

It was a great pleasure for me to be a part of the author's creative journey. Viewing films as an educational tool was a valuable learning experience, and such endeavours deserve recognition.

Kartikey Bhatt

Professor, Film Critic, Academician and Researcher
Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Adv. Kamendu Joshi- M.Com, LL.M, FCS
Managing Partner

605, Silver Radiance, Nr. Pakwan Cross Roads, Sindhubhavan Road,
Bodakdev, Ahmedabad 380 054, Gujarat, India
079- 4009 7948, +91 98985 55011
kamendu@krjoshi.com



Date: 20th March 2023

Film has been an integral part of today's society. It depicts what is happening in the society across through different kind of genre. I am extremely happy to see growth of Article Writing Competition on Law and Film initiated by ProBono India in collaboration with Chitrapat Communication, Ahmedabad in the year 2022. We are thankful to them for giving us an opportunity to support the event along with flagship event of International Socio-Legal Film Making Competition launched in the year 2017. I have been informed by the organizer that they have received overwhelming response in 2nd Edition of the competition. I wholeheartedly congratulate them for the grand success. I have gone through selected articles submitted in the said edition and very much impressed by the thought process of young minds reflected in their pieces.

A big compliment to Dr. Kalpeshkumar L Gupta, Founder of ProBono India for initiating this first of its kind initiative. I am sure they will keep organizing such event in this series and add value in the field of Law and Film.

Best Wishes.


Kamendu Joshi

Managing Partner
Kamendu Joshi & Associates

PREFACE

“I believe that cinema picks up ideas from society and not the other way round.”

— Amitabh Bachchan

Often it is believed that people learn many things from films and implement them in their lives, whether good or bad. But most of the time, it is the other way around. We completely agree with the abovementioned statement made by Shri Amitabh Bachchan. We are sure that all of you will agree with the fact that films are the best method of communication which conveys a lot about society. Recent films like Jai Bhim (2021), Article 15 (2019), Section 375 (2019), Pink (2016), and Court (2014), along with older courtroom drama films like Damini (1993), Meri Jung (1985) and even Aawara (1951) made a huge impact on society at large.

Last year as film enthusiasts, we deliberated on organizing an Article Writing Competition on Law and Films. The said competition focuses on socio-legal issues prevailing in our society shown via films. The competition is open to all, not having any kind of bar, qualification etc. We started with excellent articles in the first edition that happened in 2022, which were compiled and released accordingly. Looking at the success of the first edition, we organised the second edition of it. We received overwhelming responses across India, receiving three times more entries than last year. We are thankful to all young minds for their thought-provoking pieces of work. I am sure filmmakers at state, national and international levels also be surprised by the student's work.

We thank Mr. Kamendu Joshi, Managing Partner, Kamendu Joshi & Associates, Ahmedabad, for generous sponsorship and support in organizing the event.

We hope this will become helpful literature to study different phenomena and situations shown through the lens of films.

Dr. Kalpeshkumar L Gupta
Founder, ProBono India


Bhushan Kankal
Co-Founder, Chitrapat Communication

LIST OF SELECTED ARTICLES

SR. NO.	NAME OF THE ARTICLE	PAGE NO.
1.	SECTION 375 <i>Boddu Harshith Sai, Bennett University, Greater Noida</i>	1
2.	NAVIGATING THE LEGAL AND EMOTIONAL COMPLEXITIES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT THROUGH 'PINK' <i>Shreya Bajpai, MNLU, Nagpur</i>	4
3.	A SOCIO-LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THAPPAD <i>Aayush Kumar, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi</i>	8
4.	WITNESS FOR THE PROSECUTION (1957): A TIMELESS MASTERPIECE <i>Ankita Jain, MNLU, Aurangabad</i>	11
5.	IMPACT OF KASHMIR FILES ON INDIAN SOCIETY <i>Syeda Nadia, TNDALU, Chennai</i>	14
6.	COURT <i>Aadya Narain, Jindal Global Law School, Sonipat</i>	18
7.	DAMINI <i>Anwita Parashar, NALSAR, Hyderabad</i>	21
8.	12 ANGRY MEN: A TIMELESS TALE OF JUSTICE AND JURISPRUDENCE <i>Ayush Dumka, SLFJPS, NFSU, Gandhinagar</i>	25
9.	AAKROSH (1980): A NEGOTIATION BETWEEN IDEALISM AND REALISM <i>Sachin Sahu, NLIU, Bhopal</i>	29
10.	AN ANALYSIS OF THE MOVIE 'JAI BHIM' <i>Ishika Soni, NMIMS, Hyderabad</i>	32
11.	NOT THE BUSINESS OF JUSTICE BUT THE BUSINESS OF LAW- SECTION 375 <i>Sunaina, Panjab University</i>	35
12.	12 ANGRY MEN – INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY <i>Harsh, Army Institute of Law, Mohali</i>	38
13.	12 ANGRY MEN- THE FILM AND ITS LEGAL PERSPECTIVE <i>Varun Kumar, NUSRL Ranchi</i>	42
14.	DOWRY: FINDING HOPE IN GREATEST FIASCO OF LAW <i>Saumya Kumar Singh, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya</i>	45
15.	OH MY GOD <i>Jayana Mishra, DSNLU, Andhra Pradesh</i>	48
16.	MULK: AN INTRODUCTION TO ISLAMOPHOBIA <i>Shambhavi Shahi, SLS Noida</i>	51
17.	'JAI BHIM' MIRROR OF THE SOCIETY FOCUSED ON INSTITUTIONALIZED DISCRIMINATION <i>Soumit Nath, KIIT Law School, Bhubaneshwar</i>	54
18.	PINK <i>Nisha Anna Joseph, Kristu Jayanti College of Law, Bangalore</i>	57

SR. NO.	NAME OF THE ARTICLE	PAGE NO.
19.	ADVOCATE K CHANDRU : THE VOICE OF THE MARGINALISED Prabhath Chowdhary Pudota, <i>KIIT Law School, Bhubaneswar</i>	60
20.	EK RUKA HUA FAISLA Mugdhaben Patel, <i>NFSU Gandhinagar</i>	63
21.	THE POWER OF TORT LAW AND UNDERSTATED HEROISM IN DARK WATERS (2019) Chandan Maheshwari, <i>National Law University, Delhi</i>	66
22.	THE MAN WHO CROSSED HITLER Pravertna Sulakshya, <i>RGNUL, Punjab</i>	69
23.	WITNESS (2022) Sridhar L, School of Excellence, <i>TNDALU, Chennai</i>	72
24.	“WHEN GOD TURNS INTO DEVIL; AN ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA” Mridulika Pandey, <i>CMP Degree College, Allahabad</i>	75
25.	DAMINI (1993) Shabab Alam, <i>Faculty of Law, Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi</i>	78
26.	PINK Ajay Sahani, <i>ILS Law College, Pune</i>	82
27.	SECTION 375: MARZI YA ZABARDASTI Asma Khan, <i>ILS Law College, Pune</i>	85
28.	THE ACCUSED (1988): A DEPICTION OF HORROR Subramanyan H, <i>Delhi Metropolitan Education</i>	88
29.	THAPPAD Sathya Sruthi S, <i>SLS Hyderabad</i>	91
30.	UNPACKING THE THEMES OF THE SHAWSHANK REDEMPTION: A DEEP DIVE INTO THE ICONIC MOVIE Sanchit Sinha, <i>NUSRL, Ranchi</i>	94
31.	GARGI – INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY Saloni Kothari, <i>MMM’s S C Law College, Pune</i>	97
32.	JOLLY LLB Shubham Gupta, <i>NMIMS, Hyderabad</i>	100
33.	IT’S NOT ALWAYS A MAN’S FAULT Aditi Pramanik, <i>CMP Degree College, University of Allahabad</i>	103
34.	PHILADELPHIA: A LESSON ON THE ORDEAL OF HOMOSEXUALITY THROUGH JUXTAPOSED VALUES Hridyanand Ojha, <i>Nirma University, Ahmedabad</i>	106
35.	THE MOVIE –NAANDHI-IT’S SOCIO LEGAL IMPACT Karingula Jyothsna, <i>Osmania University, Hyderabad</i>	109
36.	NO ONE KILLED JESSICA: INJUSTICE TO JUSTICE Ring Baliyan, <i>CCS University, Meerut</i>	112
37.	SECTION 375 Advait Sharma, <i>NUALS, Kochi</i>	114

SR. NO.	NAME OF THE ARTICLE	PAGE NO.
38.	MIMI <i>Leesha Goyal, NUALS, Kochi</i>	117
39.	ANKUR ARORA MURDER CASE <i>Kiran Singh, CNLU Patna</i>	120
40.	ONE RATIONAL MAN V/S. 11 ANGRY MEN <i>Nitin Kishore, NLU Jodhpur</i>	123
41.	NO ONE KILLED JESSICA <i>Sundarum Singh Sengar, ICFAI Jaipur</i>	126
42.	DARK WATERS: THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SOUL IN THE FACE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DECADENCE <i>Kratin Shastri, Nirma University, Ahmedabad</i>	129
43.	THE RISE OF THE BANDIT QUEEN: A LOOK AT PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN <i>Anubhav Sharma, Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi</i>	132
44.	PARIYERUM PERUMAL: ENDURANCE AND THE WILL TO FIGHT <i>Swaroop Nair, Amity University, Maharashtra</i>	136
45.	MOHAN JOSHI HAZIR HO ! <i>Ramashankar, Bharatratna Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Law College, Mumbai</i>	139
46.	GARGI- "DECEIVED BY DISGUISE" <i>Niharika Bendreddy, Pendekanti Law College, Telangana</i>	142
47.	BADLA: VICTORY OF TRUTH OR POWER OVER JUSTICE? <i>Preet Dulhani, NUALS Kochi</i>	145
48.	CHANDIGARH KARE AASHIQUI : STEPS TOWARDS TRANSFORMING THE STATUS OF TRANSGENDERS FROM THE EYES OF LAW TO THE HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE <i>Bhoomija Pandey, IMS Unison University, Dehradun</i>	148
49.	377 AB NORMAL: A KERNEL OF NEW ERA <i>Raja Kumar, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya</i>	151
50.	ARTICLE 15 <i>Kumar Satyam, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya</i>	154
51.	GARGI (2022) <i>S Suriyakala, Tamil Nadu National Law University, Trichy</i>	157
52.	JOLLY LLB (2013): A POWERFUL COMMENTARY ON THE REALITIES OF THE INDIAN JUSTICE SYSTEM <i>Shivam Bhattacharya, GNLU, Gandhinagar</i>	159



ANALYSIS OF MOVIE SECTION 375

Boddu Harshith Sai
Bennett University, Greater Noida

INTRODUCTION

This complex subject of laws intended to safeguard women and how women are abusing those very same laws for personal gain is addressed in the bold and timely film Section 375. Both sides of the tale are presented by the narrative's use of point-of-view changes. From the opening scenes the audience witnesses a relation between the Law and Justice. Tarun Saluja (Akshaye Khanna) asserts during a law school event that "**justice is abstract, law is an actuality**". It stands out in a film that generally appears to take its legal study seriously that Saluja (Akshaye Khanna) is presented as Senior Advocate, High Court—which one is not mentioned. He strongly believes in the rule of law, the right of everyone—including accused rapists—to the assistance of counsel, and the distinction between justice and the law. His younger sister Hiral Gandhi (Richa Chadha), who can't stand this last aspect, departed his chamber because of it.

ABOUT THE FILM

Famous film director Rohan Khurana (Rahul Bhat) is detained and found guilty by the Sessions Court after Anjali Dangle, a costume designer, accuses him of rape. As Rohan's helper, Anjali is sent to his home to gain his approval on certain costumes. When Anjali gets to his house, Rohan and the maid are already there. Rohan sends the maid to the market when Anjali arrives so that they can be alone in the house. Soon after, we witness how Rohan is pushing her and "forcing" her against her will. In the next scene Anjali is observed by her neighbour, stepping out of an auto rickshaw while her face is covered in a scarf. However, the neighbour notices Anjali's behavior as being strange right away. Her brother is the first person to discover her when they arrive at her residence, and they then proceed to call the police.

Following the filing of the complaint, the police, in accordance with standard procedure, sends Anjali for a full body examination. Major bruises are discovered all over her face and in between her thighs during the examination. In addition, the scrapings taken from under her nails contain traces of Rohan's DNA. When Rohan is examined, it is discovered that his back is covered in nail scratches and that his DNA matches the DNA found on and inside Anjali's body. When all of the evidence is presented to the Sessions Court, the Judge immediately sentences Rohan to ten years in prison. After the Sessions Court issues this order, Rohan's wife seeks the assistance of Tarun Saluja (Akshaye Khanna), a well-known criminal lawyer. When the Sessions Court order is challenged in the High Court, Anjali is represented by Hiral Gandhi (Richa Chadha), a utopian lawyer and champion of women's rights who is fighting her first major case. Surprisingly, Hiral was once Tarun's trainee.

Tarun attempts to expose the flaws in Anjali's claims under the watchful eyes of judges Justice Madgaonkar (Kishore Kadam) and Justice Indrani (Kruttika Desai). Throughout the course of the case, Tarun presents concrete evidence and refutes Anjali's claims. Hiral, on the other hand, defends her client with emotion rather than logic. She comes across as a lawyer who is zoned out and occasionally raises an 'objection'. Rohan confesses during the hearing, and the details included in the confession were:

- Anjali and Rohan had an extramarital affair, and Rohan had promised her a major film project.
- As a result of the relationship's end, Rohan refused to give Anjali the project, and Anjali tried to blame Rohan for the rape.

However, everything that happened between the two of them was completely consensual. And Tarun is successful to demonstrate that Anjali's own brother was partially responsible for the bruises that were discovered on her body. And despite the fact that it is a crucial piece of evidence, the court entirely ignores it.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

From the legal point of view the court maintains the Order of the Sessions Court due to the murky nature of the case and evidence, public pressure, and a lack of conclusive evidence of Anjali's spitefulness. Anjali then admits to Hiral outside the courtroom that Rohan's confession was accurate and that some of her bruises were caused by her own brother and some by herself. Hiral is stunned by this and feels bad about her. The title of the film 'Section 375' is derived from the same section of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 that contains the definition of rape. In this movie the accused Rohan is charged with the following offences mentioned under the Indian Penal Code, 1860:

- Section 376: Penalty for rape
- Section 342: Penalty for wrongful confinement
- Section 354B: Penalty for assault or use of criminal force on a woman with intent to disrobe
- Section 506: Penalty for criminal intimidation.

And I feel that the film never feels dragged and delivers the messages it intends to deliver early on. It touches on its main premise of informing the audience about Section 375. As it is commonly assumed that "no rape occurs without the consent of a woman," the film emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between "will" and "consent," the two main requirements when it comes to sex.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

If the acts committed were not consensual, all of these sections are legally applicable. However, the film depicts two opposing viewpoints on the same situation, one more plausible than the other. Tarun appears throughout the film as the devil's advocate, supporting a criminal and being despised for it. He examines and presents facts in an unconventional manner. He is constantly questioning the case's veracity, even having his practicing license suspended at one point. According to my understanding of Section-375 movie it had raised many questions on my understanding on the MeToo movement. The film raised a lot of questions about the #MeToo Movement making it extremely timely. Even though the film received positive reviews from critics. However, it did not perform well at the box office and failed to get the acclaim from the audience and it had received mixed reviews, but it definitely sparked a debate. During the #MeToo Movement, many allegations

were made, some of which were true and some of which were false, similar to the movie. Women were seen on social media speaking out about various incidents that happened to them years ago, and this was seen not only in Bollywood but also in the entertainment and corporate sectors.

By the understanding of this movie I have felt that women make false allegations for a variety of reasons, including vengeance, previous grudges, workplace animosity, attempting to obtain money through compensation, and so on. The more heartbreaking part is that there are no laws protecting men from false allegations made by women. Feminism is a relevant and important movement in today's world, especially in a patriarchal country like India, but it should not be exploited or confused with pseudo feminism and misandry. The judges in the film admit that the case has two different theories, either of which could be correct, but because the law was created for and in favor of the victim, it must be followed regardless of which theory is correct.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

After the analysis of this movie I can say that this movie was gripping take on the aspects Law vs. Justice and it shows not only woman always become victim of the offences like rape and other sexual offences and even men can become an victim in the cases where if the women are likely to take revenge and have their personal vengeance on a particular person and making the false allegations on them and the sad part is that even though the man is not at wrong the society treats him like a criminal and they will be on a opinion to get him punished by not even seeing the issue from his side of the story. And for these types of the offences there are no laws protecting the victims herein this case it is Rohan.

I believe that the present societal mentality of the people is deeply ingrained in Section 375; the hash tag #hangtherapist is trending online, and #MeToo is frequently mentioned. And it is precisely this that raises the question of why director Ajay Bahl chose to focus his camera on the idea of a false case at a time when women are finally finding the strength to come up about the sexual harassment and assault they have endured for so long.

CONCLUSION

The film is cynical about the distinction between law and justice; the law is concrete, but justice is abstract. Tarun establishes in the film's opening line, "Justice is abstract, but law is a fact," and there are numerous similar lines throughout the film. Tarun asserts his right to be heard. "Imagine a world without the constitutional right to self-defense," he says early in the film. This would be a horrible world. Tarun, predictably, blames social media for demonizing his client prematurely and permanently. In doing so, he ignores the fact that the man had already been convicted under the law, so whatever outrage ensued was legally sanctioned. It is clear from the film's plot that the director is more interested in depicting the plight of the accused but does not always make the best effort.

In the guise of being a subtle reminder of how no man accused of rape can ever "walk free," even if acquitted by the legal system, the film sends a very toxic and dangerous message. At the end of the movie when Hiral meets Tarun and admits to him that she does not believe that justice was served, Tarun replies "**we're not in the business of justice; we're in the business of law**". This only goes to show that justice is a nebulous concept, and law is merely a means to an end. In this case, the tool does not exist, preventing justice from being served.



“‘NA’ SIRF EK SHABD NAHI.. APNE AP MEIN EK POORA VAKYA HAI..”:

NAVIGATING THE LEGAL AND EMOTIONAL COMPLEXITIES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT THROUGH ‘PINK’

Shreya Bajpai

Maharashtra National Law University, Nagpur

INTRODUCTION

Violence against women, including rape, sexual assault, verbal abuse, and harassment, has reached epidemic proportions throughout the globe. Rape in particular is not limited to any demographic or economic class.

Sexual assault is a crime that stems from patriarchal values of dominance and masculine superiority. Survivors and their families in India are still often subjected to blame-shifting from society, which may be devastating. Survivors’ voices are further muffled since the culture of shame accompanies them through the criminal justice system, the courtroom, and medical facilities.

Because it violates the most basic human right, the right to life, guaranteed by the Constitution of India, and ruins victims' sense of dignity and leaves them with psychological and physical scars, it is reprehensible in every way. Women in India live in perpetual terror since rape is a possibility at anytime and anywhere.

ABOUT THE FILM

“Pink” is a landmark film in Indian cinema that explores the complexities of sexual assault cases and the socio-legal issues surrounding women’s rights and safety in India. Directed by Aniruddha Roy Chowdhury and released in 2016, the film stars Amitabh Bachchan and Taapsee Pannu and is based on the story of three young women who are falsely accused of a crime after fighting off an attempted

sexual assault. "Pink" received widespread critical acclaim for its powerful storytelling, insightful commentary on Indian society, and bold stance on women's rights and safety.

The colour 'pink' is generally associated with females. However, the title of the movie as 'Pink', complemented by the opening scene of the movie showing a young man lying in the backseat, groaning in agony as blood runs down the side of his face, while he is being driven to the hospital by his friends while on the other side, three young women travelling in a cab, looking rather anxious, gives a sense of trepidation to the audience. The movie revolves around the crucial issue of sexual assault, women's rights and the idea of 'consent', which is still lost to many Indian men.

As it happens that three young women, Minal, Falak and Andrea living independently in a shared apartment, go to a party at a resort with three males where one Rajveer tries to force himself on one of the women, Minal. In self-defence, Minal hits Rajveer with a glass bottle grievously injuring him in response to which they start receiving threats. Later, Falak has to take a leave from her job, due to a fake picture of her being released in her office. When the girls finally file the complaint against the boys, Rajveer using his political affiliations files a case of attempted murder against Minal. The movie then proceeds towards the Courtroom scenes where the defence attorney Deepak Sehgal, who suffers from bipolar illness, takes up the girls' cause.

A plurality of Indians still adheres to a patriarchal mentality in which men and women are evaluated differently and pink is a strong statement on this issue.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film was praised for its realistic portrayal of the psychological impact of sexual assault cases, its examination of patriarchal attitudes, and the need for more legal protection for women. The film did not hold back from depicting the horror, panic, and humiliation that victims of sexual assault necessarily feel and emphasized that women should be free to make their own decisions, without fear of violence or prejudice.

The resounding theme of the film, 'No means no,' served as a potent reminder of the significance of permission as the same is misunderstood or neglected in a patriarchal society. The term is used to describe an act of independence/ autonomy that is not the result of external pressure or influence. However, it is open to several interpretations. For instance, whether a woman wants to involve in any act of sexual nature, is her decision and hence, requires her consent. Even if a woman says nothing but seems unsure, stays quiet, moves away or stops responding, it cannot infer that the woman has consented. One of the scenes from the movie depicts the same, that even if Minal, Falak, and Andrea had agreed to go to the resort with the boys, had food with them, were polite and had drinks with them, it cannot be inferred as giving consent for sexual activity. As was also represented in the movie through the question that came before the court in the trial scene, "*jo ladkiyan party mein jaati hai aur drink karti hai, wo pushtaini haq ban jaati hai aapki*".

The film's main theme, "**No means no,**" is, therefore, a powerful call to remember the value of consent and honour women's independence.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The film was criticized to a large extent because of how succinctly the Indian judicial system was portrayed and how it failed to show the complex barriers that women encounter in trying to get justice. The creators should have given more attention to the nuts and bolts of running a courtroom. Witnesses are called and dismissed at whim by Sehgal, the trial moves at breakneck speed, and the judge finds someone guilty of a crime for which they were never even accused. Even though the audience has a sense of satisfaction that *'justice is received'*, however, the reality is far from this, as proving consent and another critical aspect of sexual assault cases is extremely tough.

The greater socio-legal context of sexual assault in India was not addressed, which is another point of criticism levelled at the film. For instance, the film doesn't go into the pervasiveness of patriarchal beliefs and violence against women in Indian society. Filmmakers missed an opportunity to tackle the root causes of sexual assault by focusing only on the ordeals of victims and their court battles. In addition, the film reinforced harmful stereotypes, particularly with its portrayal of males. Although the idea of consent was a prominent theme of the film, it simplified patriarchal attitudes toward women and the multiple root causes of sexual assault.

While the movie was lauded for its powerful representation of the psychological strain of sexual offences and its criticism of patriarchal systems, it could have fared better by addressing the larger socio-legal setting of sexual assault in India and delivering a more accurate representation of the Indian legal system. Although it has its flaws, the movie cannot be denied for the role it had in changing popular perceptions of sexual abuse and women's rights.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film had a profound effect on Indian culture and the judicial system by highlighting sexual abuse and the challenges faced by victims in seeking justice. It received praise for its complex depiction of sexual assault cases and its criticism of the patriarchal attitudes that frequently contribute to violence against women. It had an important legal influence since it brought to light the challenges survivors have in obtaining justice in India and started a national dialogue on the need to change the Indian judicial system. Improved knowledge of the particular obstacles that survivors of sexual assault confront in getting justice has been among the responses to the film.

More importantly, the film stimulated conversation on the significance of consent and the need for a more nuanced definition of sexual assault.

Last but not least, the film left an enduring impression on the Indian film industry, spawning a new generation of socially aware films that tackle gender-based abuse and women's rights. The film's financial and critical success proved that it is possible to make meaningful art while also addressing pressing social and legal challenges.

CONCLUSION

Altogether, 'Pink' is a powerful and thought-provoking film that sheds light on the complicated socio-legal issues surrounding women's rights and security in cases of sexual assault in India. With its compelling depiction of the legal and emotional consequences of sexual assault cases and its call

for stronger legal protection and respect for women's autonomy, this film marks a turning point in the history of cinema.

The film has served to bring attention to the struggles that sexual assault survivors and their families endure in India, and has had a long-lasting impression on the public's understanding of sexual assault cases and the judicial system there. It is proof that movies can be used to teach, motivate, and start debates on complex political and legal topics. The subject of sexual assault and the need for a more nuanced and empathic response to the issue were therefore brought to the forefront of Indian culture and the judicial system.

Pink is a riveting example of the courtroom drama genre, and its portrayal of the legal and ethical complexity of sexual assault cases will remain relevant and influential for years to come.

In the guise of being a subtle reminder of how no man accused of rape can ever "walk free," even if acquitted by the legal system, the film sends a very toxic and dangerous message. At the end of the movie when Hiral meets Tarun and admits to him that she does not believe that justice was served, Tarun replies "**we're not in the business of justice; we're in the business of law**". This only goes to show that justice is a nebulous concept, and law is merely a means to an end. In this case, the tool does not exist, preventing justice from being served.



A SOCIO-LEGAL ANALYSIS OF “THAPPAD”

Aayush Kumar

Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi

INTRODUCTION

Cinema is powerful. It is a universal language, whether it be through movies, documentaries, biographies, or short-films. Cinema is also a social mirror, it depicts the real challenges that society faces. Law is another indicator, like cinema, that reveals the nature and make-up of a society; for instance, the more men who make the law, the more patriarchal the law is. The patriarchal system of society has become institutionalised over time and is a foundation for most personal laws. The rest of society has been conditioned to respect and abide masculinity as the superior authority. This social mirror can be seen in the film industry through the depiction of male and female characters, for instance women in Indian movies are mostly portrayed as sweet, modest, shy, and obedient to their husbands while the protagonists of such movies portray a man as being strong, angry, and responsible. However this narrative is slowly starting to fade with the new wave of films with strong and independent female characters, one such film is “Thappad”.

ABOUT THE FILM

Thappad, directed by Anubhav Sinha, tells the story of Amrita, a woman whose life is turned upside down when her husband slaps her during a house party. This incident left her traumatised. She couldn't feel respected in the "house," which she loved and considered to be her "home." Amrita came to the realisation that all the respect and love she felt she was receiving in the house was not for her but for being the "daughter-in-law" of the house. No one in the house held Vikram responsible for his actions or demanded that he apologise to Amrita after the incident. In consequence, Amrita decided to file for a divorce. To society, a wife seeking a divorce for no other reason than receiving a slap from her husband was ridiculous. After she learned she was expecting a child, things became more difficult. The plot then continues, challenging various social norms regarding marriage and a woman's worth in Indian society. A domestic helper in Amrita's home named Sunita is also depicted as experiencing violence and abuse in her marriage. Early in the movie, she discusses the abuse with Amrita, who did not pay much heed to it. Even though Amrita's family is aware of Sunita's abuse, they do nothing because they believe that domestic violence is common among lower-class families. Amrita only starts to see it differently after she herself was at the receiving end of the abuse.

The film features parallel storylines that span the lives of women from various social backgrounds. through these women , the film draws attention to different aspects of gender-based violence and

the legal responses to these issues. Amrita's attorney informs her up front that her case would not hold up if the dispute were to be challenged in the courts. a case that is being tried in a justice system where women's testimony is frequently disregarded and they are frequently accused of filing "false cases." These are important observations that call attention to the "secondary victimisation" that occurs when legal systems further oppress women who have survived domestic abuse.

In India, divorce can be obtained through mutual consent of both parties or by proving 'fault' by one party. Both Amrita and her husband are Hindus therefore their marriage is governed by the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. This Act specifies the different grounds for divorce that are available to both parties and exclusively available to the wife, respectively. Cruelty is one such ground for divorce provided under Section 13(1)(ia)¹. Cruelty however is not defined by the Act, but is interpreted according to the circumstances of the case and through precedents. Generally speaking, an incident of a "single slap" could be classified as cruelty under section 13(1)(ia), but in reality it is dependent on the court which may grant relief or may not.

In the case of Neetu Naveen Kohli v/s Neelu Kohli², The Supreme Court held that the cruelty must be "grave and weighty," and must also be of a kind that "the petitioner spouse cannot reasonably be expected to live with the other spouse."

Until now, the judiciary has not accepted single isolated instances of cruelty as valid grounds for divorce. The emotional violence that a slap inflicts is enormous, but sadly it falls short of the legal and social definitions of domestic violence. Domestic violence³ cannot be classified as a single isolated incident in a matrimonial setting, which is how society views it as the husband's right, and judicial trends are a reflection of that .

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The movie highlights the fact that, in most cases, a single slap is insufficient to end a marriage in the eyes of the law. Even proving that this one incident occurred is intertwined with complexities given that witnesses to the incident could be easily persuaded, as they were in the movie. Unfortunately, her petition would not be sufficient to grant her relief under the Indian legal system. Despite having an empathetic understanding of her unwavering determination, her lawyer was well aware of this fact. The movie, it could be argued, supports the idea that the "fault grounds" for divorce should be liberally construed. Women shouldn't need to experience severe or persistent abuse before they have "enough" proof to end a marriage.

By being portrayed in a variety of social contexts, the women in the film represent the diversity of womanhood. Each of these women interprets being a woman differently, both inside the home and

¹ Section 13 (1)(ia) says that any marriage solemnized, whether before or after the commencement of this Act, may, on a petition presented by either the husband or the wife, be dissolved by a decree of divorce on the ground that the other party has, after the solemnization of the marriage, treated the petitioner with cruelty

² (2006) 4 S.C.C. 558

³ A comprehensive and inclusive definition of Domestic Violence is provided in Section 3 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence, Act, 2005 Act. It covers the various facets of domestic violence, including the economic, sexual, psychological, and physical violence.

in public. They engage with life's realities in a variety of ways and occupy a variety of roles within the larger family institution.

Without a doubt, Thappad succeeds in departing from typical commercial Bollywood stories. It explores the theme of patriarchy, which still exists in a variety of ways in people's lives. The goal of the movie was to show viewers that, in addition to people from lower social classes who believe it is acceptable to hit their wives, like the husband of the maid, there are also educated, wealthy people who harass and abuse their wives while also preaching respect for their mothers and sisters.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

All the women in this film, with the exception of Sunita, are seen exerting significant efforts to mend or end their unhappy marriages/relationships. Amrita files for a mutual divorce, Nethra separates from her husband to start a new life, and her brother modifies his behaviour. These female characters now have the opportunity to live happy and fulfilling lives. Sunita's future, however, is uncertain because her husband's character is still depicted as being unchanged. Lakhs of women may relate to the difficulties faced by Sunita more than they do with Amrita and a lasting solution for the domestic violence faced by her would have also encouraged them to stand up for themselves against the abusers. The film showed no options for Sunita to get out of the abusive relationship. Giving the audience a message that violence against women of all classes should be taken seriously and addressed would have been appropriate. Unfortunately, the film failed in this sphere.

CONCLUSION

The importance of films like "Thappad" in today's climate is admirable. The traditional patriarchal practises of Indian marriages are criticised in the film, as is the repression of victims of domestic abuse. The movie rejects the idea of normalising gender stereotypes in addition to highlighting the importance of gender equality. Movies can change the way people perceive society by elevating the status of women. If audiences see strong, independent women portrayed on television and in films, they might have a better understanding of the cultural and social issues that affect women.

Films like "Thappad" make us question why our matrimonial laws keep failing our married women. How difficult it must be to be married to someone who is a constant reminder of inequality and humiliation. Laws must change to meet the evolving needs of society. Adherence to antiquated, ill-defined customs and traditions hinders progress. When societal questions are posed in a variety of media, including literature, film, or any other format, an answer is always required.

*"Usne mujhe mara, pehli baar,
nahi maar sakta
bas itni si baat hai"*



WITNESS FOR THE PROSECUTION (1957): A TIMELESS MASTERPIECE

Ankita Jain

Maharashtra National Law University, Aurangabad

INTRODUCTION

A classic masterpiece, *Witness for the Prosecution* is an iconic courtroom drama released in 1957. Directed by Billy Wilder and based on Agatha Christie's play of the same name, it follows a veteran criminal barrister Sir Wilfrid Roberts who takes up a seemingly unwinnable case – that of Leonard Vole who stands accused of murdering a rich widow. The movie was critically acclaimed for its compelling plot, taut direction and great performances from a brilliant cast. It holds a special place in film history as being one of the few courtroom dramas to be awarded multiple Oscars, including Best Director and Best Supporting Actress (for Wendy Hiller). In this article we will explore the themes of justice and morality as presented in *Witness for the Prosecution*, examining what the movie got right and where it went wrong.

ABOUT THE FILM

Witness for the Prosecution is based on Agatha Christie's short story 'The Witness for the Prosecution' which was published posthumously in 1925. The film adaptation saw major changes from the original work; however it retained many crucial elements like the character arc and twisty climax that makes it so captivating. Wilder is known for his style of using dark humour, irony and complex characters to build dramatic situations and this movie showcased these aspects perfectly. The film stars Tyrone Power as Leonard Vole who gives a powerful performance as an innocent man fighting for his freedom in a trial filled with doubt and uncertainty. His counterpart Marlene Dietrich does an outstanding job playing the vengeful yet fragile Miss French while Charles Laughton plays Sir Wilfrid Roberts, their astute lawyer. Throughout the movie we see how each of them handle intense cross examinations as they search for clues that can lead them towards justice. The climax of the movie occurs when Roberts calls upon German nurse Romy Schneider as a witness, who casts crucial light on Vole's character – effectively turning the trial around.

From dialogue delivery to nuanced facial expressions, every aspect of *Witness for the Prosecution* seems masterfully crafted. Furthermore, its impeccable cinematography only adds to its drama where slow camera movements capture scenes ranging from intimate conversations to hectic courtroom moments. The soundtrack also deserves special mention as it builds up tension whenever

needed but never detracts attention away from what's happening on screen. Due to all these factors combined, this timeless classic managed to win numerous awards including two Academy Award nominations and seven BAFTA awards including Best Picture.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The first thing *Witness for the Prosecution* gets right is its nuanced portrayal of the main character, Leonard Vole (Tyrone Power). Through subtle gestures, expressions and interactions with other characters, we see that he is an intensely passionate man, who stands firm in his convictions even when everyone around him begins to doubt him. Furthermore, in scenes such as when he confronts Christine (Marlene Dietrich), Vole's own emotions come alive on screen – which further adds to our appreciation of the complexity of his character.

The movie accurately portrays the legal proceedings involving a defendant such as jury selection, opening arguments, presentation of witnesses and physical evidence. Furthermore, it captures some of the inner workings of courtrooms in terms of witness testimonies and cross-examinations. The movie also realistically conveys how circumstantial evidence can often be decisive in judicial decisions. Wilder does a masterful job of manipulating tension throughout the court proceedings as it shifts between moments of hope and despair, creating suspense that keeps viewers hooked until the verdict is delivered. He expertly conveys not just wit and intelligence but also compassion for his client and an unwavering commitment to justice no matter what the cost may be.

His most impressive feat however is creating a strong sense of empathy towards Tyrone Powers character by utilising certain cinematic techniques such as close ups and cross cutting shots, making viewers believe and relate to his plight. In addition, music plays an important role in this classic thriller with composer Franz Waxman's score enhancing scenes of high emotion. These tactics were revolutionary at the time and cemented Wilde's reputation as one of Hollywood's best filmmakers.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

One element which did not quite live up to expectations was the depiction of Vole himself; lacking depth or charisma, Tyrone Power fails to capture audience sympathy even when claiming innocence. The first issue with *Witness for the Prosecution* is the dismissive treatment of ethnic minorities within the film. Characters of colour were casted into stereotypical roles such as maids or butlers and were portrayed as being subservient to the main characters. This depiction completely disregarded any realistic role people of color might occupy in court proceedings, thus alienating potential viewers who sought more progressive representation. Additionally, female characters were too often used as mere plot devices to push forward male protagonist's arcs, denying them their rightful place as major players in their own story.

The biggest issue lies in the relationship between Leonard and his wife Romaine. From their initial introduction, it's obvious they are not equals, both socially and financially. As Leonard is courting her despite having an established relationship with another woman, the power imbalance between them begins to become clear. This plays into stereotypes about gender roles at the time which further muddles the morality of the story. Furthering this point, the outcome for each character hinges entirely upon whether or not the prosecution can prove their guilt instead of any sort of ethical assessment.

Another aspect that seems outdated is the portrayal of classism throughout the movie. While society was different back then and so was its expectations of individuals, there's something disheartening watching characters degrade themselves based on material possessions or lack thereof. Whether trying to make a good impression by way of expensive meals or using a working-class accent to garner favor from potential jurors, these scenes show just how heavily weighed social standings were during that era. Although praised by critics at the time, the movie has become known as one of the most poignant examples of flawed British justice in cinema history.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

In spite of its faults, *Witness for the Prosecution* has had lasting impacts on both legal discourse and popular culture. At the time of release, it sparked a renewed interest in the criminal trial process, inspiring public debate about the intersections between morality and legality. It also raised questions concerning gender dynamics in courts of law. For instance, lawyers traditionally excluded women as witnesses until very recently when attitudes began to shift toward more inclusive practices. Ultimately, this film showed society how far we still had to go before achieving true judicial equality.

On top of this, Marlene Dietrich's character – Christine Helm – creates another layer of controversy due to her gender role. Though she plays a powerful female lawyer fighting for justice against powerful men, her presence also promotes old-fashioned perceptions of women as weak and dependent. To put it simply, it muddles up the important message of empowerment and reduces it to mere tokenism.

More significantly, *Witness for the Prosecution* put Alfred Hitchcock's name firmly at the top of Hollywood greats list; establishing him as one of cinema's premier directors. Its suspenseful storytelling and stylistic choices set new precedents in filmmaking which are still felt today. In this regard, it provided us with an invaluable template for constructing compelling stories that appeal to audiences around the globe.

CONCLUSION

Although *Witness for the Prosecution* did not wholly stand the test of time, its legacy remains solidified in cinema history. To this day, *Witness for the Prosecution* remains among the greatest courtroom dramas ever produced. Its ability to create palpable tension within viewers through clever plot devices, unexpected turns, and brilliant performances make it a cinematic masterpiece sure to stand out against other films in its genre.

This cinematic gem still remains a favourite among cinephiles who appreciate its artistic direction and detailed production values. Every frame seems calculated to perfection and adds value to the overall feel of the movie. It does well on both intellectual and emotional levels, making it stand apart from other similar movies of that era. Even after 63. Years since its initial release, the film still holds up today and remains timelessly captivating!



IMPACT OF KASHMIR FILES ON INDIAN SOCIETY

Syeda Nadiya

The Tamilnadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai

INTRODUCTION

The Kashmir Files is a 2022 Indian Bollywood drama film. The film depicts a fictitious plot centered on the expulsion of Kashmiri Hindus from Indian-Administered Kashmir in 1990s. It portrays the eviction and circumstances leading up to it as genocide, which scholars universally believe to be inappropriate. According to the film, such truth were hidden through a conspiracy of silence.

The film was written and directed by Vivek Agnihotri. The film stars Mithun Chakraborty, Anupam Kher, Dharshan Kumar, Pallavi Joshi, Chinmay Mavdlekar and Bhasha Sumbli. The film marks its release on March 11th, 2022.

ABOUT THE FILM

The Indian film business is the world's largest business with a vast number of films made for entertainment purpose. The cinema is a strong medium that speaks in multiple languages about varied culture, politics, religious and socioeconomic challenges. Many languages are prevalent in India and the films in these languages are known as regional cinema. Bollywood dominates all over regional cinema. The article is based on an analysis and evaluation of the recent film "The Kashmir Files" which produces and claims to represent the intensity and truth that occurred during the battle (Time). The purpose of this article is to investigate movie in relation to several political, social, legal and religious concerns. This article is based on judicial opinion of the film.

The plot revolves around a Kashmiri college student (Krishna) who has been brought up by his exiled grandfather and is unaware of the circumstances of his parent's death. After his grandfather's death Krishna comes across the fact that the Exodus was benign and he was curious to uncover the facts of his family's death. In Kashmir during 1989-1990 Islamic militants banned the Kashmiri Hindu pandits from Kashmir valley using the slogan Raliv Galiv ya Chaliv (convert to Islam, leave or die) and Al-Safa Batte Dafa (with god's grace whole Kashmir pandit community will leave valley).

The plot shifts to Pushkar Nath Pandit, a teacher who wants to protect his son Karan, who has been accused of being an Indian spy by the militants. Pushkar appeals to his best friend Brahma (a civil servant) for Karan's protection. Brahma travels to Kashmir and witnesses the violence against Kashmiri pandits. He reports the issue to Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, subsequently he suspends Brahma.

Militant Commander Farooq Malik Bitta, finds Karan inside a rice container and shoots him. To ensure their safety, Pushkar and his family are taken by their journalist friend Vishnu Ram to Kaul, a Hindu poet who maintains cordial relationship with Muslims. Kaul takes many pandits to his house, but a group of militants arrive to pick Kaul and his son under the guise of offering protection. The rest of the pandits leave the place but are later shocked to see the corpses of Kaul and his son hanging on the tree.

The Refugee Pandits settle in Jammu and live in poor condition. Brahma is now appointed as an advisor to the new governor of Jammu and Kashmir. At his request, the Home Minister visits the Jammu camp where Pushkar demands the removal of Article 370 and resettlement of Kashmiri pandits. Brahma manages to get Sharda government job in Nadimarg, Kashmir and the family moves there.

One day, a group of militants headed by Bitta, dressed as member of Indian Army arrive at Nadimarg. They started rounding up and shot all Hindu Pandits into massive grave. Pushkar is left free to spread the world the glimpse of whatever happened there.

The scene shifts to present day, where Krishna is under the influence of Radhika Menon who is the supporter of Kashmiri Separatism. Krishna contests the ANU student election. After Pushkar's death, Krishna travels to his ancestor house to spread the ashes as per Pushkar's last wish. Krishna holds Bitta responsible for the situation of pandits. But Bitta claims that it was Indian Army who killed his family. When Krishna questioned about this claim, Brahma handed over a file and Krishna finally discovers the truth. Krishna returns to Delhi and gives a phenomenal speech where he elaborates the history of Kashmir. This truth shocks professor and other students out there.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The Kashmir Files obtained an A certificate from the Indian Censor Board (CBFC), which is available exclusively to adults (aged 18 and above). The British Board of Picture Classification (BBFC) found that the film had "severe bloody violence" and classified it as only recommended for individuals aged 15 and up. The film was graded 18+ by Australian censors.

In New Zealand, the censorship clearance was loaded with controversy. The New Zealand Classification Office reportedly described the picture as R16. However, after the Muslim community expressed worries regarding the propagation of Islamophobia, the classification accused the Classification Office of suppressing the picture because of its political nature, and was supported by other politicians.

The film was banned in Singapore by the censor authority as the film portrayed one-sided Muslims. The boycott has been claimed to be a strong-handed means of defending the country's secularism, an approach of pre-emptive moves that Singapore's ruling People's Action Party has traditionally used to promote racial and religious communal harmony.

ISSUES AND CONTROVERSIES

Since the movie's release, it has changes resulting controversy and generated headlines that is huge (and substantial) enough for the whole world to witness.

Here are four instances in which The Kashmir Files put India on the map for the wrong reasons:

The 'Vulgar Propaganda' Controversy

The Kashmir Files was recently honored at the International Film Festival of India (IFFI) in Goa. However, a few days later, Nadav Lapid, an Israeli filmmaker and Jury Chairperson, openly condemned the film during the IFFI closing ceremony, saying: " "The film 'The Kashmir Files' troubled and startled all of us. It appeared to us to be a propagandist and vulgar picture, unfit for an aesthetic and competitive part of such a prominent film festival..."This is the latest controversy to appear in relation to The Kashmir Files.

Protests in Theatres

The movie was a box office success in 2022. It was, however, a film that sparked violent fights in theatres. Screenings were suspended in numerous cinemas throughout the country after social media recordings of violence inside theatres went viral. Because of the film's contentious character, several theatre owners pulled it off their screens, resulting in even more clashes and riots.

Polarising Reviews Across the World

With the release of The Kashmir Files, polarising reviews began to stream in from all around the world. Some believed the film was 'islamophobic,' while others were astounded at the level of violence and manslaughter that occurred in Kashmir without most of the public being aware of it. Even now, debates are fueled by disagreements regarding the film's genuine goals.

Singapore Banned 'The Kashmir Files'

The film was banned in Singapore in May 2022 for its "provocative" and unfair image of Muslims. The authorities said that the movie will not be classified because of its aggressive and unfair representation of Muslims and its portrayals of Hindus being persecuted in the ongoing clashes in Kashmir. Due to the Kashmir Files, Singapore's actions once again focused attention on India.

JUDICIAL PERSPECTIVE

Intezar Hussain Sayed v. Zee Studios and Others

The PIL petition is filed by an individual, who is a resident in Uttar Pradesh, against a movie entitled "The Kashmir Files." The petitioner contended that the trailer of the movie reveals several scenes, which could hurt the religious sentiments of people residing in India.

The petitioner seeks an order:

- To delete the trailer from all social media platforms.
- To amend the scenes which are discriminatory in nature.
- To scrutinize the dialogues of the film before issuing certificate of films.

The Bombay High Court verified that the Central Board of Film Certification had granted certificate under Sec 5A of the Cinematography Act, 1952 for public viewing.

Thus, the Bombay High Court dismissed a plea seeking a ban on the release of 'The Kashmir Files,' directed by Vivek Agnihotri, since the petitioners did not question the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) certificate issued to the Sanjay Leela Bhansali film.

In accordance with the plea, the film "would not only harm the religious sensitivities of the Muslim community, but will also provoke emotions and inflame members of the Hindu community, with the evident danger of sparking bloodshed in all areas of India."

In *Kumari Vijaylaxmi Jha v. Union of India (2017)*⁴, the Delhi High Court dismissed the petition stating that Article 370 is a temporary provision and continuance of such provision could be a fraud on Indian Constitution.

In *Prem Nath Kaul v. State of Jammu & Kashmir (1959)*⁵, the Supreme Court observed that Article 370 can be invoked based on the object and terms that are considered in the context of special feature of the constitutional relationship between the state and India.

The case of *Sampath Prakash V. State of Jammu & Kashmir (1986)*⁶, it was observed that Article 370 can be invoked even after dissolution of Jammu & Kashmir Constituent Assembly.

Article 370 of Indian Constitution

Article 370 was inserted through a presidential order of 1950. The Government of India felt the necessity to repeal Article 370 of the Constitution on 5th August, 2019 and divide the state of Jammu & Kashmir into two union territories.

Article 370 of the Indian Constitution grants special status to Jammu & Kashmir, which has been source of contention between India, Pakistan and China. Jammu & Kashmir were controlled by India from 1952 until 31 August 2019 and article 370 granted it the authority to have a distinct constitution, a state flag and internal administrative autonomy.

Negative Aspect:

According to the film, whatsoever happened to Kashmiri pandits during the militancy constituted genocide. It was estimated that 400 Kashmiri pandits had been killed and 5 lakh had been displaced since the armed war began. According to official numbers, just 21 people were killed. had been displaced since the armed war began. According to official numbers, just 21 people were killed. According to a survey conducted by the Kashmiri pandits sangharsh samiti, 399 people were killed. According to the Jammu and Kashmir government's website, 60000 Kashmiri Hindu families have migrated the valley due to violence. As a result, the film did not depict the actual figure.

The film's negative side was when terrorists masquerading as army officers invaded Nadimarg and shot Kashmiri pandits into an open grave during the day. According to Nadimarg's house, the killings occurred at night, while the majority of the population was sleeping. As a result, the film did not portray the right time.

In the end, the Kashmir files are about the broader global imaginary, which has been under reconstruction since 2014. It is about where Hindus and Muslims should fit into this new idealistic world.

CONCLUSION

I would like to conclude by emphasizing that accessing Kashmir files is challenging since there is no one agreed-upon set of documents or material that forms the files, and various people have different interpretations of the data contained within them. However, some common themes that appear from discussions about the Kashmir issue include the need for significant transparency and responsibility in resolving human rights violations, political persecution, and other concerns that have harmed the Kashmir valley and its people. Many people think that the contents of the Kashmir files underline the importance of finding a long-term solution to the region's conflict, which can only be achieved by respecting the rights and dignity of all those affected by it.

⁴ Kumari Vijaylaxmi Jha V. Union of India; 2017 W.P.(C) 19618/2017

⁵ Prem Nath Kaul v. The State of Jammu & Kashmir; 1959 AIR 749, 1959 SCR Supl. (2) 270

⁶ Sampat Prakesh V. State of Jammu & Kashmir; 1969 AIR 1153, 1969 SCR (3) 574



COURT

Aadya Narain

Jindal Global Law School, Sonipat

INTRODUCTION

Court dives headfirst into the convoluted, archaic, stagnant, and unpredictable character of the Indian judiciary. An absurd case is filed against Narayan Kamble for allegedly abetting the suicide of manual scavenger Vasudeva Pawar. Tamhane demonstrates how systemic inadequacies manifest as deeply unjust decisions, particularly for marginalised communities. Alongside sombre and realistic courtroom proceedings, the film opens windows into the lives of each character, the socio-political context, and the city, outside the court. The court is a product of this social reality, and the notion of law as shaped by individuals determines the film's narrative style. India's onerous legal system houses the most pending cases in the world. The film depicts how the world outside the courtroom causes biased decision-making, unequal access to justice, and arbitrary curtailment of freedoms, compromising the judiciary's impartiality.

ABOUT THE FILM

The inaccessibility is highlighted by the socio-economic backgrounds of characters. Tamhane contrasts Vora's lavish home and his boast of owning the building, with a destitute, dark, crowded slum. Viewers are introduced to Pawar's home. Vora is informed that Vasudeva's body recovered from the sewer was so filthy that even his family could not touch it. Exiting the court, we see that Pawar's wife has never been inside a car, a physical manifestation of reaching the court. When she went home after her husband's traumatic death, she lost her livelihood. For every day that she attends court, she loses a day's wages, and may jeopardise her income entirely. Contrasting the State's endless capacity to sustain litigation, audiences wonder how anyone without similar resources could ever access the justice system. The film introduces key judicial actors within the courtroom, but forces viewers to re-evaluate them completely outside it. It highlights how individuals are embedded in their social context. Audiences can play jury and judge when they view a circumstance in its entirety. Vinay Vora, well-educated and well-spoken, defending a political activist from an underprivileged background pro - bono is a natural hero in the courtroom. Nutan, contrastingly, is loud, judgemental, and orthodox, and for many viewers transgressing the boundaries of her gender. She seems almost ridiculous reading lines from legislation without intonation or explanation. However, outside the court, this purportedly equal antithesis is questioned, when the lives of the two are juxtaposed. Nutan travels home in crowded public transport. She must consider whether olive oil, could be potentially factored into a strict budget, collect her son, and run errands. Vora travels in his air-conditioned car to his air-conditioned home. He visits the grocery store too, picking up cheeses and wines without glancing at prices of these luxuries. He snaps at his mother with inordinate entitlement even as she cooks food, lays the table, and serves him. Nutan cooks and clears up, while her family watches television. At the day's end,

Vora falls asleep to the television with a glass of wine, while Nutan finally begins her research for the next day. Tamhane challenges audiences by asking what happens when the opponent is not a villain. Tamhane demonstrates that rather than harbouring any evil agenda, most individuals, particularly from the working class, are trapped because it is difficult to survive in these unequal systems without a measure of complicity. Rather than despise individual characters, the audiences now seek reform of the system that perpetuates these circumstances.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film demonstrates that, far from being isolated, the legal system is greatly influenced by societal prejudices. Nutan's family applauds a xenophobic play, that vilifies regional minorities. These discriminations translate into Nutan's harsh treatment of Kamble, who she views as an 'outsider' responsible for the country's economic and moral crises. She finds his case frivolous and attempts for a severe sentence, highlighting the impact her prejudice has on the courtroom proceedings. The judge belongs to a dominant caste, while both victim and alleged perpetrator belong to depressed castes. Their Dalit identity is primarily indicated through symbols such as Ambedkar's portrait, a red flag, and Kamble's lyrics, while Sadavarte's fanatically religious opinions are revealed through his familial interactions. Although ostensibly devoid of caste discrimination, even the upper echelons of the Indian judiciary have a history of prejudice against depressed castes, by invalidating their suffering, or by punishing them more harshly than the privileged (Shukla 4412). Without these explicit recognitions of plural identities, which are contextualised only outside the courtroom, Court would have been a more realistic, but equally restricted commentary on the condition of the Indian judiciary as numerous other courtroom dramas produced in India. Rather than portray injustice as concentrated within the few hours of proceedings, it demonstrates that systemic inequity translates into disparate power dynamics and partisan decisions in the courtroom.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Firstly, in an attempt at realism, the courtroom scenes are highly technical. For example, that the Dramatic Performances Act is an archaic colonial relic, is lost in the endless reading of the legislation verbatim. Secondly, many courtroom scenes can be laughed off or scoffed at by viewers which implies that they are viewed as rare or exaggerated exceptions, rather than accurate portrayals of the everyday. They are de-dramatized, but nevertheless reminiscent of popular courtroom dramas. Examples include the unpreparedness of the lawyer in the stolen watch case, and the woman who was not heard because her clothes were not "modest" (*Court* 58:24) enough. For viewers, the lawyer is likely to return soon better prepared, and the woman with full sleeved clothes. The system is arbitrary and archaic, but it may be passed off in these circumstances as mere idiosyncrasies, and thus invalidated.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

With no soundtrack but Kamble's songs, the film begins with the harbinger of events that led to his prosecution. Folk music has historically been a tool of dissent and this powerful means of moving audiences contextualises Kamble's senseless prosecution. As Kamble sings, "Screams from the funeral pyre – cannot be called a performance" (*Court* 1:31:23), he perceives a disturbed social order, that the rest of the film attempts to replicate. Traditionally, poets express their gratitude through their art to patrons who sustain it. Kamble uses gratitude ironically to denigrate a government seeking to censor his art. These ideas of arbitrary censorship are carried forward, when

Vora is assaulted outside the courtroom for arguing the archaic nature of an ancient religious practice. This violent moral policing, without any consequences, also demonstrates the curtailment of freedom of expression within the judiciary. It is emphasised only in scenes outside the courtroom. There are also subtle indications of voices being silenced, for example, when Vora addresses a seminar about the futility of legal proceedings for many marginalised clients and is interrupted by plugging in a loud fan that drowns out the remainder of his speech. The utter apathy this signalled towards the tragic circumstances that Vora was outlining, also foreshadowed that Kamble's case may prove equally futile, and would be ignored in the broader scheme of things. The irony of censorship in the film *Court* extends beyond its plot into the circumstances of its release. A powerful commentary on the hidden injustices of governmental and judicial systems, two scenes in the film were muted due to censorship by the Central Board of Film Certification.

CONCLUSION

Despite the undeniable politics in the film, by providing holistic representations of entire lives, *Court* is comprised of 'normal' people. It recognises that the majority of people are passive, reactive, and unaware, rather than proactively political or radical. Viewers may be unable to identify themselves with the rabidly orthodox, or with the slow, argumentative lawyers, but they will see themselves laughing at stereotypical jokes, ignoring the poverty and destitute conditions of Indian public workers, and arguing against caste based affirmative action. Viewers would be able to recognise themselves in the film, and the realisation that one is implicated in the prejudices of a system is an incomparably powerful reminder of its inadequacies. The threat and practice of censorship in the film highlights the barrier preventing meaningful discourse around justice. In conclusion, *Court* uses a few crucial tools: re-evaluation, realism, relatability, and repercussion. *Court* is titled aptly, extending beyond the courtroom, to encompass the entirety of reality in the film. The open ending, where audiences are left unsure whether Kamble will ever find justice, cements the final block in the understanding of the repercussions of the courtroom reverberating across many lives outside it. The aspect of relatability and realism stems from clearly designed settings, powerfully contrasted social circumstances, and the subtleties of interaction. Re-evaluation occurs through a complete picture of otherwise fragmented and decontextualized lives and motivations of characters in films.



DAMINI

Anwita Parashar

NALSAR, Hyderabad

INTRODUCTION

Rajkumar Santoshi directed and co-wrote Damini, one of the court masterpieces shown in 1993. It stars Meenakshi Seshadri as the title character, Sunny Deol, Rishi Kapoor, and Amrish Puri. Damini, the protagonist, watches her housemaid being raped by her brother-in-law and his buddies. Despite numerous challenges, she works hard to obtain justice for the victim with her husband and Govind, a lawyer. The film is considered one of Bollywood's best woman-centric films ever produced.

ABOUT THE FILM

Damini, a modest and vivacious woman, is the movie's focus. She belongs to a lower-middle-class family, and when a rich businessman named Shekhar falls in love with her at first sight, it completely upends her life. Shekhar marries Damini in opposition to his family's wishes, who had intended him to wed the daughter of another successful businessman. Damini joins her husband's family, but despite his unflinching support, she is subjected to constant insults and torments. She shares her pleasures and sorrows with the housekeeper, Urmi, her only companion. During Holi, Shekhar's younger brother Rakesh and his intoxicated friends rape Urmi viciously. Despite Shekhar and Damini's best efforts, it is too late to stop the terrible sexual assault. Urmi's body is abandoned before being taken to a government hospital with little medical supplies. Shekhar's family tries to keep the situation secret, but Damini is on her side. She visits the police and reports the incident; her marital family refuses to take her in. As the trial gets underway, defence attorney Chaddha viciously cross-examines Damini. Moreover, due to a lack of assistance from her family, Damini is classified as mentally ill and sent to a mental hospital where she is confined to other inmates. Urmi passes away during Damini's time in the asylum, and her death is recorded as a suicide.

Damini escapes the asylum because she cannot endure the mental anguish there, where her family's ultimate goal is to drive her completely insane. Along the way, she meets an alcoholic lawyer named Govind. After his wife passed away, Govind began to despise the court system. At first, he declines to take the case, but when Damini asks him to defend the oppressed Urmi, he reopens it. The attorneys, Chaddha and Govind are engaged in a legal battle, and eventually, they win the case, and justice is served against all odds when Shekhar gives his testimony in the court.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

In the film, it is shown how daughters are treated like mere possessions with no independent personality and how, even after all these years, a woman's main achievement is to find a suitable spouse with whom she may spend the rest of her life. In the film's beginning, we observe how Damini is frequently reprimanded by her in-laws for not bringing dowry. The ills of the dowry system

continue, and her standing in the family is based on the wealth she provides, effectively turning marriage into an economic institution. We also observe the systematic suppression of daughters' aspirations, who are led to believe that their goals are unimportant. As a result, they ignore chances when they present themselves, making them reliant on their husbands and fathers for all their requirements.

The most significant component of the film is how rape victims are frequently harassed by their own families and authorities, even after so many years when crimes against women are still frequently dismissed as a mistake and how its made to believe that it must be the victims fault. She must have done something to encourage him. Women's suffering is portrayed in the media as entertainment, and is rudely questioned by the press. In an ideal society, a rape trial would be sensitive and brief. Unfortunately, the situation in the courts is not so as shown in the movie, how a key witness is intimidated and harassed by asking unpleasant questions and attempts are made to make her uncomfortable into silence by asking her to name the body parts where the perpetrators touched as well as the positions they were in. if we believe it is an exaggeration we need to reconsider this as also shown in Jagmohan Mundhra's movie Bhawandar, which is based on the Bhanwari Devi rape case, where the survivor is asked if she had an orgasm. In this instance, the awful inspiration for the movie came from actual truth. In this particular rape case, where Urmi is the housemaid and the accused are in a position of control over her, also illustrates the gender, social, and economic power dynamics at play. it was seen in the film that while the police were portrayed as self-interested, corrupt and at the beck and call of the rich, the judge was portrayed as a mute spectator who could be easily manipulated, making citizens struggle to get justice.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie has propagated gender roles and confirmed the gender issue. the movie fails to focus on domestic violence; it somehow normalises the beatings and marital relationships. The trial in cinema has little connection with reality and this movie is no exception to that, While exceedingly strict rules of procedure govern the courtroom, evidence, and conduct, all rules are suspended in the Bollywood version. Anyone can walk into the courtroom and offer testimony in the form of dramatic monologue, new facts and witnesses can be presented as a surprise element, a lawyer can pick up a bottle of medicine that has been presented as material evidence and drink it up to prove that it is not poison, and, as in the case of Damini, a defense attorney can even conduct his version of a police lineup in the courtroom by presenting a bunch of men, faces covered in Holi colours, and shoving them onto the witness. in tthe end we see Damini also delivering a powerful and emotionally charged speech where she describes how everyone involved, from the media, to the police, to the doctor, made a business out of Urmi's rape as a result of which she was raped again and again in an open Court. Such portrayal of actors within the criminal justice system heightens the focus on the hero as the "saviour" and reduces the role of the State in securing justice for victims. Damini's courtroom scenes can be called as a theatrical for a classic good vs evil drama. They did not attempt to portray the workings of the law realistically.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie does an excellent job of showcasing our society's apathy for the poor and downtrodden and the deeply ingrained tendency to compensate people's lives and dignity with money. Through all of these incidents, how crimes against women are considered their fault, how women are always

subject to regulations and oppression, and how the idea of honour for one class is maintained above that of others, the film effectively addresses the problem of feminism and the oppression of women by society, particularly the wealthy for their own self-interest.

The film propagates defined gender roles, the first enquiry is regarding the questions asked to the victim or the witnesses during the trial. The defense lawyer attempted to shame Damini into silence by asking her to name the body parts where the perpetrators touched Urmi and the positions they were in. This reflects how an honourable woman in Indian society, keeping with standards of propriety, is expected to be embarrassed to call out the names of private body parts or sexual positions in a public setting. Damini, falters and hesitates to confidently describe the entire scene, thus reinforcing the stereotypes associated with the acceptable actions of "proper women."

It is also interesting to note that in the last scene before the verdict is given, Damini shames Chaddha by referring to his attempts to quieten her by asking her to name the body parts. She names them not as body parts but by alluding to their value in a woman's body. This reinforces the stereotype that such body parts, instead of being seen independently as a part of a woman's sexuality, can only be talked about in open spaces in an "honourable way." She also asks Chaddha if he would have dared to ask his mother or sister the same questions that he asked her, which again reinforces that a familial relationship must be assumed between a man and a woman for her to be seen as worthy of his respect, and not just because she is a woman.


It is notable that even though Damini is the central character of the film and is the one who begins the fight for justice for Urmi, ultimately it is Govind, an embittered ex-lawyer who finally comes to her rescue when all else fails, and saves the day. This affirms the stereotype that at the end of the day, irrespective of a woman's struggle for a noble cause, the fight is won only when a noble man joins her. On the question of the symbols in the film and the message conveyed by them, it was notable that the perpetrators were explicitly shown with a bottle of alcohol in their hand right before they raped Urmi. Then again a bottle of alcohol was shown while the rape was being committed. Coloring the heinous crime of rape with the presence of alcohol introduces a bias in our society and the criminal justice system that rape is caused only by alcohol consumption and diminishes the focus on premeditation in a sober state. This turns out to be crucial in cases where the victim has also consumed alcohol at the time of the offence and reduces the veracity of her claims or the perceived gravity of the offence.

CONCLUSION

Damini holds our hand through her journey of social transformation as she stands at a fork in the road where one option leads to the honour of her family and the other leads to justice for a young girl. Damini is not someone you would meet readily, but there is a Damini in each of us, as Meenakshi Sheshadri has expertly handled. The film emphasises how rape is that heinous crime where the perpetrator escapes punishment because the social structure and the law are heavily skewed in his favour, and the victim, or the raped woman, has no choice but to swallow her tears and live her life with the unhealable wounds on her heart and soul. Most of the time, these cases are either not filed or dropped before they even reach court. Even when a case like this is brought before a court of law, the defendant's attorney will use legal pretexts to defend his client, who would use the acquittal as motivation to do the crime again with a different victim.

The administration of justice in India is realistically portrayed with courtroom drama, allegations, the murder of the victim, and efforts to prove the witness is mentally ill. She criticises the justice system's shortcomings and some attorneys' callousness towards rape victims. Her voice perfectly encapsulated the anxiety and annoyance that people who have dealt with the law go through. It also showed how perverted minds will go to any lengths to twist the facts in order to protect their children from the grasp of the law and the vast gap between the rich and the poor. The people of that era referred to Damini as a representation of social developments. Tareekh pe Tareekh Deol's dramatic speech, which criticised the infamous delays in the Indian legal system and proclaimed that "justice delayed is justice denied," was therefore well received by the audience.

In light of the above, Damini may be regarded as a successful film that takes a step forward in representing Indian women and giving them agency, while also drawing attention to the criminal justice system's apathy and insensitivity towards victims of sexual assault. At the same time, it must be recognised that it did so within the greater boundaries of prescribed gender roles, and that the portrayal of its characters confirmed certain gender stereotypes.



12 ANGRY MEN: A TIMELESS TALE OF JUSTICE AND JURISPRUDENCE

Ayush Dumka

SLFJPS, NFSU, Gandhinagar

INTRODUCTION

"12 Angry Men" (1957) is a classic courtroom drama directed by Sidney Lumet that explores the American legal system and the role of the juror in a trial. The film takes place in a deliberation room where a group of jurors must decide whether a young man is guilty of murder. As the jurors discuss the evidence and the case, their personal prejudices and biases come to light, leading to a tense and emotional debate. The film highlights the importance of due process, impartiality, and the need for individuals to carefully consider evidence before reaching a conclusion.

"12 Angry Men" is considered a masterpiece of the courtroom drama genre and continues to be widely regarded as a classic today. It remains an important film that provides a thought-provoking and powerful commentary on the legal system and the importance of justice, fairness, and individual responsibility.

ABOUT THE FILM

"12 Angry Men" is a landmark film directed by Sidney Lumet that takes place entirely in a jury deliberation room. The film focuses on the decision-making process of a jury tasked with determining the guilt or innocence of a young man charged with murder.

The film opens with the jurors being brought into the room to deliberate, and they are initially unanimous in their belief that the defendant is guilty. The holdout juror, played by Henry Fonda, is not convinced of the defendant's guilt and is willing to take a closer look at the evidence. As the deliberation progresses, it becomes clear that the jurors are divided into two groups. The jurors who believe the defendant is guilty are eager to reach a verdict and go home, while the holdout juror and his allies are willing to take the time to carefully consider the evidence and reach the right verdict.

Throughout the film, the jurors' personalities and motivations are slowly revealed. Some of the jurors are swayed by their personal experiences, while others are motivated by their own prejudices and biases. The film shows how these factors can influence the decision-making process and the need for individuals to carefully consider the evidence before reaching a conclusion. As the jurors discuss the case, the film takes a deep dive into the intricacies of the legal system and the dynamics of group decision-making. Each juror brings their own experiences, prejudices, and biases to the table, leading to a tense and emotional debate. Despite these challenges, the holdout juror and his allies are relentless in their pursuit of justice. The film shows how the jurors, one by one, come to realize that the case is not as clear-cut as they initially believed.

The holdout juror and his allies work to convince the other jurors to take a closer look at the evidence. They question the testimony of witnesses, point out discrepancies in the evidence, and call into question the credibility of the prosecution's case. The holdout juror uses his intelligence, empathy, and persuasiveness to convince the other jurors to look beyond their own prejudices and biases and consider the evidence objectively. In the end, the holdout juror and his allies succeed in convincing the other jurors, and the defendant is ultimately found not guilty. The film's final scene shows the jurors leaving the deliberation room, each one taking a moment to reflect on the experience.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

"12 Angry Men" is a renowned movie that highlights the American legal system and underscores the importance of impartiality and fairness. The film depicts the legal system and the obstacles faced by jurors in a high-stakes trial with remarkable accuracy.

One of the major aspects that the film got right is the representation of the deliberation process. The film portrays the difficulties and challenges that may arise during the deliberation process, such as the influence of personal experiences, biases, and prejudices. The film highlights the need for jurors to consider the evidence objectively and impartially, which is crucial in ensuring a fair trial. The film depicts the power of effective communication and the ability of one person to make a difference. The character of Juror 8, played by Henry Fonda, demonstrates how an individual can use persuasive reasoning and critical thinking to change the opinions of others. The film perfectly shows the importance of individual responsibility and integrity in the face of societal pressure.

The film accurately showcases the importance of impartiality and the need for evidence-based decision-making. The film highlights the danger of jumping to conclusions based on incomplete or circumstantial evidence and how this can lead to wrongful convictions. "12 Angry Men" accurately depicts the legal system and jury deliberation and its message on impartiality, justice, and individual responsibility remains relevant. It's a must-see for those interested in the administration of justice.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

"12 Angry Men" is widely regarded as a classic film, but it is not without its flaws. Although the film accurately portrays some aspects of the legal system, there are several elements that it oversimplifies or misrepresents.

The deliberation process depicted in the film is one such oversimplification. While the film does show the difficulties that can arise in the deliberation, it depicts the process as taking place over the course of one day and reaching a verdict in a relatively short period. This misrepresents the real deliberation process, which can be much longer and more complex. The jury deliberation process is depicted as happening in a vacuum, without any influence from outside sources, whereas in reality, juror bias and outside influence can play a significant role in the verdict.

Another oversimplification in the film is the depiction of the legal system itself. The role of the judge is diminished, while the jurors make decisions on their own understanding of the law. In reality, the judge plays a crucial role in the process, guiding the deliberation and ensuring the law is followed. The film is limited in its representation of diversity, as all 12 jurors are white, middle-aged men. This lack of representation may be a product of its time, but it also undermines the universality of the film's themes. Moreover, the film fails to fully examine the issue of racism and prejudice in the legal system. In reality, racism and prejudice can play a significant role in the legal system, leading to wrongful convictions and injustices.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie "12 Angry Men" has had significant socio-legal impacts since its release in 1957. It has played a role in raising public awareness about the importance of impartiality and objectivity in the jury system.

One of the key socio-legal impacts of the film is its influence on jury deliberation practices. The film has encouraged jurists to take their responsibilities seriously and to be more cautious and thoughtful when making decisions in the deliberation room. Additionally, the film has brought attention to the issue of prejudice and bias in the legal system. The film demonstrates how personal biases and preconceptions can interfere with the deliberation process and result in wrongful convictions. The film has helped to raise awareness of these issues and has contributed to efforts to address them in the legal system.


Furthermore, the film has also been used as a teaching tool in law schools and in legal training programs for judges, jurors, and lawyers. It provides an excellent example of the challenges that jurors face in reaching a verdict, and has been used to promote ethical and legal literacy among professionals in the field. The film continues to be widely studied and discussed and is widely considered to be one of the most influential films in the history of American cinema.

CONCLUSION

"12 Angry Men" is a masterful film that provides a thought-provoking and powerful commentary on the legal system and the importance of justice, fairness, and individual responsibility, and it is an important film for anyone interested in these issues, particularly law students. Throughout the film, the jurors struggle with personal biases and preconceptions that interfere with their ability to make an impartial decision. The film highlights the importance of considering all perspectives and being willing to change one's opinion based on new evidence and arguments. For law students, the film is a valuable resource for learning about the legal system and the role of the juror. The film provides an inside look at the deliberation process and the challenges that jurors face in a high-stakes trial.

The film is also an important reminder of the importance of impartiality and fairness in the legal system, and it encourages law students to think critically about these issues.

The film's timeless message about the dangers of conformity and the importance of impartiality and independent thinking continues to resonate with audiences today. The film's powerful acting, tight direction, and insightful script have made it a classic of the court room drama genre. The film is an excellent resource for law students, as well as anyone interested in these issues, and it is highly recommended that they watch it.



AAKROSH (1980): A NEGOTIATION BETWEEN IDEALISM AND REALISM

Sachin Sahu

National Law Institute University, Bhopal

INTRODUCTION

In India more than a thousand movies are made every year in different regions, in different languages. Court room dramas and legal battle movies are very popular among the audience, in which some are very popular like the film DAMINI and its famous dialogue of Sunny Deol “Tareekh Pe Tareekh, Tareekh Pe Tareekh”. Movies can be used to propagate awareness about the socio political issues of the times that we live in, it's very important to make the society see it's fault, it's grey areas, it's areas of concern so that we can work upon it and make it a better place to live in. Movies are a very effective tool to communicate ideas of great importance to masses with a pinch of entertainment. Movies can be a good medium to make the layman understand the complexities of socio legal problems and their solutions as well. Lately there is wave of courtroom dramas in Indian cinema, films like Pink, Jai Bheem, Mulk, Criminal Justice have gained critical acclaim and Jai Bheem was India's official entry to Oscars 2022.

ABOUT THE FILM

Aakrosh is a film that came in the year 1980 that deeps dive into the issues of caste discrimination, corruption, and loopholes of criminal justice system, the film starring Nasiruddin Shah, Om Puri, and Amreesh Puri, as the main characters playing the pivotal roles. Aakrosh is a brilliant movie to show the apathy of our legal system towards the poor and marginalized citizen of this great country. It emphasis on the point that the law is blind it cannot see through its own eyes, you need to take the help of evidence to make it see the 'truth' that you claim to be the 'truth'. Aakrosh is moral battle between idealisms and realism, its two main characters Mr. Dusane and Bhaskar argue their cases in which Bhaskar is a young lawyer who has recently graduated and coincidentally he is the junior of Mr. Dussane who is the public prosecutor in Lhamya bhiku's trial. Bhaskar is enthusiastic about the legal world, the power of pen and his black court he wants to solve the problems of this world and has the ambition to become a good lawyer like his father, on the other hand Dussane is an experienced lawyer who had keenly observed the functioning of the legal system and he is very well aware of the loopholes and inadequacy of the court to provide justice, that's why he is realistic in his approach. Lhamya Bhiku is an adivasi labourer who cannot tolerate injustice and will not bow

down to the mighty power of Rich elite or to the dictate of the socially dominant groups. He do not speak a word in the whole film but let his eyes speak of his ordeal, how her wife has been raped and killed because he raised his voice against the injustice that his community is subject to, he do not speak because he fear that if he speak his sister and father will meet the same fate as his wife did. In a scene when Mr Dusane receives the telephone the person on the other side abuse him with casteist slurs specifically as “Neech jaat” and warns him that if he will try to cross or break the cast barrier he will be punished, this scene essentially points out to the denigrated mindset of the caste superiorists, their disgust towards the Adivasis and their sheer hate towards them.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film is also a very nuanced portrayal of a person's mental situation when the sword of law is hanging on this head, Lhamya Bhiku get arrested on false charges of murdering his own wife, and when he tries to sleep in the jail he becomes anxious and scenes of her wife crying in pain comes in front of him, and he gets very unstable emotionally. Bhaskar has been appointed as the lawyer of Lhamya Bhiku, this arrangement points out to the inadequacy of the legal aid services, Bhaskar has no experience at all this is his first case, so he should not be given this case instead an experience lawyer who can defend Lhamya should handle the case, due to poor remuneration lawyers with good experience and skills do not wish to contribute to legal aid services. Films like Aakrosh are a mirror to the society, these are the problems of our country that are usually ignored or the majority of the people don't know about it at all, This films portrays the prevalence of naked violence and cruelty in our society. The use of symbolism is very effective Lhamyas silence says volumes even without uttering a word , he is been silenced and told to accept what is given to him, it shows the dominance of one community on the other , it will shake people's conscience and fill them with many questions, which the film do not answers

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

When Dusane says that “ye log to aise hi hote hain”, It puts me into a moral dilema why he is saying that, after all he is one of them and I assume that he knows that they are not like that, it's the ostracization of these people the active and passive violence that has made them like that. Crimes against SCs /STs is on the rise in our country but according to the data given by NCRB 65.90% of the under trials are from SCs STs and OBCs, the stark anomaly points out to a biased criminal justice system. There is a common hopelessness in the minds of Lhamya Bhiku and Mr Dusane they both know that it's just near to impossible to get justice for a poor person, because the system works on money where only the person who can buy witnesses can afford justice, in the end Lhamya Bhiku picks up an axe and kill his own sister so as to protect her chastity and to avoid further humiliation to the hands of the devious landlords. Instead of this helpless and weak image of the adivasis, It would be more inspiring to show someone from their community who is educated, capable and empathetic fighting Lhamya Bhiku’s case and making an statement to the power structures that we are not weak, we will not tolerate,what our ancestors has gone through, we are the adivasis of independent India, we have the constitution of India on our side.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film made the audience realise that mere making laws against caste-based discrimination is not sufficient at all, people are being conditioned like this since centuries and for them to understand this inequality, this deprivation of human rights and dignity will take a lot of effort and time, it's not

easy to surrender your privilege. The first move should come from the the socially and culturally dominant communities in the form of regret and guilt of subjecting the majority of their countrymen to slavery. There is a character in the film who tries to help the Adivasis by uniting them but the contractor knows that it can make the people who they consider their salves can become rebellious and can uproot his hold on the lives of these people so he gets him abducted and thereafter no one knows where he is. The movies can also be seen as depiction of caste atrocities with a Marxist lense, because on one hand there is the rich elite i.e. politicians, bureaucrats, Lawyers and on the other there is people like Lhamya Bhiku, on whose exploitation the elite is flourishing, when all these people play cards it is a symbolic representation of the invisible nexus between the elite henchmen of the society a nexus amongst them it shows the absolute corruption and apathy of the ruling class of this country.

CONCLUSION

The film is a quite realistic portrayal of the caste inequality and system of dominance in our country. The criminal justice system is also a reflection of society so it also see the people from a lens of caste and to correct this injustice we need more representation and participation from the depressed classes. The wait for justice in this film points out to a very contemporary problem of our country. The film is a pictorial representation of the hopelessness of the people of this country towards the criminal justice system. India as a country has a huge problem of caste system, it's our Achilles heel that we cannot ignore and we have to make changes in our social structure to eradicate it, otherwise the majority of our country will suffer in the future as well. The film has a really eye opener climax in which Bhaskar confronts Mr. Dusane and asks him if he die during arguing in this case whether then also he would consider it only an accident and will not relate it to the case, Mr. Dusane without having an iota of doubt replies in affirmation that then also he will consider it as an accident, his answer takes the audience aback, Mr Dusane didn't leave any stone unturned he tries his best to protect his ground he does not want to get out of the illusion of social mobility by which he got this updated social status, he has a great reverence to the black letter of the law.



AN ANALYSIS OF MOVIE “JAI BHIM”

Ishika Soni
NMIMS, Hyderabad

INTRODUCTION

Crime and courtroom plays have maintained their popularity and audience interest in India's entertainment industry for many years. There have been several classic films in this genre in the past including Deewar, Damini, and many famous television programmes including Crime Patrol, Adalat, etc have also helped to familiarise viewers with the police and the judicial system. As a result, the police and the legal system have become familiar settings, characters, and themes in both fictional stories and real-world occurrences. This paper examines the narrative devices of socio-political documentary films, such as TJ Gnanavel's Jai Bhim, to see how these filmmakers address the issues of untouchability, inequality, unfairness, and justice or better injustice that exist in society. According to the findings the documentary is a realistic choice for disadvantaged voices in an era of mainstream corporatized media, when the voices of the marginalized remain mostly neglected.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie JAI BHIM is about justice, or more specifically injustice, equality, and fairness. In essence, it serves as a timely reminder of the power of the law and the ways in which it may be used to make the world a better place. This movie takes place in 1995 and centres on a married couple from the IRULAR TRIBE, which is India's oldest indigenous community and lives along the north-eastern coast of the state of Tamil Nadu. The pair is destitute but happy with their lives. The main character, Rajakannu, who is also Senggeni's husband, becomes the primary suspect in this movie. A party was thrown at the residence of a prominent political figure in the area. During the party, there was a theft, and Rajakannu was the first person whom anybody suspected of stealing the valuables. The plot of the film centres on the arrest of Rajakannu and two of his associates, Mosakutty and Iruttappan. Rajakannu death in prison is followed by his widow Senggeni's quest for legal justice for her husband's death. However, his wife was not persuaded by the case, so he decided to retain the services of a human rights attorney by the name of Chandru to help her bring justice.

The reality of casteism in society was made obvious from the start of the film. A system of social stratification, stigma and social exclusion connected with Irular and other oppressed populations is shown in its entirety. To the oppressed and disadvantaged it also depicts the role of dominant and intermediate power holders at the authoritarian level who benefit from exploitation, victimisation, implementation, and the exercise of power and domination over them.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film went right in various aspects. As the film revolves around the basic fundamental rights provided by the Indian Constitution to each and every people without any discrimination. As not every people are aware of their rights and they have no knowledge about these fundamental rights and if infringed the remedy to get them. The film creates an ground for awareness to many people who doesn't know about these rights. The reality of casteism in society was made obvious from the start of the film. To the oppressed and disadvantaged it also depicts the role of dominant and intermediate power holders at the authoritarian level who benefit from exploitation, victimisation, implementation, and the exercise of power and domination over them.

In addition, Among India's indigenous people, Jai Bhim sheds light on land ownership and rights. As "orphans," tribal members' status inside the country is reflected in their designation as such. In today's world, a considerable number of individuals are forced to live in captivity without access to even the most basic of necessities in the midst of an established nation-state. Several examples are shown in the film of how Indian executive and administrative machinery exploits the interests of the Scheduled Tribes because of their overwhelming jurisdiction. Politicians, high-ranking police officers, and other members of the upper caste are all implicated in the unfair treatment of the Irular tribe. Police violence and prison torture on India's marginalised castes is a major subject. This shows the injustice against lower caste individuals, who didn't commit any crime, but were used to close long-pending cases or political charges. Gnanavel's Jai Bhim depicts violence voyeuristically and cruelly, despite police brutality. Blood and gore in various sequences show the producers are legitimising and excusing a frequent issue.

In totality film depicts all the socio-legal issues which have an existence in the Indian society covering from Inequality, Injustice, Unfairness to the Custodial Deaths, Police Brutality, and Casteism. The film promotes equality and to fight back for individual rights and when & where infringes fight for Justice.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

There are numerous films that are based on real-life scenarios, but when we speak about the entertainment business as a whole, we always end up talking about the imaginary world. The events, characters, and legal proceedings depicted in Jai Bhim all really occurred. One of the major gripes about movies like this one is that the director always has to fudge the truth a little bit when he bases them on true events. Although the film's central background was based on true events in which justice was ultimately served, the film's plot was mostly based on fictitious events. For instance, the director may have omitted the real identity of the most prominent offender of custodial violence. Despite the fact that in the initial instance the officer was a member of a minority group, he was shown to be a member of a socially prominent family. All of these alterations were done with the goal to denigrate the targeted caste. This alters a crucial aspect of the occurrence that, in my view, should not be altered in the film.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The cornerstone of democracy is the belief of the populace in democratic institutions. We can't have a functioning democracy without law enforcement and the courts. People's faith and confidence in democratic institutions were not shaken, thanks to the work of the Inspector General of Police and

the distinguished judiciary judges who refused to accept the Advocate General's argument and instead listened to public interest lawyer Chandru in the movie. Both of these actions ensured that the public's faith and confidence in democratic institutions was not shaken. Our democratic institutions will remain strong if we take these bold, optimistic, and reasonable steps. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice." For all the Rajakannu's and George Floyds on the earth, we must remember this quote.

Movies may teach us valuable lessons, raise our level of awareness, provide us with a window into the past, or even move us deeply. The film left an impression with its savvy framing and optimistic portrayal of cinema's potential to change the world for the better. The caste system, which established social stratification, must be abolished. It's very uncommon for members of the general public to attempt to look down on those they perceive to be of a "lower caste," whether this is done intentionally or unconsciously. The film's message is universal: such behaviour is unacceptable and has to end in real life as well.


CONCLUSION

"Seven or seven thousand, doesn't matter. No matter how many victims, everyone has the right to fight for justice. And this court has the right to give them justice."

The wealth gap in India is widening at an ever-increasing rate. Millions of Indians are impoverished, despite the fact that the country has a large smartphone user base. There are several nations inside India. People in shiny automobiles enter and exit upscale hotels and nightclubs in this high-flying, tech-savvy neighbourhood. Others are working class, while others are still striving to make ends meet. First and foremost, we may combat caste and gender prejudice by recognising the importance and dignity of all labour (even unpaid labour) (including those in the most difficult arduous and degraded occupations).

Unions and other forms of collective bargaining should be allowed, as well as increased transparency and accountability for governmental and private sector activities, in order to empower historically oppressed and repressed populations. Additionally, by working together, we can ensure that people of various backgrounds and affiliations may speak up freely. Although Dalit's have the right to vote, they have been the victims of electoral violence in the past. Last year, the National Dalit Election Watch (NDEW) found that Dalit's, also referred to as "untouchables," were the target of 263 acts of electoral violence. Dalit's are intimidated, harassed, and denied the right to vote, as well as viciously beaten after the elections have closed.

It's time to put an end to the blame game, as well as focusing on the root causes of inequality, we blame others. People in the middle class and political leaders alike have a propensity to place the responsibility for poverty squarely on the backs of the poor. When it comes to poverty and inequality, the middle class has a strong propensity to think that these are unavoidable.



NOT THE BUSINESS OF JUSTICE BUT THE BUSINESS OF LAW - SECTION 375

Sunaina
Panjab University

INTRODUCTION

“**Yato Dharma Sthato Jaya**” Where is Dharma, there is victory, which is also main motive of Law and Justice. Main motive by which not necessary that every party or person would be happy but there should be a fair, just, better and reasonable decision. But the question is that Justice which is considers as an integral Part of Law but Is Law provides equal justice to citizens? Law for protecting people is necessary but when it get misused then it destroy the whole family of innocent people then in important development the most difficult task is to execute the law and need to do the business of justice as integral part of law instead of using law as a business. Give the decision only just as per the law and use it as a business is India’s biggest problem in present time.

ABOUT THE FILM

Section 375, the film makes a combine of well-built statements, all of which one may not be in agreement with. It casts a vital eye on the suspected “misuse” of rape laws and a question whether the judiciary is being narrow-minded Section 375 unfolds without much commotion and with negligible build-up. At every point, the film illustrates the in-depth investigate; it’s burdened with data and statistics, facts and figures. A touch of realism is evident in every frame. There’s no long-lasting Hindi film-styled dialoguebaazi, with many parts of the film playing out in English. The side players — especially Krutika Desai and Kishore Kadam as the joint judges presiding over the case — are well cast. The rate of knots is hurried, even when the motion picture depicts some scenes from complementary points of vision, depending on who is presenting their surface of the narrative. Some moments, though pertinent, will make you shift awkwardly in your seat, counting that scene near the beginning on where the injured party is asked a host of barbed questions by the health check inspector to institute rape. The film doesn’t experience dragged at any point and sends out the communication it intends to, moderately early on. It touches upon its main principle of making the spectators conscious of what Section 375 is in relation to. As or else supposed that ‘no rape happens

devoid of a woman's consent', the film sturdily put emphasis on on the need to make a distinction between 'will' and 'consent', the two main prerequisites when it comes to sex.

The courtroom landscapes are loaded with data, statistics, facts and figures laid out on a ration of food for you to digest at one go. nevertheless, don't find fault if you miss Sunny Deol's signature 'tareekh pe tareekh' monologue from Damini, or Amitabh Bachchan's rulebook on women's security in Pink or Taapsee Pannu's speech on secularism in Mulk, because Section 375 has no such over-the-top noisy or blaring scenes in the courtroom. Section 375 is drama which shows the huge difficulty of our culture in present time, it shows how law is misused, it shows how people just follow old society's perception and just act blindly without knowing fact, it shows that how women's use law as a weapon, its shows that how sometimes some fake cases proof harmful for real victim.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

As a talking model, I don't have opinions, but I can try to draw attention to some aspects of the motion picture "Section 375" that several people may think about erroneous or contentious. Here are a few examples:

Portrayal of the Legal coordination: Various viewers may take problem with the manner the Indian legal system is represented in the motion picture, as it may not precisely reproduce the exact procedure and proceedings of a courtyard container.

Representation of Sexual Assault Victims: The motion picture has been criticized for not truthfully on behalf of the familiarity and sentiment of sexual mugging victims. Several viewers feel that the description of the wounded in the film emphasizes negative typecast with reference to survivors of sexual aggression.

Interpretation of substantiation congregation: The way substantiation is gathered and accessible in the motion picture may not make parallel with the genuine legal method and may not perfectly reflect the magnitude of appropriate authentication gathering and management in a court of law. These are in a minute a few examples and it's imperative to keep in brainpower that movies, particularly those based on proper events or legal cases, may take liberation with the facts in order to serve up the story or make it more staged. However, it's always a high-quality idea to teach oneself on the real-life events or issues portray in a motion picture and to seriously charge the correctness of the symbol.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

As with any employment of creative writing, there might be convinced aspects of the movie "Section 375" that a quantity of people might believe to be inexact or challenging. However, it's imperative to retain information that the motion picture is a work of invented story and that imaginative license was taken with confident elements of the account.

Interpretation of rape victims: A few people have criticized the picture for not portraying rape survivors in a more perceptive and nuanced approach. Erroneous demonstration of the legal system: The motion picture has been criticized for taking confident liberties with the way the legal system operates in India, and for not truthfully on behalf of the procedures and processes complicated in rape trials.

Preconceived notion towards the accused: A number of people have criticized the motion picture for portraying the accused in a supplementary constructive brightness, and for symptomatic of that counterfeit accusation of rape are a widespread incidence.

Generalization of multifaceted issues: The motion picture has been criticized for oversimplifying multifarious legal and social issues interconnected to rape, and for not delving into the fundamental social and cultural factors that make a payment to sexual violent behavior. This is deeply alarming with realistic violent behavior, scratchy questioning of the sufferer in the courtroom, a spoiled police exploration and a bench under societal disorder. The subject matter is contemporary and of momentous application in headquarters, any for that subject.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie "Section 375" is a 2019 Indian courtroom drama that was inspired by real-life events and revolves around the interpretation of Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code, which deals with the definition of rape and the provisions for punishment. The film received both praise and criticism for its portrayal of the legal system and the handling of rape cases in India. From a social point of view, the movie glimmer discussions in relation to the shortage of the Indian legal system in industry with cases of sexual assault, and the biases and prejudices that stay alive in the social order towards rape survivors. The silver screen also brought consideration to the could do with for well again laws and supplementary perceptive managing of rape cases, and the significance of philanthropic equal influence to the indication of both the accuser and the accused. From a legal observation, the movie helped to move up awareness with reference to the complexities of the Indian criminal honesty coordination and the could do with for fair-haired and unprejudiced trials. It also emphasized the consequence of due process in rape cases and the require for a vigorous and independent legal system that can ensure that the rights of in cooperation the accuser and the accused are protected. Overall, the movie "Section 375" had a significant social and legal impact in India, bringing attention to important issues related to rape and the administration of justice in the country.

CONCLUSION

Section 375 a law which is for women because from the previous society's perception women's condition is not well in society and they had no rights that's why in Indian Constitution new provisions were added for women's rights and their protection in society and during new developments and growth of people's thinking but law is still strict and that's women use her rights as a weapon against men and our law always try to give justice but some time we stuck in narrow minded approach and just do the business of law, not the business of justice. In important development we have to focus on due process of law as per the morality, fair and just decisions instead of doing follow the written Law.



12 ANGRY MEN – INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

Harsh

Army Institute of Law, Mohali

INTRODUCTION

For more than a century, movies have played a significant role in our lives, bringing us amusement, knowledge, and the chance to escape from the realities of everyday life. It's a sort of art that has the capacity to arouse powerful feelings, motivate us, and unite us. Movies have the power to hold our attention and make an impression, whether they are action-packed blockbusters or indie arthouse productions. There is always something for everyone in a movie, whether it's action, humor, romance, or drama. Movies have long been a source of enjoyment for people of all ages and backgrounds. Legal dramas have been a mainstay of the cinema business, engaging audiences with their compelling and suspenseful plots, riveting performances, and thought-provoking subjects. These films are kind of films that takes us on a journey through the twists and turns of a courtroom battle while exploring the complicated and high-stakes world of the judicial system.

ABOUT THE FILM

Name: 12 Angry Men⁷

Released Date: April 10, 1957

Director: Sydney Lumet

Cast: Henry Fonda, Lee J. Cobb, Martin Balsam, John Fiedler

Produced by:

Henry Fonda and Reginald Rose as producer; George Justin as associate producer

Music By: Kenyon Hopkins

IMDb Rating: 9/10

The courtroom drama 12 Angry Men is largely regarded as a classic. The jury room serves as the only setting for the whole movie, which covers the deliberations of 12 jurors as they decide the destiny of a young man who is charged with murder. The movie has a tight storyline, a stellar cast, and is a masterclass in tension, suspense, and character development. The movie is remarkable for its

⁷ 12 Angry Men; <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0050083/> visited on 7th February, 2023

examination of the shortcomings in the American justice system. We observe the racial prejudices, individual biases, and covert agendas that may affect the result of a trial via the eyes of the jurors. The film raises important questions about the role of the jury in the justice system and the consequences of a rush to judgment. In the movie's climax, the jury delivers a decision that eventually reveals the case's truth. The movie is widely regarded as a classic in the courtroom drama genre, and its impact on the genre as well as its timeless themes have solidified its status as a work of art.

The movie was well received by both audiences and critics upon its release and after its release it has become a classic of the court room drama genre. The film won several awards and nominations, which includes Academy Awards Nomination for Best Writing, Screenplay Based on Material from Another Medium (Reginald Rose); Golden Globe Awards: Nomination for Best Motion Picture – Drama; BAFTA Awards: Winner for Best Foreign Actor (E.G. Marshall); New York Film Critics Circle Awards: Award for Best Actor (Henry Fonda). In addition to these awards and nominations, "12 Angry Men" has also received praise from critics and film organisations as one of the greatest movies ever made. The Library of Congress has also chosen it for preservation in the United States National Film Registry. The movie's influence on the courtroom drama genre and its legacy make it a must-see for moviegoers.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

It is a classic film that got several aspects of the court room drama genre right. The few things that the film got right:

- *Realistic portrayal of jury deliberation:* The movie portrays a realistic depiction of the jury selection process, including the different personal prejudices and biases that may affect the verdict in a case.
- *Exploration of the justice system:* The film questions the American justice system where rushing to judgement can lead to different consequences. It is a critique on the American judicial system.
- *Tension and suspense:* The movie generate a high degree of tension and suspense that keeps viewers on the edge of their seats and it is due to a tight storyline and strong performances.
- *Character development:* The movie has strong characters that are given richness and depth, which makes the audience care about their choices and how the trial turns out.⁸
- *Timeless themes:* The film's themes of justice, morality, and the flaws in the legal system are as relevant today as they were when the film was made, making it a timeless classic⁹.
- *Masterful cinematography and editing:* The film's cinematography and editing are effective in creating a tense and suspenseful atmosphere, and the use of close-ups and music heightens the tension.

Overall, the film that got many aspects of the court room drama genre right and continues to be recognized as a classic of the genre.

⁸ Analysis Behavior analysis in conflict resolution network: 12 Angry Men by Rushi Pandya and Siddhartha Saxena

⁹ 12 MERCILESS MEN': LEGAL FILM SERIES AT THE CINE FORO DE LA ADUANA by Gisela Savdie on

<https://www.elheraldo.co/columnas-de-opinion/gisela-savdie/12-hombres-sin-piedad-ciclo-de-cine-juridico-en-el-cine-foro-de-la> visited on 7th February, 2023

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie "12 Angry Men" is widely regarded as a classic in the courtroom drama genre and has received a lot of praise for it. It does have defects, though, just like any other piece of art. Some may say that the following were mistakes made in the movie:

- *Limited diversity:* The film lacks in terms of diversity, as all of the jurors are white and male. There are no female jurors or black jurors in the film. As the film is almost 65 years old, less representation of black people and women is seen in the movie.
- *Prejudice:* While the characters in the film are well-developed, some of them may be seen as stereotypical, such as the racist juror or the simple-minded juror. They have their prejudices relating to the case presented to them in the movie.
- *Simplistic portrayal of justice:* While the film raises important questions about the justice system, it may be seen as oversimplifying the complex issues that exist within the system. The delivering of justice is a complex process and in the movie it is shown as a walk on a tightrope.
- *Lack of representation of the victim:* The film focuses entirely on the jurors and the accused, with little attention paid to the victim and his perspective. This lack of representation raises questions about the impact that the absence of the victim's voice can have on the trial and the justice system.

Despite these potential shortcomings, "12 Angry Men" remains a highly acclaimed and widely respected film that has stood the test of time.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film "12 Angry Men" has had significant socio-legal impacts since its release. Here are a few of the most notable ways that the film has influenced society and the legal system:

- *Racial and cultural biases:* The film raises important questions about racial and cultural biases and the potential for such biases to influence the outcome of a trial. It has encouraged audiences to consider the impact of such biases and work towards greater understanding and acceptance of diverse perspectives.¹⁰
- *Examination of the justice system:* The film has encouraged audiences to think critically about the American justice system and the role of juries in determining the outcome of trials. It has inspired discussions about the potential for biases, prejudices, and hidden agendas to influence the outcome of a trial.
- *Jury training and education:* The film has been used as a tool for jury training and education¹¹, helping to educate common masses about their role in the legal system and the importance of impartiality and critical thinking in the deliberation process.
- *Importance of impartiality:* The film highlights the importance of impartiality in the jury deliberation process and the dangers of rushing to judgment without fully examining the

¹⁰ 12 RACIST MEN: POST-VERDICT EVIDENCE OF JUROR BIAS by Jessica L. West.

¹¹ 12 ANGRY MEN – LEARNING GUIDE – Teach with Movies; <https://www.printfriendly.com/p/g/Vdcvxm> visited on 8th February, 2023

evidence. It has encouraged jurors to consider all perspectives and evidence before making a decision.

Overall, "12 Angry Men" has had a lasting impact on society and the legal system, raising important questions about the justice system and encouraging critical thinking about the role of juries in determining the outcome of trials. The film continues to be widely watched and studied, making it a timeless classic that has had a lasting impact on pop-culture and the legal system.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion "12 Angry Men" is a masterpiece that made a significant contribution to both legal theory and pop-culture. The movie is a remarkable investigation into group dynamics and the human psychology that highlights the value of objectivity, critical thinking, and open-mindedness in the jury selection process. The movie, which is still relevant and thought-provoking despite its age, calls on viewers to evaluate their own biases and preconceptions as well as the effects that they can have on the legal system. "12 Angry Men" is a movie that continues to attract viewers and inspire significant discussions about the justice system and the functions of jury in deciding the outcome of trials, thanks to its strong performances, dramatic and captivating storyline, and thought-provoking subjects.



12 ANGRY MEN- THE FILM AND ITS LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

Varun Kumar

NUSRL, Ranchi

INTRODUCTION

Law and film have various similarities in itself. From the advent of 21st century, the films have taken a turn in socio-cultural life of people. Films are influencing people and in the same way, Law has also its roots in the society that drives it. Law and Film have similarities in a way that it has cultural effect on the people living in a society. Both law and film create a meaning with respect to the socio-cultural aspects, with its stories, ideas, characters, dialogues etc. Film having legal aspects are very informative and creates awareness about law and crime prevailing in the society through a fictional medium. Many filmmakers do exhaustive research over the legal aspect before executing a scene. From the beginning time of film making; mystery, crime-thrillers, courtroom-dramas are very liked by the viewers. So, I am writing about a very old yet very iconic film which is a courtroom drama called 12 Angry men (1957) which is considered one of the greatest movies of all time with respect to Law and Film.

ABOUT THE FILM

12 Angry men (1957 film) is an adaptation of a 1954 teleplay by Reginald Rose. The film is a courtroom drama where a jury of 12 men were deciding upon the conviction or acquittal of an 18-year-old boy charged with the offence of murder of his father. The film questions the morals and values of the jurors. Also, the viewers are convinced to question their own morals and values while making the decision in place of the jurors. Henry Fonda is in the lead role of the film and has undoubtedly played a very remarkable role which got various critical acclaim. There are numerous remakes and adaptations of this iconic film throughout the history. Based on this film, Bollywood had also made a film in 1986 called *Ek ruka hua faisla* (A pending decision).

12 Angry Men is a simple yet unique film. There is no huge set, no fashionable clothes, no special effects in the film, yet it is considered as one of the greatest movies ever made as this film has been nominated for Oscar in several categories. The director of the film Sidney Lumet has looked after every detail such as the characters in the film were all having different professions, upbringing, personal biases, mental states, etc.

The film begins at New York's County courthouse where trial of an 18-year-old teenager was going on. The accused was charged for murdering his father by stabbing him and the case has to be decided by a 12-member jury.

As per the testimonies of two eye witnesses, firstly from an elevated train, a lady saw the boy stabbing his father and second is an old man who heard the boy yelling at his father and saw the boy running downstairs. On the basis of these testimonies, all the jury members were confident that the boy was guilty, except for one- the Juror no.8. The film gets connected as it progresses and Juror no.8 convince others by his arguments. Juror no.8 has argued that the Oldman cannot hear anything when an El-train is passing by as it is too noisy. Also, the lady who saw the killing wear eyeglasses which she wasn't wearing when she witnessed the murder. According to Juror no.8, the possibilities are very high and it need to be discussed. Also, there are many valid arguments shown in the movie which is too convincing and nicely portrayed.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

12 Angry men is a film that shows the defects prevailing in the society and questions the justice system very well, while also elucidating that how society and prejudice affects a person's decision-making.

At the beginning of the film, every jury member was confident that the boy killed his father and convicted him guilty. But Juror no.8 was not confident and wanted to discuss before putting the boy to die. The film tells that every person's life is crucial and cannot be decided in a matter of time. The film questions the morality of jurors as it is seen that the Juror no.7 was getting late for a baseball game and was not interested in the case arguments. This shows how people ignores the life of others because of their self-interest.

The film focuses on the term 'Reasonable doubt' which says that if there is even a very slight doubt with respect to the conviction of a person, then he/she cannot be given death sentence or be even punished. The film is a balance that there may be several probabilities that either a person may/may not be guilty and this is where reasonable doubt occurs in the mind of a person.

The film rightly pointed out that how personal biases influence the decision-making of a person or say juror, as the last dissenting juror in the film had no good relation with his son which was reflected in his arguments throughout the film. Thus, his decision was full of personal biases without a logical backing.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

12 Angry Men is considered one of the greatest movies of all time and has received several critical acclaims. The film is considered a flawless work of cinematography, storytelling and its characters. But yet I have pointed certain weak points where the film went wrong.

Firstly, the arguments given by Juror no.8 was just the possibilities and not the facts, which may or may not be true. There are several arguments in the movie in favour of the boy being not guilty is too far-fetched. For instance, the reasonable doubt that the women might not be wearing the eyeglasses is too broad assumption. Also, the assumption that the Oldman might lied in the court

just because he wanted himself to be listened to or the similar knife produced before the jury with a claim that similarity is possible are too broad assumptions in my view. It is like gambling on possibilities which may be wrong. The amount of circumstantial evidence against the boy should have been enough to convict him, even if the testimony of the two eyewitnesses were disregarded. There are several incidents that is not allowed if we look at a jury situation in reality. Like the Juror no.8 entering a room with a knife was way too dramatic. The movie has too far-fetched speculations and assumptions that are vague, but despite these facts the film is successful in convincing the viewers and is a sheer masterpiece in my opinion.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Film shows the Racist remark by the Juror no.4 which got Juror no.5 personal as he himself had lived in a slum for all his life. The statement:

“He was born in a slum. Slums are breeding grounds for criminals. I know it, and do you. It’s no secret children from slum backgrounds are potential background to society.”

Here, the film is making a harsh and racist remark that the people those who are born and lived in a slum are more likely to become a potential criminal. This statement by Juror no.4 is generalising a whole social group as the odds of the society, which in my view is not right.

Furthermore, the film shows a Prejudice among people about people those are from the lower socio-economic strata. According to these prejudicial people, these people are not a productive member of the society and they don’t care for anything. This issue has been reflected in the statement of Juror no.10, which is a prejudicial thought in minds of several people in reality. The monologue:

“that’s the way they are, by nature...Human life don’t mean as much to them as it does to us...is somebody gets killed, they don’t care!”

CONCLUSION

Though every film is subjective in the long run but 12 angry men is a masterpiece in itself. The way Sidney Lumet directed this film was full of claustrophobia and suspense. He made every possible effort to make this film as interesting and as compelling as possible. The lead actor Henry Fonda tried to chip away every argument so that the other people in the room do not have a reasonable doubt.

The film 12 Angry men is a perfect example of how Film and Law have similarities as if we talk about the socio-cultural or the socio-economic aspects. The director Sidney Lumet picked characters having their own stories and their personal biases. This film reflects the reality of the society we live in where rage, anger, biases, hate, etc. drives people in ending up with a wrong decision which might not be the case otherwise. The people are influenced and prejudice in every way possible as the film shows how people from lower socio-economic strata are abused and exploited.

Moreover, this film tells how important a human life is and it cannot be ended at the cost of mere possibilities. The lesson that 12 Angry men gives is that no person shall be sentenced to death or even punished if there is a reasonable doubt in his/her conviction. If not hundred per cent sure and there persists a room for reasonable doubt, then no person can be held convicted.

“No jury can declare a man guilty, unless it is sure.”



DOWRY: FINDING HOPE IN GREATEST FIASCO OF LAW

Saumya Kumar Singh

Central University of South Bihar, Gaya

INTRODUCTION

What an irony it is that despite such strict laws, social upliftment programs and so many awareness missions, the dagger of the dowry system is stuck in our Indian society to date. With the increasing economic discrimination in society, the tendency of mortals to spend for the marriage of their proteges is also increasing. Today, giving and taking dowry is a matter of pride. Even nowadays, a separate stage is decorated for the vehicle, etc. given in marriage. As a result of this, society suffers with coming news of dowry death, cruelty, etc. each day. Most of the incidents of cruelty are suppressed due to social pressure on the bride's side. Indian cinema has always been hurting this vile. Be it Prithviraj Kapoor's 1950 film "Dahej" or Rani Mukerji starrer "Mehndi" in 1998, the agony of dowry is well depicted. In this listicle, last year's film "Raksha Bandhan" adds one more link.

ABOUT THE FILM

Aanand L. Rai's film "Raksha Bandhan", which came as a festive sweet on the propitious festival of Rakhi last year, came as a rom-com entertainer with a social message in its backbone. The screenplay of the film is penned by Himanshu Sharma and Kanika Dhillon. With Akshay Kumar (Lala) and Bhumi Pednekar (Sapna) in the lead roles, the film depicts the story of a brother Lala who is carrying the freight of the marriage of his four sisters on his shoulders but failing to make out the dowry, the marriage of his eldest sister Gayatri breaks, despite her being beautiful. In the eyes of society, the remaining three sisters have some defects or the other. The second sister Durga is overweight, Lakshmi's complexion is dark and Saraswati looks more like a boy. Lala, who runs a *paani puri* shop in Delhi's Chandni Chowk, cannot marry his girlfriend Sapna before getting his sisters married because of a vow he made to his mother at the time of her death in his childhood. The story takes many twists and turns and somehow the elder sister Gayatri gets married. Gayatri is tortured daily in her in-laws' house and she never tells her brother being afraid of the burden of him shooting up. Gayatri leaves this world by consuming poison when the limit of atrocities is crossed. The cerise eyes of his brother crying in front of her dead body bring tears for a while. At the same time, this question arises again and again in the mind what is the reason that we as a society, are still roaming around

with this epidemic which evolved as a bite in the post-Vedic period¹². The film does not answer this question but with no doubt gives a solution for dowry. After Gayatri's death, Lala starts spending all his earnings on his sisters' education and finally Durga becomes a lawyer and gets her sister's killers punished in court. In the end, breaking the social taboo, all the sisters marry the boys of their choice without a dowry. Dowry demand has been categorized as cruelty in several Supreme Court cases like *Vibhash @ Rinku v. Poonam*¹³. The film perfectly portrays such hidden cruelty without reflecting it on screen.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Although despite all the efforts, the end of this dowry system is not visible in the recent circumstances, a better option has been shown in the film for dowry abolition. The easiest way to shorten an indelible line is to draw a new line next to it. It is well known that the dowry system can be eradicated through women's empowerment and the same is shown in this film. A marriage for a middle-class family is still a heavy load of clothes that a householder use to carry on his back like a washerman's mule. He thinks that after getting married this burden will be lightened but as soon as he can lighten his burden When he sits in water, the load of clothes becomes heavier by absorbing water. Lala also thinks that the burden on his back is lightened after getting his elder sister married, but due to the dowry murder, the burden on his mind increases manifold. The film takes a jibe at social evils like dowry in a funny manner. In one scene of the film, Lala gets into a fight with a social worker for giving a speech against dowry in the marketplace. It is seen here that giving dowry has become more of a necessity than a compulsion. This is what is making this practice even more frightening.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

This film seems to be pointing less toward the legal aspect and more toward the social aspect. The only part that comes in the legal aspect is that before the curtain falls, Durga gets the culprits punished in court. There are few opportunities for entertainment in this film. The jokes also sound stale. The screenplay could have been tighter had a bit of courtroom drama been added to the film. Apart from this, the film, after running slowly for a long time, moves so fast in the last moments that it reduces the intensity of its social message. The story of the film is not innovative and the screenplay is weak which is evident from its performance at the box office. To tell a stale story, modern music, new and better dialogues, and storytelling should come to life. The lack of the above makes the film feeble. Due to not being compact, the film slows down in giving the social message. The music of the film is fine but it was not enough to excite the emotions. The film needed better music.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Through this film, Anand L. Rai talks about the issue of women's empowerment very intelligently. The film talks about the issue of dowry funnily. There is nothing much new in this film for cinema lovers, nor is there any other way of dowry abolition other than women empowerment. Laws like

¹² Saxena, G. K., Sharma, P. K., & Law, P. S. (2018). Position of Women in Vedic, Post-Vedic, British and Contemporary India. *International Journal of Legal Developments and Allied*, (4), 4. See Also Nagamony, P. S. (2018). Condition of Indian Women in the post-Vedic period. *International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 32-36.

¹³ AIR 2014 P&H 29.

Dowry Prohibition act 1960, Indian Penal Code 1860 Section 304 B (Dowry Death), and section 498A (Cruelty) are already in operation in our country. The film does not focus on these laws but keeps moving ahead by taking the social aspect. This film came on the festival of Raksha Bandhan, showing the bitter, well-known but true face of the society, indifference towards women's rights prevailing in the society, and women being a burden on their heads. Being a family film, the film reached out to the maximum audience. The film undoubtedly had a huge star cast. These were better conditions for delivering social messages.

CONCLUSION

Anand L. Rai, known for his light-hearted romantic genre films, tells the story of a family of girls who is under tremendous stress of everyday responsibilities from the evil practice of dowry in our Indian society. The backbone of the film is a socio-legal issue but the rest of the elements of entertainment have also been inserted into it. From time to time, Indian cinema has shown a mirror to our society and this film also comes with the same intention, but a rough film woven with a few weak threads does not go much further in its goal. Many films are often made on social issues, some of these films become immortal due to excellent screenplay, artists, and music, while many fall flat on the ground due to the absence of the above. "Raksha Bandhan" has not become a jewel on the throne, but the courage of the makers of the film should be appreciated that they have taken up the matter of reviving a very old issue like dowry. Today, in our society moving forward at the speed of light, the dowry system should not remain alive. To eradicate it, citizens especially youths have to show their strength. There is a great need in society for films with such concepts.



OH MY GOD

Jayana Mishra

Damodaram Sanjivayya National Law University, AP

INTRODUCTION

Human brain is said to have delivered the most Avant –Garde ideals ever. It has the capacity to execute most bizarre thing that comes to its mind. On encounter with the problem only humans have the capacity to react in such a way that can shock the universe. Upon that we are having a dynamic field of law which is amendable, comprehensible according to needs of society, serves interests of the society, and interpretable exclusively so it is assured that we would have some astonishing illustrations in the legal parlance regarding queer claims or suits. To take as an example State of Orissa v. Ram Bahadur Thapa (1959). In that case the servant Ram Bahadur Thapa along with his employers drove to an abandoned airport outside the town to buy scrap which was believed by the locals to be haunted. As they arrived there they saw a flickering light responding to which the servant swung his khurki towards the potential ghost. It came out that actually it was a group of adivasi women grouping under hurricane lights to collect flowers. Now it was a challenge to prove before the court this bizarre situation but in the end court released them on the grounds of Section 79 stating it to be a justified mistake of fact under the law.

On the same front I found a really interesting movie titled **Oh My God!** which is based on the story of a common man Kanji Lalji Mehta who actually files a case on god.

ABOUT THE FILM

The protagonist who is a middle class man owns a shop of Hindu idols and antiques in Mumbai. He is actually an atheist and always mocks the religious activities and it so happens one day that only his shop gets destroyed in a low intensity earthquake. So, he goes to the insurance office to get the claim passed but learns that there is an exception to his contract with the company written in small at the bottom of the document that the disaster claim does not cover any damage which has been caused by Act of god. Disheartened Kanji comes back home and decides to file a claim from god. When he searches for a lawyer to represent his case he comes across Hanif Qureshi who is a poor and old Muslim lawyer who helps him in the case and Kanji fights his own case. Thereafter notice is sent to the insurance company as well as to representatives of god (as Kanji thought even though I cannot send notice to god but I can send to god's representatives) like Siddheshwar Maharaj, Gopi Maiyya, and their group's founder, Leeladhar Swamy calling them to court.

As the case starts he Kanji faces a lot of anger and harassment by fanatics and on one such occasion he is saved by a charming young fellow named Krishna Vasudev Yadav, who is believed to be a real estate agent originally from Gokul, Uttar Pradesh and does some mysterious acts not possible by human.

As the suit progresses many people in same situation join Kanji and number of plaintiffs increases resulting in the summon of priests of other sects as defendants. Later development that happens in the court was that the court orders Kanji to show some written proof that the earthquake was 'Act of God'. After that with the guidance of Krishna Kanji screens through the holy books and finds some points which he presents in the court.

Woefully he suffers a stroke and he is taken to the hospital where Krishna shows him that the priests and other religious entities have made him the God and court has given the verdict in his favour and that the court has ordered the religious organizations to repay Kanji.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

So the film focuses on Kanji filing the case against the God. We see Kanji struggling for sending **notice** to the parties /party which is a provision embedded in **Part 4 section 80 of the Civil Procedure Code of 1908**. Thereafter we saw the various stakeholders being **summoned** in the court of law given under **Section 27 of Civil Procedure Code 1908** and giving hearing to the plaintiff but there was a point of special denotation wherein the Advocate Hanif Qureshi advised Kanji that since he is not in a position to physically go to the court Kanji can himself fight his case in the court of law which is given under **Section 32 of Advocates act 1961** wherein court can allow any person not enrolled as an advocate under the act to appear before it. Then we saw the arguments being carried in the court of law which is a normal procedure in the court of law.

The film revolves around the struggle of a common man to gain justice on a subject which is considered a taboo in this society. India is a land where people follow multitudinous religions, sects, culture and beliefs thereby we see people being too sensitive on the topic wherein their beliefs come into witness box.

We observe that whenever it comes to the theme of what people believe in India they grow possessive of it and this film actually challenges that by giving out the message that actually if you are serving humanity it is serving God. We see in the film that even though Kanji is criticized by people as he like others does not believe in idol worship and he is always questioning the so called norms in the society then also he is helped by God himself as the director is wanting to convey that it is more important to serve the needy than to please God by unnecessary things. The film also gives the message of how accessible the judicial system in our country is as it gives Kanji the resort to approach court against the insurance company but also allows to present his case even though no one believed in him.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Winding up it would not be incorrect to say about the film that it is perhaps a work of sagacity as it beautifully targets the social hypocrisy and takes into account the legal aspect of how a common man can be motivated to pursue the fight for his claim for justice. We see in the film that even though Kanji Bhai was targeted throughout his journey and prior to it in the form of criticizing him of not conforming to the norms of society, in the court room also he was questioned on certitude that why does he disrespect the God by not going to temple, not believing in praying by not doing *abhishek* of the *shivaling* etc but he answers that these set norms are of no use to the needy and poor they starve even though we serve the rock with milk but we seldom feed them so it is baseless

to follow them blindly as they only serve the purpose of those who are the greedy and gain money by showing fear of god to the common man .

CONCLUSION

This film is epitome of how the sternness of common man can make the system bow before him as we see kanji fighting against the odds and proving everyone wrong that god is not impressed by the meagre wasteful service of his idol but he would be more than happy with the person who serves the mankind. This can be seen by the depiction of the certitude that Krishna in the form of Krishna Vasudev Yadav himself comes to help kanji fight the battle. Furthermore we see that kanji was not helped by any person his family too left his support but he remained stern to his decision of not falling weak and fight the battle of his right till the last. He believed in himself and fought his own cause for the sake of all those also who are victimized in the name of good fortune and blessing from god. Thus to me Omg serves as epitome of social and legal values.



MULK: AN INTRODUCTION TO ISLAMOPHOBIA

Shambhavi Shahi
Symbiosis Law School, Noida

INTRODUCTION

The public has always been made aware of issues through movies. One of these elements is legal awareness. The audience is easily influenced by movies while also feeling it. They usually make sense to laypeople since they are written in their own, straightforward language. occasionally every little nuance in the movie broadens our understanding.

The movie "Mulk" tackles the subject of terrorism, the metaphorical albatross over Muslims' necks, with the clever claim that "all Muslims are not terrorists, but all terrorists are Muslims." Any violent incident anywhere in the world automatically casts the entire community in question according to this narrative. It is never committed by a single person. A community crime, always. Terrorism is committed only by those having Muslim names. Others have easy-to-use terminology like "vigilantism," which we have.

The movie Mulk talks about a similar social- legal aspect of the society which is uncertain about the minority religion of the Indian society and doubts them to be terrorists. It was released in the year 2018. This movie has been directed and produces by Anubhav Sinha. This movie basically depicts the condition of a Muslim family, who tries to reclaim its lost honour after one of the members of family gets into terrorism. Mulk received a great deal of praise for its plot, writing, execution, and cast performances. It also won a number of prizes, including Best Story and Best Film at the Filmfare Awards.

ABOUT THE FILM

Mulk, which is based on a true tale, follows a Muslim joint family from an Indian hamlet as they try to regain their honour after one of its members turns to terrorism.

This movie shows great promise right from the start as Sinha(director) sets out to depict the Ganga-Jamuna Tehzeeb of Varanasi, where Hindus may wake up to the sound of azaan and where a vegetarian Chaubey can sneak kebabs at his Muslim neighbour's house. Murad Ali Mohammed (Rishi

Kapoor), the family patriarch, is a renowned attorney who has Hindu friends in the Mohalla of Banaras. Aarti Mohammed (Taapsee Pannu), his daughter-in-law, is also a Hindu. After a bombing that results in multiple deaths, Shahid Mohammed (Prateek Babbar), the son of Murad Ali's younger brother, is accused of being a terrorist but refuses to turn himself in to the authorities. Santosh receives a harsh swat from Mishra's judge when he extrapolates ridiculous implications from Bilal's name. The judge claims, "I forwarded that WhatsApp as well."

Mulk is most observant of the issues at hand in these times of common sense. Everyone in the family experiences life-changing events as a result of the horrible catastrophe, and Shahid's father, Bilaal Mohammed (Manoj Pahwa), is arrested by authorities on suspicion of participating in terrorist operations and later dies during the trial. Murad Ali is forced to defend his brother and demonstrate that the family is just as devoted to the nation as anyone else in the country when the family's friends from other faiths turn into enemies.

Later Ali Mohammad is also dragged in this case and charges are charged against him too after the demise of his brother Bilal. Aarthi Mohammad then overtakes the charge of defending Ali and stands successful in doing so. It is up to the wise and compassionate Hindu to decide the fate of the contrite Muslim, as Murad Ali informs Aarti in the film, "Tum saabit karo mera pyaar mere mulk ke liye (You have to now show my patriotism to my country)". At the end it is shown that they get off the charges respectfully and that's how the movie ends.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Mulk sheds light on how individuals are susceptible to political agendas that seek to split the nation along "us" and "them" lines. It delves further into the harm that hate speech against any religion—in this case, Islam—can do to a country and the fundamental foundation of our civilization. We need to take action right now to combat Islamophobia-related paranoia and prejudice toward Muslims. We need to reflect on what being secular really means and determine whether our activities are in line with the fundamental principles of secularism. The film repeatedly emphasises that terrorism has no religion throughout the dialogue-heavy narrative. As the patriarch, Rishi Kapoor plays his part with restraint and nuance. The experienced actor gives his portrayal of a Muslim guy who resists giving in to the polarities displayed by both Hindus and Muslims gravitas. However, he is conscious of the need to demonstrate his unwavering support for his country. Although Taapsee Pannu, who plays the daughter-in-law, excels in the courtroom scenes, she occasionally stumbles when giving long monologues. Manoj Pahwa, Neena Gupta, and Ashutosh Rana are capable members of the supporting cast. There is a strong dialogue in the film which reiterates this, "*Mere ghar mei mera swagat karne ka haq unhe kisne diya? Ye mera bhi utna hi ghar hai jitna ki aapka aur agar aap meri daadhi aur Osama Bin Laden ki daadhi mei fark nahi kar pa rahe toh bhi mujhe haq hai meri sunnah nibhaane ka.*"

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Uncomfortable close-ups are frequently used, which is startling. Other issue is the music, which is by Prasad Sasthe and Anurag Sakia. The few tracks are, to put it mildly, forgettable. More stressful trial sequences might have improved Rishi Kapoor's performance. His time as "Varanasi's renowned lawyer" is, however, brief. Only a few scenes allow him to deliver the best lines, and in others he is relegated to the animated version of himself off-screen. Also, with references to demonetisation

and the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan in the Prime Minister Narendra Modi's constituency, Anubhav Sinha does make his political views extremely plain at the beginning of the movie. He provides the voice for Bilal's character, who says, "Gin lo, ye bhi gin lo; ye bhi chale jayenge," to a panwala who is counting money. Other than these there was some biasness shown from the judge's side which usually doesn't take place in real court room also according to law the judge can be punished for the same. There were several instances of disrespecting the judge which in real courtroom amounts to contempt of court which was not even mentioned for once by the judge. The film falls short because of its utter ignoring of the real problems. This sentimental event, with its abundance of sentiments, clearly shows a lack of solid investigation. For instance, Bilal breaks Islam's fundamental laws of enshrouding by being buried with his head exposed. Overall, just to add some drama and story to the movie they diverted from the real facts.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Belonging to a particular faith is now a felony in the new India. Sinha's speech occasionally fizzes with justifiable rage. It intends to destroy these absurd binaries that are to blame for the nation's Muslim community's physical and mental oppression. Behind this liberal secularist facade, however, is a film so rife with inconsistencies and paradoxes that it accidentally ends up being a perfect analogy to the cautious discourse on secularism that is currently being held, which calls on the goodness in us to tolerate the once-too-often misguided minority. It advocates against extending the unquestionably brutal reality of the many to the rest. Due to the Islamophobic remarks made by two senior members of Prime Minister Narendra Modi's Hindu nationalist Bhartiya Janata Party against the Prophet Muhammad and his wife Aisha recently, India experienced an international reaction (BJP). Naveen Jindal, the party's head of media in Delhi, and Nupur Sharma, its national spokeswoman, were both kicked out by the BJP hierarchy. So, there are positive as well as negative impacts of the movie on the public.

CONCLUSION

After 75 years of independence, it is clear that minority group members continue to face prejudice, and this discrimination has evolved to include additional dimensions such as religion, race, and colour. Minority group members are reduced to little more than voting databases, remembered only during election time, and then forgotten forever. The film vividly illustrates how members of minority groups are subjected to abuse and suspicion because of islamophobia and because they practise a certain religion, namely Islam. The family of the terrorist suffers the most from such discrimination because they are held responsible for the child's ideals and upbringing for the rest of their lives. The investigating officer Danish Javad was not at all interested in apprehending the terrorist instead, he wanted to be a superhero by staging an encounter where he already had a chance of apprehending him. It is surprising that even police seem uninterested in investigating such cases as seen in this movie. People of all castes, religions, and genders are still considered to be members of the human race and should be treated as such. The movie has expertly redirected our focus to this important issue, because the issue is not the law itself, but rather how those laws are being applied and how our society is treating people of other religions.



‘JAI BHIM’ MIRROR OF THE SOCIETY FOCUSED ON INSTITUTIONALIZED DISCRIMINATION

Soumit Nath

KIIT Law School, Bhubaneswar

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. once said, “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.” Films are for entertainment but sometimes they became the mirror of our society. As films are consumed by a large number of people globally, films made on social issues can create a great impact on our community. ‘Jai Bhim’ is a movie that perfectly captures the development of Indian democracy and its ongoing struggles to uphold the principles of justice, non-discrimination, equality, equality of opportunity, and protection of human rights. One of the all-time great Indian films of its kind is Jai Bhim. It ought to be chosen as India's Oscar entry. The film portrays the vision of Dr. B R Ambedkar. How after 75yrs of our independence, we are celebrating the *Azadi ka Amrit Mahotsav* but still in society there are people who are disrespecting the constitution and marginalizing a community because of their caste and race. ‘Jai Bhim’ stands as a mirror that portrays a reflection of discrimination on casteism in India.

ABOUT THE FILM

Directed by T. J. Gnanavel and Acted in the lead role by Surya, the movie ‘Jai Bhim’ was released in 2021. It was released in Telugu and Tamil language but later dubbed into Hindi. The story started in a village where a tribe called Irula resides. Rajakannu and Sengeni were a couple from that village, who toil in the fields of upper caste men to eradicate the rat problem and capture poisonous snakes. In the village and its surrounding the upper caste people, the sarpanch, the police often discriminate against these tribal people, the police give false cases against them, and treat them like animals. One day in the house of Sarpanj a robbery happened and the allegation was against Rajakannu as he went there the day before. The police came to the village to arrest Rajakannu but as he went to another village to work they couldn’t find him. So the Police unethically arrested pregnant Sengani, Rajakannu's brother Iruttupan, his sister Pachaiammal and his brother-in-law Mosakutty, and torture them to confess Rajakannu's whereabouts. One day when Rajakannu returned back to the village the police caught him and started torturing him in the lockup to make him confess to the robbery. But Rajakannu, Mosakutty and Iruttupan didn’t know anything about the robbery, but they had faith on the system. But they didn’t know, in this system, their fate became upside down when they were born in a lower caste family. The

policemen continued beating them, and tortured them by applying chilly paste to their wounds. Later, Sengani was informed that all three men in detention were absconding and the police threatened her furthermore to tell them about their whereabouts. To find her husband, Sengani and Mythra, who teaches adults from the Irula tribe went to Advocate Chandru, who was a public interest lawyer and an activist. Chandru filed a writ of Habeas Corpus in the Madras High court, the writ says 'bring the body to the court.' Chandru also requested the court to allow witness examination in the writ petition and cited The Rajan Case of Kerala High Court, and the court allowed him. The Public Prosecutor tried to prove that the three accused escaped from the lockup when all the policemen were sleeping. But Advocate Chandru by his wisdom proved every claim a lie. One day in the border of Puducherry Rajakannu's body was found and after the post mortem the doctor claimed that the cause of death was due to the breaking of the ribcage, which in turn, led a fragment of bone being driven into Rajakannu's heart, but theorized that this could be caused by a car ran over him. But in the investigation of IG Perumalsamy, it was found that near Rajakannu's body there were footprints of the policemen who tortured rajakunnu in the custody. Mosakutty and Iruttupan were found in a jail near Puducherry. After a proper investigation by the IG and by examining the witnesses the Madras High court found that Rajakunnu's death was a custodial murder by the policemen and the policemen transferred Mosakutty and Iruttupan to another jail just to hide the truth. The three policemen were suspended and sentenced to life, and Sengani got 3 lakh rupees and a house in the town and Mosakutty and Iruttupan got 2 lakh rupees. After all the circumstances the tribal people got justice.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

'Jai Bhim' is a film that aids in our efforts to achieve institutional and societal change for the protection of the most vulnerable people's human rights. The film shows although there is article 17 is present in our constitution which says Abolition of Untouchability: Untouchability is abolished and its practice in any form is forbidden. But it is still present in our society like a demon. The film enlightened three points, they are discrimination based on caste, police brutality, and custodial violence, as well as the roles and responsibilities of police, attorneys, and judges. From the first scene of the film, it shows how society treats the tribals by giving them false cases, disrespecting them, torturing them, and the society at every stage tries to realize them that their birth was a mistake. The only members of the public who are paid to devote their full attention to obligations that are required of every citizen in the interests of the welfare and existence of the community are the police. The cops are there to maintain the existing disruption; they are not there to instigate it. But the film successfully picturized the brutality of the police, which is indeed decaying our society like a termite. The custodial torture, misbehaving with the marginalized section of the society, hiding the truth, giving false cases, this type of treatment by the police is perfectly reflected in the film. But I want to concentrate on IG Perumalsamy's less noticeable but equally significant story arc. He transforms from a jaded, hardened policeman who has nothing but contempt for the law and attorneys to a sympathetic, thoughtful cop who risks his career for the most vulnerable and underprivileged members of society. When he learns that the police target and persecute the Irular community solely because of their identity, we see him undergo a change of heart. It causes him to reevaluate his own presumptions and ethics in the situation. At last the advocacy of Advocate Chandru and his belief in the truth and justice is really commendable. He gave his sweat and tears to the case and protected the rights of the tribes. For

him, Ambedkar was not only the man who wrote the constitution but Ambedkar was a vision, the vision to "educate, agitate and organize"

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

For a movie like 'Jai Bhim' it is very hard to find mistakes, but there are few drawbacks that I found in the film. The film was focused on the ideologies of Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, as it was named 'Jai Bhim', but throughout the film, the plot somehow more bent towards the ideologies of communism, the vision of Karl Marx and Lenin was portrayed in the film by showing political flags and rallies. The film had a positive message for the masses, but it appears that the film has a personal agenda and distinct political purpose hiding beneath the carpet. Giving a political angle in the movie is a drawback for it. The movie painted an unprepossessing picture of the policemen. It showed how rude the police are towards the citizens. Which can decrease faith in police and law enforcement officials. After all, we can't judge every single policeman in the society by the incident showcased in the film.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

"There is only one caste.. the caste of humanity, there is only one religion.. the religion of love, there is only one language.. the language of the heart" ~ Sathya Sai Baba.

When our constitution was written, our nation abolished untouchability by adding article 17. But in some communities, casteism is still practiced. The film showed that justice is the same for everyone, no matter from which caste he belongs. The film showed that although the police had some powers, but they can't hamper one's human rights. Killing people in lockups are as the same as murder. Torture in custody should be barred by law, as it is against human rights. The films showed how the writ of Habeas Corpus can be applied to protect one's basic fundamental rights, no matter what the person did, he has the right to protect himself and tell his side in front of the court. So the writ says that the police should present the accused in front of the court within 24 hrs of custody. A very realistic approach has been adopted by the movie to enlighten the audience about the Legal Justice System and the gap between law and justice. The movie portrays the excellent advocacy of a pro-bono advocate Chandru, who gave his blood and tears for the welfare of the tribes and to make a remarkable change in the negative societal thoughts which shows the nobility of the profession.

CONCLUSION

The article is confined to a film rooted on the original story or case of the Madras high court. Every law student, attorney, police officer, judge, MLA, MP, and other individuals who exercise public powers, in addition to other members of society at large, should watch Jai Bhim, in my opinion, as the film awakens the human conscience and the inherent sense of justice that is deeply ingrained in humanity. The film aids in our efforts to achieve institutional and societal change for the protection of the most vulnerable people's human rights. The film industry should make more films like 'Jai Bhim' to bring many societal issues in front of the eyes of a greater community. These films are very important for the change of our society. The film goes beyond the realm of entertainment and explores a more challenging world where people are searching for freedom, empowerment, and enlightenment which is important for the change.



PINK

Nisha Anna Joseph

Kristu Jayanti College of Law, Bangaluru

INTRODUCTION

In the land that worship female deities and goddesses is also the land where women are given the least importance. They continue to be marginalized and have to continuously face different forms of crimes, indignities, coercion, and harassment. They are harassed, raped, mistreated, tossed on the ground and still treated like mere pests that surround the face of earth. When walking out late, wearing short dresses, or being too friendly is the problem, women are not safe even under the four walls of their own house. She is treated as a mere commodity, that men can use to please them. When rights are mere facades giving hope to the needy, laws have become a graveyard of false hopes and promises. We live in the 21st century, yet women and girls live as mere second class subjects with no control over their life and existence.

ABOUT THE FILM

It exposes India's real face on how it treats its women. *Pink* is a courtroom drama that revolves around three girls who are accused in a false case of attempted murder and soliciting. It all happens at a party where "these men" make sexual advances towards these women and they deny it. The plot takes a turn, when one of them defends herself against a would-be molester and injures him. This man is severely injured. However, the girls file a complaint, but the police officer takes no interest in taking into account the political power of the accused. He and his cronies try to intimidate the girls, They are threatened, molested, blackmailed and the trial is where it eventually leads, where a senior advocate defends them. What is significant, however, is not that the girls are acquitted after being put through endless trauma, but that the men involved are also 'found guilty' in the same trial.

It aims to show the dark side of the law on how much trauma women have to go through in filing a complaint against male perpetrators who harm and violate them. When the law enforcing authorities itself turn a blind eye on these victims, there is no one to protect these victims.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film portrays the enormous powers the rich have in manipulating the law. When innocents are jailed, criminals walk free in broad daylight. It can also be seen that the concept of Zero FIR is introduced by one of the three protagonists of the film. According to the idea of a "Zero FIR," an FIR can be filed in any police station, regardless of where the crime occurred. Even though the crime scene is not in his area of responsibility, the Station House Officer (SHO) of any police station is required by law to submit your FIR. Later, the official can give the concerned police station the Zero FIR. The film also introduces us to Section 354 of the The Indian Penal Code (IPC).

Where a woman can charge any person under this section who assaults or acts in a manner to outrage her modesty, the punishment is with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with a fine, or with both.” Section 503 of the IPC also comes into play here which talks about criminal intimidation, that is to threat or injure the reputation of any person. Another section which is introduced in the movie is Section 307, which is Attempt to murder, Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder. The film manages to touch on various aspects of how a woman is treated under the law, the same law that gives her protection, abuses her.

The film, also teaches us how women are protected under the law, where women can get bail on weekends and other privileges in court, such as during interrogation, one of the female characters was asked some personal questions which may make it uncomfortable to say in front of people. The judge, however, offered her to avail *Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*, under which she could answer the questions on camera, that is, privately, in the presence of only one police officer and a woman constable so as to protect her sensitive information.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie, however, fails to throw light on the other issues that women face while filing a complaint where they do not receive the justice that they deserve. The movie also falls short in attempting to give us a truthful picture of the legal process. One can also notice that not everything that happens in the movie is what that happens in reality. In the movie inside the courtroom, it is all theatrics and showmanship, where the advocate is growling one minute, silent and mumbling the next. It is also observed that in movies they focus more on drama and punch dialogues, where as in a courtroom, in reality, an argument depends only on reason and fact, and facts and only facts is a reliable guide to the truth, persuasion is less fastidious. Pink is not providing a critique of the law’s actual functioning. What it is doing is to use the court as a pretext to examine a well-worn public issue and take a widely accepted side on it.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie, even though it has a lot of ups and downs, it manages to show a correct picture of the difficulty of being a woman. Here, people seem to form notions just because a woman is a working woman or she is a divorced woman, every woman who is independent or not under the control of a man is prone to engaging in physical activities with a man. The three women are a Christian from Meghalaya, a Muslim from Lucknow and a Hindu from Delhi. The unique casting in the movie shows us, no matter where a woman comes from or what background she has, she is never safe, there is something or someone that is a danger to her life. Often, parents teach a girl child to act appropriately, or society tells a woman what to wear, till what time she can stay out, Every time only the victim is blamed. It is time to step outside of the little box and teach our boys and men how to treat a women, Only then will our society progress. The main message that the movie was trying to deliver was the importance of consent. Consent plays a huge role in every situation. “no means no”. No matter what the situation, getting the consent of the other party is very important.

CONCLUSION

This is a movie that forces its audience to think. It portrays the general attitude of people towards women. The movie was an honest representation of the trauma a woman goes through so as to receive justice. The sad part is there is always someone to set out moral yardsticks for a women. A woman investigative officer doesn't help either despite, being a woman. After all, she too is a part of this society. It shows how we fail as a nation to protect the daughters of our nation. This is not just a woman's problem, it's about every woman living in this egoistically twisted man's world. It's about parents, brothers and husbands worried about their loved ones' safety. We turn a blind eye only because it is not our problem nor something happening to our loved ones, but soon enough it will be us who will face it. Its time we take our eyes off the victim and stop victim shaming rather than shift our focus to the perpetrator. When money can buy law, the scale of justice loses its balance. This can be fixed only through the course of law and effective implementation of the existing laws.



ADVOCATE K CHANDRU : THE VOICE OF THE MARGINALISED

Prabhath Chowdhary Pudota
KIIT School of Law, Bhubaneswar

INTRODUCTION

Law and Film create meaning through storytelling, performance and constructing human subjects and social groups. JAI BHIM is a film from Tamil film industry, the film shows about caste discrimination and police brutality. It is not the first film of this type of genre in Tamil film industry there are films like Asuran (2019), Visaranai (2015), Pariyerum perumal (2018) etc. JAI BHIM set in 1995, is a courtroom drama and an investigative thriller directed by T J Gnanavel. The film is a hard-hitting representation of the role of power domination unleashed over the oppressed and marginalized sections of people. It is adapted from a real-life incident of three Irular (Scheduled Tribe) men who were arrested for an alleged theft case in 1995. Chandru a human rights lawyer and activist works on the case and helps them get justice. The film also focuses on the brutal methodology used by the police, and corrupted system within the police, it produced the most extended Habeas Corpus case in the history of High Court of Tamil Nadu, India.

ABOUT THE FILM

Right from the beginning of the film, the reality of casteism that exists in society was clearly manifested. Overall, it portrays the system of social stratification, stigma, and social exclusion associated with Irulars and other marginalized communities around us. It also represents the role of dominant and intermediate power holders at the authoritarian level who enjoy a better condition by exploiting, victimizing, and exerting power and dominance over the oppressed and downtrodden sections of people. Without any evidence and homework, the police took Rajakannu and others into custody for the theft of gold in the party leader's house in which Rajakannu was called by the party leader few weeks ago to catch the snake. Where Rajakannu and two others became victims of custodial torture where the police forcefully demanded them to accept the crime of alleged police charges for which they denied. The very next day, the police personnel arrived at the tribal community and informed the family of the arrested men that Rajakannu and two of his companions had escaped from the jail. Then police warned them to inform police if the escaped men came back to their settlement. But Rajakannu's wife Senggeni was very sure that there was no chance to escape from the jail as they were severely injured and

physically unable to escape. Certainly, she doubted that the police had done something bad, and that had happened inside the Jail. By seeking the help of Cuddalore Marxist Communist Party local body leaders, a complaint was raised about the missing people to the Deputy Superintendent of Police (DSP) and even to the district collector. Since no action was taken on the given complaint, Senggeni seeks help from Advocate K. Chandru to seek justice. Where the case moves forward and many truths regarding the case gets unfold. When the case was transferred to the CB-CID by the request of K Chandru, Rajakannu's dead body was found at a public place near a temple in Meensurutti. Through the photos taken by a studio on Kumbakonam road in Chennai, his wife saw for the first time a photo of her husband Rajakannu as a dead body, who had been seen with severe injuries at the police station earlier. It was proved in the court that all through this case the police had tampered all the evidences to get rid of the legal complexities. Based on it the court has given judgement in favour of Rajakannu's family.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The metaphor of catching rats and the snake at the movie's beginning, the director T.J. Gnanavel dedicates a couple of minutes to describe to us the daily routine of the village. First, Rajakannu and his people work to catch rats so that snakes can be far from the fields. Rajakannu blows smoke to force the rats to come out and be caught. On the other side of the field, his brother helps him send smoke under the ground. Senggeni actually captures them and spares one little mouse to finalise the procedure. Three characters to catch the scary rats hiding secretly under the ground. And they needed other three characters to capture and lock the corrupted policemen, who were stealing money and brutally torturing the people of the village: Chandru, Mythra and, finally, Senggeni to finalise the operation. Carefully and slowly, they needed to blow new proves to the court to keep the case alive until the corrupted ones had to step out and be captured by their colleagues. Chandru is the snake for the abusive policemen (The snake at Chandru's house). As shown that Senggeni spared the life of a little mouse, and it can be said the same for what Chandru did. Not all policemen are evil. The cooperation between Chandru and the honest side of the police, represented by Perumalsami is the key to guarantee justice and democracy. We have basically applied the "Jai Bhim" in the reality of this film the untouchable people received justice, brought by the power of the law and the dedication of the health part of the government authorities through judges and police.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

To begin with, Parvathi Ammal was not informed, consulted, and her formal approval was not obtained. The film crew never approached her to show her interest in making a film out of her life's events, or to initially offer financial compensation. The critics were under the view that the name Parvathi was purposefully changed to Senggeni, and the protagonist's caste was altered from Kuravar to Irular to avoid any potential legal consequences. Thus, the film undercut and twisted the Kuravar community's identity, history, and pride. The storylines were changed to kindle the emotion and gain the sympathy of the viewers. For example, the village chief was depicted as an arrogant man. However, in reality, he was very kind and helpful to the villagers and the couple, Rajakannu and Senggeni. The movie was said to have harmed the Vanniyar community's reputation, for example, the inclusion of 'Agni kalasam' (fire pot) and a character named, 'Gurumoorthy' who was a harsh, vicious sub-inspector of police. Out of the all available calendars used in the film, an 'Agni Kalasam' daily sheet calendar was chosen in a scene, and later

it was transformed to a Hindu Goddess after a legal notice was issued against the film for allegedly distorting and maligning the Vanniyar community. Following that, when the calendar's 'Agni Kalasam' image was changed to 'Hindu Goddess,' numerous Hindus mistook the film crew for causing injustice to all Hindus, reigniting the controversy. They began to wonder, "Why Hindus and why not a neutrally sounding image as a replacement?" Additionally, critiques question the use of vanniyar symbolism that was brought into the picture. This is the question the film crew failed to address.

CONCLUSION

Jai Bhim is a movie about justice or, better injustice. It teaches us the power of the law and how to use it to build a better world. It's not a fight between low castes and high castes. Not even against the police officers, but it's a fight against the entire system. Jai Bhim seeks a better society, where humans must have human rights. The film certainly produces an embedding of Ambedkarite ideology through various photo frames of Periyar, Ambedkar and Buddha, along with the recurring images of Marx and Lenin, signifying a left representation. It translates into a saviour-ship project that works to liberate the 'other' from the tyranny of caste. Jai Bhim means light, Jai Bhim means love, Jai Bhim means journey, from darkness to light, Jai Bhim means tears of billions of people!



EK RUKA HUA FAISLA

Mugdhaben Patel

NFSU Gandhinagar

INTRODUCTION

Film plays an important role in giving a point of view to common people about particular field. A doctor can feel a life of lawyer by watching a movie or series, a police worker can feel a life of doctor, common man can feel any profession or any misery on the basis of movie, etc. Film can also help people to choose their profession. Looking forward to law and film, law related film can be a base for understanding law and Justice for a common person. As in this article I have described the movie “Ek Ruka Hua Faisla”. Law and Film has attracted only limited attention in the literature on law and popular culture namely, the impact of popular culture on public perceptions of law and justice. It examines the context in which the study of popular culture in relation to law has developed and its principal goals and the working assumptions of those engaged in this work. It examines work that has been carried out specifically on how perceptions of law and justice seem to be affected by popular culture. It notes some of the methodological issues that have emerged in these studies and goes on to look at what kinds of limitations are inherent in such kinds of work and how these might be addressed.

ABOUT THE FILM

Ek Ruka Hua Faisla is an Indian Hindi-language thriller film, directed by Basu Chatterjee. It is a remake of the Golden Bear winning American motion picture 12 Angry Men (1957) directed by Sidney Lumet which was an adaptation from a 1954 teleplay of the same name by Reginald Rose. In this movie, 12 jurors sit in a closed room to decide upon the fate of a 19-year-old boy who as per facts of the case had stabbed his father with a knife and the noise of him threatening his father was heard by a neighbour living downstairs while another neighbour saw the boy stabbing his father from the last two windows of a moving train.

The jury was in no mood to discuss or debate upon the facts or circumstances as according to one juror the boy came from a low background and it is in the blood of people living in slums to fight and kill, therefore he must not be given any other opportunity to kill others by setting him free and must be sentenced to death.

The movie also talks about the opinions in the mind of jurors which are based on emotions and personal grudges against a particular community. The judge puts up an interesting condition, that death sentence will be pronounced only when all the jurors are in agreement but on initial voting only one juror decides that he needs to be fully convinced before he puts someone’s life on line. The eleven members are agitated at that single person as they were now supposed to sit and convince him leaving aside all there important works such as watch a film, carry out their

businesses, go for recreational practices etc. In spite of the pressure by other jurors this one person wants to discuss the case from the beginning putting forth every proof and possibility that can lead them to truth.

After a series of debates which are in the manner of satirical presentations touching upon various aspects like corruption, bureaucracy, poverty, class and communal discrimination the wave turns in favour of the child as the jurors start to believe that there is a reasonable doubt about the fact that it was that particular boy who killed his father. At the end only one juror keeps his verdict as guilty while all others change it and a long argument between all of them reveals the fact that he had a poor relationship with his son and because of that particular reason he wants the defendant to be guilty and sentenced to death and as he cries out loud tearing the photo of his son he changes his judgment as well.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The movie “Ek Ruka Hua Faisla” is about **how a person can change the mind of a whole crowd**, by sticking to his convictions backed up by rationale thinking.

This movie is special, especially because it portrays the thinking of 12 different people from 12 different aspects of society, from self-made guy coming from the slums to famous doctor to elite class people. In these 12 jury members, everyone was so careless to reach their decision except that 12th person. They are so preoccupied with their personal problems or engagements that they do not understand the gravity of their decision. One person’s life is on stake. Yes, the accused guy could be real culprit or maybe not.

To overcome our prejudices, to think beyond what we know and to observe the real truth without any presumptions of the observer is not something easily achieved. Many scholars like J Krishnamurthy have even called this practice as the greatest form of meditation one can do. This sounds true, since most of us all are so prepossessed with our knowledge, that the reality in front of us is always shadowed by the images projected by our mind, our thoughts and our accumulated concepts.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

In this movie it was shown that one juror’s personal bad experience impacts his decision and he wants defendant to be guilty and sentenced to death. It shows that a person’s personal bad experience decide someone’s life which is completely wrong. Personal experiences can help to improve yourself but they can’t be the base to decide someone else’s fate. It made people to lose their faith on Justice.

What if that one man won’t stand for the acquittal of that boy? There will be no reconsideration of the facts, they do not find a reason for his acquittal and definitely that innocent boy will be hanged to death. It shows that the person who is accused, wants someone’s faith on him/her to prove his/her innocence.

Law and its provisions are like a double-edged sword, which can be used for public interest and also misused in selfish interests and the interests of the governing class. For example, the crime of corruption and tax evasion grows not because of population growth but due to government's inability and unwillingness to check them.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

'Let Hundred Guilty Be Acquitted But One Innocent Should Not Be Convicted'

This statement is the guiding principle behind rules of procedure and evidence guiding our courts...when any law relating to procedure and evidence requires interpretation, the interpretation given to such provision is usually in favour of the accused...upholding the presumption of innocence.

The reason for this is to ensure that the police and prosecution do their job right, and to ensure that an over-zealous prosecution doesn't result in an innocent man being convicted of a crime he didn't commit.


Justice is the ultimate aim of every legal system. Justice would be denied in a horrendous way in every case where a prosecution results in an innocent man being convicted. Unfortunately, despite all safeguards being adopted by the courts, even today innocent people are convicted. That is the reason constant vigilance is needed to ensure that any person accused of a crime is given the benefit of doubt, and that we don't encroach on the presumption of innocence.

CONCLUSION

The movie is a master piece, the story and the concept behind needs to be observed. Twelve jurors - common people with their usual daily problems, emotional swings and their regular habit to stick to what is obvious - are selected to judge a case where very strong evidences are available against the accused. Everything was transparent and vividly clear. The case was supposed to end with common opinion against the accused within no time. But one person was against this common judgment and this is the point where story builds up. This one person make other eleven to change their decision. It is Hindi adoption of 'Twelve Angry Men (1957)' and is equally mastered. It is acclimatized for Indian viewers. Performance of actors touches the pinnacle and it is a recommendable movie.

My one take away from this movie is - A calm attitude can work wonders in the most difficult situation!! This movie has demonstrated this fact beautifully!! Other sideline issues that have been touched are - First, how prejudice blurs the judgement and secondly, danger of giving a very sensitive duty to insufficiently sincere people.

The movie left me thinking behind, the way I view things myself, the way I take my decisions, where does this promptness to do something comes from, am I ever reached at the reality before judging the activities of mind as right and wrong. I think most of the times it never happens.



THE POWER OF TORT LAW AND UNDERSTATED HEROISM IN DARK WATERS (2019)

Chandan Maheshwari
National Law University, Delhi

INTRODUCTION

The awareness and development of tort law is so stunted in India that lay-persons are often found clueless about the existence of this branch of law. This is one reason why I look out for good cinema on tort law issues—popular movies are a superb way to entertain as well as inform.

Fortunately, there is a remarkable body of cinema and TV based on tort cases that actually took place—many of them about industrial disasters and pollution.

A Civil Action (1998) had covered the 1980s Massachusetts contamination of an aquifer with trichloroethylene in an intelligent and unconventional manner, even though the film wasn't a major commercial success. *Erin Brockovich (2000)* had covered the case surrounding the Hinkley groundwater contamination by the Pacific Gas & Electric. More recently, *Percy (2020)* covered a David v Goliath kind of case of a small farmer against Monsanto and their GMOs, and the limited series *The Pharmacist (2020)* covered the opioid crisis from the eyes of an activist. In the Indian context, *Bhopal: A Prayer for Rain (2014)* brilliantly portrays the build-up to one of the worst industrial disaster to ever take place on the face of this planet. These are just a few major examples of works in this genre.

Dark Waters (2019) is another movie in this line of superb works. Starring Mark Ruffalo and Anne Hathaway among others, *Dark Waters* makes for an engaging, informative, and inspiring viewing.

ABOUT THE FILM

Directed by Todd Haynes and based on the 2016 New York Times article “The Lawyer Who Became DuPont’s Worst Nightmare” by Nathaniel Rich, *Dark Waters* paints a grim picture—of a grim reality.

Dark Waters reveals the aftermath of chemical company DuPont’s brazen, decades-long contamination of a whole town.

Our protagonist is Robert Billot (played by Mark Ruffalo), a corporate defense environmental lawyer—meaning thereby, a lawyer who defends corporations in environmental matters. Billot decides, first by happenstance and then by determination to represent a farmer from the plaintiff’s side against DuPont, a company that’d otherwise be expected to be represented by Billot’s firm. His reason, “It just felt like the right thing to do.”

Billot’s efforts for that case and others that arise out of the contamination help push the boundaries of both law and science. He initiates tort action against a powerful corporation based on their use and improper disposal of a hitherto unregulated chemical. With no semblance on what to look for and no regulatory standards to be found once the chemical is revealed to him, Billot enters the scientific arena as well, to find his answers that would help him make a largely unprecedented case.

Dark Waters is about a bio-persistent, bio-accumulative, and extremely potent chemical with adverse health effects, C8 or PFOA—a pollutant that can now be found in the blood of virtually every living being on the planet.

It is also a snapshot of Big Corporate—how their goodwill is subject to their bottom line. It reveals how deep pockets allow them to stay ahead of the government and its regulators in their scientific know-how and pretty much everything else. It reveals how Big Corporate is always ready to throw its weight against any force that attempts to keep their activities in check or on the right side of law.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Dark Waters deals its environmental and tort law story with journalistic accuracy, limited only by the format and duration of a motion picture. But besides that story, the film also masterfully captures other themes as well.

In *Dark Waters*, a major challenge for our protagonist Robert Billot is to take a case that is quite far off his usual work, and one that is certainly still far off than anything anybody at his firm has ever done. The tension between Billot and partners at his own firm is palpable throughout the film, where the partners do not seem happy with the loss of clientele that could result from Billot’s new venture. It is a subtle portrayal of how law firms end up with their own inertia, which restricts their partners and employees in using the law as a vehicle for justice.

It portrays Billot's overwork that has him handling his usual workload of the firm as well as the case against DuPont. In addition, Billot is enraged with DuPont's pre-litigation as well as litigation conduct. The personal anger takes a toll of Billot's health as well.

The movie also captures how a big corporation like DuPont can pollute an entire city's drinking water supply, hide the fact despite knowing it for decades, engage in all kinds of diversionary tactics to prevent themselves from being held accountable—but those who seek to hold them to account will be socially ostracized instead.

Dark Waters ends as the first trial begins. But lawyers do understand—battles are most often resolved not in a courtroom but the run-up to trial.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Dark Waters and the events it is based on are testament to the power of tort law—it shows how civil recourse has the potential to make the ends of justice meet, even where government regulation of industry is non-existence, or worse, complicit with the regulated. It also highlights how a good tort law machinery can effectively neutralize the differential in power between a giant corporation and a small farmer.

But more than anything else, the movie is a biopic of Robert Billot, who single-handedly and at a great cost to himself, his family life, and the risk of loss of face for his law firm, continued to work for a cause he considered important. Legal professionals and laymen alike could be inspired and learn from his example.

Besides bringing DuPont to account, Billot also helped initiate research into the human costs of these substances that are now known as forever chemicals—a cute name for something sinister; the 'forever' indicating how long the chemicals stay inside a living person. It was Billot's work that led to the further testing that revealed the presence of these chemicals virtually across the whole world.

CONCLUSION

Dark Waters is entertaining, informative, inspiring and grim at the same time.

The movie ends offering a ray of hope. Thanks to the efforts of Robert Billot, his clients are able to hold DuPont liable to compensate for their increased risks and actual suffering of ailments. But one does stop to think how law can possibly come to terms with such massive harm, harm that seems to be beyond any legal calculus we are equipped with. And it leaves us with important questions as well—what is meaningful accountability in a case where the scale of damage caused is off any charts that we may come up with?



THE MAN WHO CROSSED HITLER

Pravertna Sulakshya

Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Punjab

INTRODUCTION

As a title “The Man Who Crossed Hitler” couldn’t help but look oddly underpowered at first glance. What had the man done, you wondered. Pushed in front of Hitler in the queue at the soup kitchen? What’s more, given the eventual course of history, couldn’t several million people claim the same distinction? Then, five minutes into the movie the light dawned. “Wouldn’t it be fun to cross examine the man who gives the orders?” someone asked – and you realised the title contained a legal pun.

Set in the Berlin summer of 1931, the film features one of the least talked about trials witnessed by the history— the trial of ‘Adolf Hitler.’ Although the film and the portrayed trial has attracted limited populace, the plot examines the role of judiciary in losing the Constitutional democracy in Germany and questioning as to the role of lawyers in shaping a societies’ ‘political structure.’

ABOUT THE FILM

The Man Who Crossed Hitler is a 2011 BBC English film directed by prominent historical film director Justin Hardy. The film begins with a series of monotone flashbacks of the 1931 Berlin, a time when Germany was struggling with a collapsing economy owing to reparations due after World War I. Among the chaos, Germany was deeply divided into extreme political groups, both the left and the right. Among the far right groups were the Nazis, led by Adolf Hitler. The party apparatus included a thuggish group called the SA, or storm troopers, which dealt with those who got in the party’s way.

In November 1930, brown-shirted storm troopers of Hitler’s SA break into the Communist Eden Palace club, killing several members. Jewish lawyer Hans Litten prosecutes them and, at the suggestion of his boss Rudolf Olden, agrees to subpoena Hitler, who had supposedly renounced violence yet clearly supported the SA, to discredit him as a popular figure. Against the advice of his assistant Margot Furst Hans, prepares his case, even involving Stennes, a rival Nazi to Hitler.

At the trial, Hans, the practiced lawyer, runs rings round Hitler for accused of murdering innocent civilians at the Eden Palace Dance Hall. Hitler is seen as frequently being unable to answer his questions. In compelling Hitler to confront the conflicts in his twisted ideology, and forcing him

to admit that he not only condoned but conceived the violence of his followers, Litten hoped to discredit him and halt his rise to power.

Face-to-face courtroom action is a rich source of drama, and the crackling tension between the two men powered the film. In a challenging role, the notoriously intense Hart gave a haunting impression of Hitler's madness, political opportunism and energy. However, the main event was surrounded by some lumpy explanatory dialogue, and there was a slightly uneasy mix between the confrontation – based on the actual testimony given – and more speculative stuff, like Hitler ranting to himself in the bedroom mirror. The smartly written and well-accounted script attempted to apply the fantasy fluency of an American courtroom procedural garnished with historical account of the time.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

In a non-Kafkaesque world, what would a person get for committing high treason, having led a “beer hall putsch” that resulted in the deaths of 20 people, including four policemen? Capital punishment? Life? Fifteen years? In Germany, in 1924, a man who wasn't even a citizen got off with serving less than nine months in a “prison” that resembled an adult summer camp. During the widely covered courtroom drama, Hitler was able to speak freely, often, according to press reports, “at the top of his lungs.” After 24 days of such ranting and raving, a hitherto obscure political figure had garnered national and even international attention. The impeccably researched plot is an example of how a determined demagogue can turn a defeat into victory. It is also a disturbing portrait of how an advanced country can descend into chaos and of the human cost that this chaos entails. It is a rich source of political understanding before Hitler rose to fame and why German citizens supported him.

Hans Litten, a German-Jewish lawyer, ‘crossed’ Hitler in different ways, not only cross-examining him in one of the most famous trials of the Weimar Republic, but making him angry in the process— and paying the price once the Nazi leader was in power. Litten is relatively unknown in Germany today, even less so in the English-speaking world. Therefore, the movie proves itself as a great source of account of the infamous litigants that were against Nazi ideals in the times.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie provides a very similar depiction of the real accounts of the courtroom; for instance, being set in the Reichswehr Infantry School, having 120 seats, arrangement for press inside, and the like. However, it displays Hitler's populace as already existent. When Hitler arrives the Courtroom, he does so like an officer, with his hands clutched behind, and people saluting him “Heil Hitler.”

Advancing further, consistent with German procedure at the time, the questions came from the judge in the courtroom session, not the prosecutor. In the afternoon session, Hitler gave a nearly four-hour opening statement, growing over to popularise with 24 days of testimony. It is pertinent to note that the real trial included opening statements of other nine defendants as well— such as Hermann Kriebel, General Ludendorff, and Ernst Rohm. These people gave wide

latitude of explanations for their actions as a blame towards Marxists, Jews, and the Catholic Church. The movie does not display these testimonies.

The role of defence lawyer Karl Kohl in the original trial has been accounted as the most aggressive defence ever, who tried to turn the tables and put the government on trial. Such depictions are necessary to prevent glorification of the “ironical hero.” However, the movie has laid less emphasis on the part of defence. Cutting to the chase, while Hitler was found guilty and sentenced to five years of jail, no depiction of his aftermath is shown, indicating how difficult it is to not forgive a leader.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

As Justice N.V. Ramana addressed at the PM Desai Memorial lecture, it is the Courts and Law that can save Constitutional democracy. As Germany was under a democracy and the wits of the Weimar Constitution, the times could have been utilised to replenish the economy and societal well-being for all by means of judicial activism and legal craft. However, judges in the fear of extremist ideas and supposed rise in power by Hitler let go of the constitutional strength. This goes in consonance with sociologist Max Weber’s ideas of charismatic authority, whereby, power legitimized by a one’s exceptional personal qualities inspire obedience from followers. The aftermath of deviating for the principles of justice to the constitution of the new People’s Court and the enactment of the dreaded Nuremberg Laws (1935) which stripped the Jews of citizenship, disfranchised them, and deprived them of basic human rights. The regime could only go worse by transforming the liberal German Weimar Constitution into an instrument of oppression, discrimination and finally the Holocaust leading to the murder of 12 million dissidents, communists, socialists, gypsies and homosexuals including 6 million Jews.

CONCLUSION

Adolf Hitler offers a great character study of a man consumed by extremist ideas and confidence upon his actions. He is not a personal devil, wicked as his actions and philosophy may be, but acts as an expression of a state of mind existing in millions of people, not only in Germany but, to a smaller degree, in all civilized countries. On his sharp contrast is depicted the Lawyer, Hans Litten, with characteristics of a lawyer who is devoted to this profession, both inside and outside the courtroom. His sharp and witty questions against the Beer Hall event and Hitler’s extremist ideology have been presented by him in the boldest manner possible. The character makes the viewer rethink the impact that Hitler precedes his dialogues. He meticulously annoys both the presiding judge and the prosecutors.

Themes such as racism, sexuality, religion, poverty, war, nationalism remain dominant through the trial conversation between Hitler and Hans. Knitted with the economically weak, politically raged, and culturally extremist depiction of the time, the movie provides a unvaluable assessment of the trial that ‘made’ Hitler rise to fame and power. The movie depicts a sense of how fragile the rule of law was in Weimar Germany, and how two types of eloquence confronted each other at that moment, the seductive rhetoric of the demagogue and the moral logic of the lawyer. Sadly, *The Man Who Crossed Hitler* highlighted that sometimes even the most courageous efforts aren’t enough either.



WITNESS (2022)

Sridhar L

School of Excellence, TNDALU, Chennai

INTRODUCTION

Manual scavenging is an inhumane treatment and violation of Article 21 of the Indian constitution. Hence, it has been prohibited through the employment of manual scavengers and their rehabilitation Act, 2013. Even though manual scavenging is prohibited in India, the practice is still prevalent in many parts of the country by exploiting the loophole in the definition of manual scavengers under the 2013 Act, which exempted those individuals cleaning excreta using devices and protective gears. As per the response of the minister of State for social justice and empowerment in Rajyasabha in Dec 2021, there is zero death in India due to manual scavenging but 321 persons lost their lives while cleaning sewer and septic tanks during 2017 to 2021 period. It to be noted these stats were taken as per the definition of 2013 Act. Another astounding fact has been responded by the same minister is that, 97% of people who were engaged in manual scavenging belongs to Schedule Caste. The film Witness is based on these statistics and portraits the struggle of single mother who tries to get justice for his son's death.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film "Witness" is a 2022 Indian Tamil language court room drama film directed by debutant Deepak. It portraits the struggle of a middle-aged single mother (Indrani) to get justice for his college-going son's (Parthiban) death due to forced manual scavenging. Parthiban is a well-good swimmer who also worked as a trainer in a swimming pool, forced to do manual scavenging just because his mother failed to pay two weekly instalments of her thandal loan. It was unknown to others, so the police were trying to cover up this incident as an accident due to drunk but their plan was collapsed, when this incident taken into the eyes of Pethuraj, a communist union leader (G. Selva). He forced the police to file an FIR and he himself took Indrani to the advocate and stood up with Indrani. Indrani didn't take back her foot and fights against the host of money gaints. This incident was taken place in an apartment located in Adyar. The apartment secretary trying to solve this issue with aid of the police, they offered him a choice to pay money to Parthiban's family. Even Parthiban's uncle is ready for this deal because they were illiterate people don't know how to handle the situation. Pethuraj is the one who stopped them and asked to proceed with prosecution. Parvathy (Shraddha Srinath) who is living in the apartment get to know a young man was died in their apartment and that was her swimming trainer Parthiban. She got CCTV footage of the incident and provide it to Indrani and she herself is ready to be a witness, if needed. The advocate encouraged her act and further asked her to bring watchman of that apartment who is also an eyewitness to the court. Trial commenced, Examination has been started with the apartment secretary he confessed that the sub-contractor taken Parthiban to the apartment and

allowed him to do enter into manhole and do scavenging. Next the contractor, he transformed his liability to the subcontractors who has actual control over the said apartment. Further the chief inspector of metropolitan corporation, claiming there is no fault of himself in the said offence and there is zero manual scavenging in his limit, these kind of incidents took place where the individuals themselves voluntarily doing such manual scavenging for money and drinks. Finally the watchman who taken Parthiban out of manhole in unconscious condition, reaffirmed the confession of apartment secretary.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

This film talks about the unnoticed topic, manual scavenging .From the structure of the screenplay, Witness seems a bold anti-caste film. This is not a film meant for suspense and shock with twist and turns. A straight forward story with great dialogue delivery. This film handles not merely the story of Parthiban but also the caste based discrimination and the struggle of particular community in broader manner. This is not the first film taking about caste based discrimination but it is unique in it's fine way, criticizing the whole society with no chances for defence by providing proper statistics of manual scavenging. It points out the loophole in the definition of manual scavengers under 2013 Act and how it's has been exploited by the Authorities to pass their buck, further The salary issues such as low salary, no payment within specified time, deductions and all. On the other hand it provides awareness about the rights of manual scavengers and their families, such as right to compensation of 10 lakh in case of death as per Supreme Court order. The director missed nothing to be questioned, provides proper logic in less timing without wasting excess time on explain outer context. Director stick with the context of the film is the major thing which made this film as successful content.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

As a story there is nothing to be questioned but as a social instrument it has some. Cinema is not merely an entertainment medium yet it is something more, it has a Power to influence people and could make audience to believe anything it present on screen. The director too much stretched on the caste concept and puts unwanted dialogues. Does it really a cased based discrimination? The film focuses in one angle alone why don't they show poverty the vain on this sort of explorations. No wealthy people belongs to the same community goes for manual scavenging. Here in this film also Parthiban went along with the sub-contractor because his mother failed to pay two thandal loan instalment. I wouldn't say there is no cased based discrimination but that alone not the problem here, more than cased based discrimination poverty plays major role. The director fails to show that. Apparently this is a film of message but the message what transferred as a whole is not a good one. The end scene alone is more than enough to flip the whole movie into trash. That is, The accusers themselves sitting in the judge seat and acquitting themselves . Frankly speaking the director shows his inexperience there he tried to make this film of message into a commercial film by putting an unwanted scene at the end. Undoubtedly this was the reason for the failure of this film.


SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Cinema is not merely an entertainment medium but undoubtedly a social instrument, which can trigger society into any direction. It is immaterial whether the message conveyed is good or bad, The society will believe it and blindly accept it as truth and act accordance towards the direction

it triggers. The movie has both positive and negative impact in the society. It is always easy to turn blind against social evils (manual scavenging) around us to live in an imaginary reality, we used to this because we know these incidents never going to happen for us and our families. This movie opened our eyes and made us to understand, we as society is witness to such social evils as well responsible for the same. This film creates an awareness to those who are all involved in manual scavenging, that they have a right to protecting as well as right to approach court. The film made a negative impact as, even a aggrieved person approach the court with adequate evidences, the judiciary will support the Administrative authorities and people with Money alone and those with small means have to suffer till their life.

CONCLUSION

The main theme of the film Witness is to portrait the issues that a poor middle aged mother faces while approaching court to get justice for his son's death due to forced Manual scavenging. It shows caste as major reason behind such incidents (forced manual scavenging) and intentionally avoided to show poverty as reason. Also it creates wrong impression toward the judiciary, since Manual scavengers are illiterate it is hard for them to understand what's right and what's wrong. There is a possibility that, they may believe the content shown in the film as absolute truth and avoiding prosecution. Hence as a content this film is a great success but as a social instrument it is absolutely an failure.



“WHEN GOD TURNS INTO DEVIL; AN ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA”

Mridulika Pandey

CMP Degree College, University of Allahabad

INTRODUCTION

Whenever we hear the term doctor, we instantly imagine an angel dressed in a white coat that is blessed with a magical power to treat a LIFE. From bringing smiles on faces of suffering humanity to defending us against death, they stand by us when our own breath refuses to do so but what if the angel himself turns into a devil and takes the life which he was supposed to save.

“Medical Negligence” is a living example of above mentioned situation which occurs due to an act or omission by a medical professional that deviates from the accepted medical standard of care, be it delayed diagnosis, misdiagnosis, surgical error or negligent medical care, the basis of all medical negligence claims is that care provided was substandard or there was improper or unskilled treatment of a patient by a medical practitioner.

Medical negligence is an important aspect of medical law which covers all forms of carelessness and mistakes committed by doctors. It is an offence under tort, IPC, Indian Contract Act, Consumer Protection Act and many more.

The issue of medical negligence has been so widespread that even our cinema has not been untouched by it. The 2013 Indian thriller film *“Ankur Arora Murder Case....when hope kills!* Is an exemplary epitome of the saying that “cinema is reflection of society we live in” as it accurately portrays a real life incident where a boy dies on the operation table due to medical negligence. Let’s dive into storyline of the movie to fathom out what happens next.

ABOUT THE FILM

This movie is a Hindi medical thriller film directed by Suhail Tatari and written and produced by Vikram Bhatt. There is a young & conscientious doctor named as Dr. Romesh Sharma who works as medical intern at Shekhawat General Hospital. He has a great amount of respect and

admiration for Dr. Viren Asthana, the chief surgeon of that hospital. All Romesh wants is to be a world class and successful surgeon like him. He lives there with Dr. Riya Shrivastava, his co-intern and love of his life.

However, when an eight-year-old boy, Ankur Arora, who was admitted in hospital for a minor appendicitis surgery, dies due to medical negligence of the most celebrated doctor, Dr. Asthana, which is when Romesh realizes that a fine surgeon may not necessarily be a fine human being. Dr. Asthana, in fear of his reputational loss, makes every possible effort to bury the truth of his negligence and falsely attributes Ankur's death to lung collapse; a medical complication.

Together with late Ankur's mother Nandita Arora, Nandita's friend Ajay Shetty and their lawyer Kajori Sen, Romesh sets out on a turbulent journey to expose Dr. Asthana and hospital. He fights for justice against his mentor whom he used to idolize, the entire hospital and also the love of his life Riya, who is initially against him as she does not want to risk her career & future due to these issues.

It is revealed that Kajori, lawyer of Romesh's side, is in relationship with her opposing lawyer Rajeev Malani, who tells her to keep the case hanging and only blame the hospital overall, not Dr. Asthana specifically. She does the same in court but soon finds out that she is pregnant with Rajeev's child. As she informs him, Rajeev orders her to abort the baby. Romesh spots them together and goes to her house with Nandita where he finds her lying ill due to an abortion pill. They take her to hospital and save her life, seeing all this Kajori promises them that from now onwards she will fight for Ankur and try her best to get justice but it turns out that all necessary evidence against Dr. Asthana has been destroyed. Dr. Riya and a ward nurse Rosina, who had witnessed the operation, also lie in court.

The next day Dr. Riya goes to Dr. Asthana to give her resignation letter, she tells him that by lying in court about the operation incident she had cheated with the credibility of her profession and her conscience and self-respect is questioning her. A heated argument between her & Dr. Asthana follows in which Dr. Asthana labels himself to be the god who should be forgiven for the mistake he has done. It gets revealed in hospital the next day that Riya had actually shot the confession outburst by Dr. Asthana on her mobile and presented it to court.

Finally the truth wins and the case ends in their favour. No matter how influential, Dr. Asthana gets arrested and court also orders 10 crore compensation to Ankur's mother. In the last scene Romesh & Riya reunite and Nandita is shown remembering her memories with Ankur, heartbroken but contented.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

- The film has been truly successful in setting a right example by presenting that no matter how influential and big name Dr. Asthana is, it is only justice which prevails ultimately.
- While portraying the dark side of hospital, on the brighter side, the movie has very well depicted a principled and resilient doctor, Dr. Romesh, who risks his whole career and future just to get

the justice done to Ankur's mother. He even keeps her relationship with Dr. Riya at stake by going against her in exposing Dr. Asthana.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

- In this movie, the court grants punishment of imprisonment to Dr. Asthana. However court does not punish other doctors who were involved in operation and had witnessed the whole incident even the ward nurse Rosy does not get any punishment, who has left the city on insistence of Dr. Asthana after taking large sum of money from him moreover, on being caught she had also given false statement in court about that operation theatre.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

- This movie has immense social impact, as it is not something fictional which has nothing to do with real life. It is based off a real tragic incident thus plot of movie itself becomes part of society and everyone's life.
- We often tend to trust doctors blindly, giving them rank of god but this movie has quietly familiarized us with rampant commercialization of medical field and medical professionals by providing meaningful insights into medical fraternity and facilities, thus it undisputedly proves itself to be an eye opener on medical skulduggery and loopholes of medical field.
- This movie successfully throws light on a crime that is life threatening but rarely discussed, especially in a country like India very few people are aware with the fact that Medical Negligence is a criminal offence under **section 304A of Indian Penal Code** or about the remedies that are available to them **under civil law or Consumer Protection Act**.
- So this movie, to some extent, indeed sensitizes its viewers about their legally protected rights in case of medical negligence.

CONCLUSION

Every medical professional or doctor has a duty of care towards their patients and when they commit a breach of this duty, it results into an incredibly traumatic experience even the slightest mistakes made by a doctor can have a life altering effect on a patient, statistics shows that around 52 lakh medical injuries are recorded every year in India out of which 98000 people lose their lives just because of medical negligence¹⁴ so it is clear that present system of addressing this menace is not adequate, for instance, we have several provisions in civil and criminal law to deal with this but the issue is that the burden of proof always lies on plaintiff that is patient, thus, it becomes difficult for patient to prove doctor's fault beyond reasonable doubt so now it is high time that laws dictating upon medical negligence get changed so as to suit patient first.

As far as this movie is concerned so the operation theatre to a courtroom, where an eminent surgeon is tried for medical recklessness. On the whole, ANKUR ARORA MURDER CASE illustrates and spotlights the gaffes in the medical profession most persuasively.

Indeed a praiseworthy effort by makers to spread awareness on this topic & an absolute picturization of the very fact that **"every life matters"**.

¹⁴ <https://www.indiamedicaltimes.com/2016/05/25/98000-people-lose-their-lives-because-of-medical-negligence/>



DAMINI (1993)

Shabab Alam

Faculty of Law, Jamia Milia Islamia

INTRODUCTION

Damini, 1993 film, explores issues of justice, corruption, and the misuse of authority in the Indian court system. Meenakshi Seshadri plays Damini, a dedicated lady who battles for justice for a rape victim amid opposition from the corrupt and powerful, in the Rajkumar Santoshi-directed movie.

The central theme of the movie is Damini's fight against the Indian court system and societal biases in order to expose the truth and obtain justice for the victim. Damini has established itself as a classic in Bollywood because to its strong performances and heartfelt plot. It is still admired for its powerful message and classic themes.

Meenakshi Seshadri won the National Film Award for Best Actress in Damini, and Sunny Deol received the award for Best Supporting Actor. The film has become a cultural phenomenon and a reference point for conversations about justice and the Indian court system because of its stirring speeches.

ABOUT THE FILM

The narrative of a lady who strives for justice for a rape victim is told in the Bollywood drama film Damini (1993). Meenakshi Seshadri plays Damini in the Rajkumar Santoshi-directed movie, which also stars Rajkumar Santoshi as the director. Damini is a driven young lady who fights against the corrupt and powerful to expose the truth and obtain justice for the victim.

The story of the movie is on Damini's battles with the Indian judicial system and societal biases in her quest to learn the truth and prosecute the rapists. Damini is a strong supporter of justice and isn't scared to question the current quo in an effort to make things right. As she risks everything to get a fair resolution, she emerges as a ray of hope for the victim and her family.

Damini encounters a variety of difficulties and challenges throughout the movie, such as pushback from the wealthy family of the rapists and resistance from a dishonest court system. But she never wavers in her commitment to pursuing justice and in the strength of the truth.

Damini is a potent movie that tackles issues of justice, corruption, and the misuse of authority in the Indian court system. The movie has become a cultural phenomenon and a reference point for

conversations about justice and the Indian court system because to its catchy music and passionate speeches.

The popularity of the movie is greatly attributed to the excellent acting, specifically Meenakshi Seshadri's depiction of Damini. Seshadri has received a lot of attention and acclaim for her stirring portrayal of a woman battling for justice in the face of overwhelming circumstances.

Damini is a technically excellent movie with stunning cinematography, art direction, and sound design in addition to having a strong message. The use of light and shadow in the film's cinematography, in particular, is noteworthy because it enhances the dramatic tension and emotional effect of the story.

Damini movie has had a long-lasting influence on Indian society, notably in terms of increasing awareness of legal corruption, women's rights representation, sexual assault discourse, enhanced domestic worker legal safeguards, and heightened public interest in social concerns. Generations have been motivated to fight for justice and equality by the movie, which is still a significant and influential work.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Movie's lasting success and relevance can be attributed to the fact that the movie got a number of things right.

First of all, the film effectively portrayed the prejudices and corruption that present inside the Indian court system. It highlights the ways in which privilege and power can be applied to subvert the legal system and maintain injustice. Many people found the movie's representation of the Indian court system and the difficulties victims encounter in getting justice to be eye-opening, and it has contributed to conversations and raising awareness about the need for legal system reforms.

Second, Damini, the movie's main character, was perfectly portrayed. Damini is a tough and determined lady who battles for justice against all difficulties and motivates viewers with her unyielding dedication to upholding morality. Damini's representation in the movie as a pillar of optimism and a defender of justice has struck a chord with viewers and continues to motivate them to stand up for what is right.

Last but not least, the technical aspects of the movie were superbly done, with amazing cinematography, sound design, and art direction that heightened the emotional effect of the movie. The film's distinctive dialogue and impactful score have become cultural touchstones and contributed to its continuing appeal.

Damini is a well-made movie that got a lot of things right, such as how it portrayed the main character, how it depicted legal corruption, how it handled its technical components, and how effectively it was performed.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

While Movie widely regarded as a classic Bollywood film, there are also some criticisms of the film's depiction of certain issues and themes. Here are a few areas ;

First, the movie exaggerates how complicated India's judicial system works. The movie properly portrays significant bias and corruption, but it does not give a full picture of the difficulties that victims encounter while trying to get justice. The legal system is portrayed in the movie in a limited manner that leaves out a wide variety of experiences and difficulties that victims of injustice must contend with.

Second, the typical way in which women are portrayed in the movie might be critiqued. Other female characters in the movie are presented as weak and dependent on males, in comparison to Damini, who is shown as a powerful, resolute woman who battles for justice. This supports damaging perceptions about women's independence and autonomy as well as traditional gender norms.

Thirdly, the movie fails to adequately portray underrepresented groups. Even though the movie's main themes of justice and corruption are universal, it omits to show the particular difficulties that oppressed groups, such Dalits, confront since they are subject to more obstacles while trying to obtain justice.

Fourthly, the movie's overly sentimental and sensationalized tone might be interpreted as manipulative and take away from its powerful message.

Overall there are several areas where the film has gone wrong. These include oversimplification of the legal system, stereotypical portrayal of women, lack of representation of marginalized communities, and melodramatic style.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film has had a significant impact on Indian society, particularly in terms of the representation of legal and social issues.

- **Awareness of corruption in the legal system:** It openly discuss the pervasive corruption and prejudices inside the Indian judicial system, the movie raised awareness of corruption in the system. It spurred significant discussions on the requirement for judicial system reforms and increased awareness of the difficulties experienced by victims of injustice in their pursuit of justice.
- **Representation of women's rights:** It challenges gender stereotypes and beliefs while fighting for justice. One of the first Bollywood movies to include a female character as a hero, the movie encouraged other directors to address gender and women's rights in their productions.
- **Dialogue about sexual assault:** The movie discusses sexual assault, a subject that was once taboo in Indian culture. Important discussions regarding the incidence of sexual assault and

the necessity for stricter laws and social standards to safeguard women and girls were sparked by the movie.

- **Increased public interest in social issues:** Many people were motivated to act and become active in social and legal concerns by the film's strong message and emotional effect. It has been credited for producing a new generation of politically and socially engaged people.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the 1993 film *Damini* is a true masterpiece that has had a profound effect on Indian society and culture. Numerous viewers have been motivated to take action and pursue justice as a result of the movie's potent portrayal of sexual assault, traditional gender roles, and corruption. The effects of it may be seen in both the legal and social arenas, as seen by the rise in awareness of the difficulties experienced by victims of injustice, the improvement of domestic workers' legal safeguards, and the complex and socially conscious representation of women in popular culture.

The movie's popularity and significance serve as a testament to how powerful film is in influencing public opinion and drawing attention to significant topics. Generations of viewers have been motivated to fight for justice and confront the status quo by *Damini*, which is still a significant and timely work.

Damini is a movie that, even after more than two decades, still has an impact on viewers, whether it is seen as an exhilarating judicial drama or as a potent political message. It had a significant influence on Indian society and culture, and its legacy continues to motivate current and future generations of activists, filmmakers, and citizens to take on today's most critical social and legal problems.



PINK

Ajay Sahani

ILS Law College, Pune

INTRODUCTION

"Pink" is a 2016 Bollywood film addressing consent and patriarchal mindset issues. The movie stars Amitabh Bachchan, Taapsee Pannu and Kirti Kulhari, Andrea Tariang, Angad Bedi and Dhritiman Chatterjee in lead roles and revolves around three young women who are falsely accused of a crime. The film explores the women's fight for justice and their attempt to reclaim their dignity in the face of societal prejudices. Directed by Aniruddha Roy Chowdhury, "Pink" received critical acclaim for its powerful message and strong performances.

ABOUT THE FILM

The story revolves around three young women - Minal (played by Taapsee Pannu), Falak (played by Kirti Kulhari), and Andrea (played by Andrea Tariang) living together in Delhi. One night, after a party, they are sexually harassed by a group of men, leading to a confrontation that results in a serious injury to one of the men. The women find themselves at the centre of a legal case as they are accused of attempting to murder. Enter Amitabh Bachchan's character, Deepak Sehgal, a retired lawyer who takes up their case pro bono. The film depicts the legal battle ensuing and the societal prejudices women face as they fight for justice. The film also highlights the importance of consent and the right of women to make their own choices. The women are subsequently charged with an attempt to murder and their case lands in court.

Throughout the legal proceedings, the women are subject to societal prejudices and face challenges in proving their innocence. They also face a lack of support from their families, friends, and the broader society. As the legal case unfolds, the film highlights the importance of consent in any sexual encounter and sheds light on the various issues that women face in India, patriarchal norms, and male entitlement based on injustices in the legal system. The film also shows how and why only Andrea is asked "where is she from" based on her look because she belonged to the northern-east region. Also, when Minal and the girls tried to file a legal complaint against them but a police officer was not ready to register their case because the person Rajveer was politically influenced and was from a strong financial background.

Despite the challenges they face, the women are determined to reclaim their dignity and fight for justice. Through their struggle, the film encourages its audience to challenge patriarchal norms and stand up for the rights of women.

In the end, Deepak delivers a powerful closing argument, highlighting the importance of consent and the right of women to make their own choices, and the women are acquitted of all charges. The film ends on a hopeful note, with the women reclaiming their dignity and standing up for their rights.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

- **Emphasis on consent:** The film highlights the importance of consent in any sexual encounter, emphasizing that women have the right to say "no" and make their own choices.
- **Patriarchy and male entitlement:** The movie sheds light on the patriarchal norms that pervade Indian society and the culture of male entitlement, where men feel entitled to access women's bodies without their consent.
- **Systemic injustices:** The film addresses the systemic injustices that women face in the legal system, including biases and prejudices, and shows how these injustices can have serious consequences for women who seek justice.
- **Social stigma and shame:** The film depicts how women who speak up against sexual harassment often face social stigma and shame, and how this can be a significant barrier to seeking justice.
- **Encouragement to challenge patriarchal norms:** The film encourages its audience to challenge patriarchal norms and stand up for the rights of women, sending a powerful message about the importance of gender equality and women's empowerment.
- **are fighting for their rights and dignity, serving as role models for women everywhere.**
- **Empowering message:** The film's message is empowering and inspiring, offering hope to women who are facing similar challenges and encouraging them to reclaim their dignity and fight for justice.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

It was very difficult to point out some of the wrongs or you can say loopholes in the movie, I tried figuring out some It's not like a well-intentioned message will necessarily make for good cinema. The same thing with the movie Pink. It could have been better. After the 1st half, the movie was becoming quite predictable and from a thriller movie it became a courtroom drama. There were some more problems in the film;

- **Depiction of Delhi:** Some viewers criticized the film's portrayal of Delhi as being overly stereotypical and stereotypical, and argued that the city is not as dangerous for women as the film portrays.
- **Representation of the legal system:** Some viewers criticized the film's representation of the legal system, arguing that it oversimplifies the complexities of the legal process and perpetuates stereotypes about lawyers and the justice system.
- **Lack of nuance:** It felt like the film lacked nuance in its depiction of the issues it addresses and that it oversimplified complex social and political issues.

- Lack of nuance in characters: It also felt that the characters in the film were not well-developed and lacked nuance, with the male characters, in particular, being portrayed as one-dimensional villains.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie had a significant socio-legal impact in India, as it shone a light on the issues of gender and women's rights in the country. The film was widely praised for its nuanced depiction of the complex social and legal issues faced by women, and for its powerful message about the importance of consent and gender equality.

- Raised Awareness: The film raised awareness about the importance of consent and the various issues faced by women in India, including patriarchal norms, male entitlement, and systemic injustices in the legal system.
- Encouraged Discussion: The film sparked discussion and debate about the issues it addresses, and encouraged people to think critically about the social norms and beliefs that perpetuate gender-based violence and inequality.
- Changed Attitudes: The film had a positive impact on attitudes toward women and gender equality, and encouraged people to challenge patriarchal norms and stand up for the rights of women.
- Impacted Law and Policy: The film had a direct impact on law and policy in India, as it encouraged the government to take action to address the issues faced by women and improve the legal system's response to gender-based violence.
- Inspiration for activism: The film inspired people to get involved in activism and advocacy, and encouraged them to take action to support women's rights and gender equality.

The movie had a profound impact on Indian society and sparked a national conversation about the importance of consent, gender equality, and women's rights. The movie also tried to safety guidelines for women.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the movie "Pink" is a thought-provoking and significant film that tackles various crucial topics related to women's rights and gender equality. It received widespread recognition for its balanced portrayal of the complicated social and legal challenges faced by women, as well as for its clear and forceful message about the significance of consent and gender equality. The film has raised public awareness, stimulated discussion, altered perspectives, impacted legislation and policies, and motivated activism. It is widely considered a milestone in Indian cinema, and its memorable message continues to impact Indian society positively. The film received positive reviews from audiences and critics alike, who praised its well-written script, powerful performances, and nuanced depiction of complex social and legal issues. "Pink" will be remembered for years to come as a significant film that highlights the vital social and legal issues faced by women in India. The film received positive reviews from audiences and critics alike, who praised its well-written script, powerful performances, and nuanced depiction of complex social and legal issues. "Pink" is widely considered a must-watch for anyone interested in women's rights and gender equality, and remains an important film in the Indian film industry today.



SECTION 375: MARZI YA ZABARDASTI.

Asma Khan

ILS Law College, Pune

INTRODUCTION

A legal movie plays an important role in a society as it gives the audience a chance to know how a court or legal system actually work it gives them a basic idea so it's a responsibility of a film maker to make the movie as realistic as possible and to show the ground reality of Indian judicial system. Hence, I chose an Indian movie which a lot have people might have watched and I also found it very close to reality comparing it with other Indian courtroom-based movie. 'Section 375: Marzi Ya Zabardasti' is directed by Ajay Bahl and the lead roles have been played by Akshaye Khanna, Richa Chadda, Rahul Bhat, Meera Chopra. It is a courtroom-based movie and the general story line is a High Court trial after a costume designer accuses a filmmaker of rape. The film makes for a gripping watch with a crisp runtime and top-notch performances.

The film Section 375 is surely a brave and relevant film that tackles a rather complex issue of laws made to protect women, and the very same laws being misused by women for their vested interest. The way narrative switches from one person's point of view to another's, presents both sides of the story. the film is largely confined to the trial in the High Court and through the proceedings, the audience is acquainted with various characters with different value systems and morals about sexual abuse. different characters and the two lawyers dissect the case with various narratives, for the most part, the film creates ambiguity, refrains from being didactic, compels you to think with facts and statistics, and resists the temptation of taking sides

The movie has some ample heavy-weight dialogues that form the soul of this film and writer Manish Gupta deserves a special mention for that. Imagine these said in a brooding tone: 'We're not in the business of justice, we're in the business of law', 'Law is not justice. It's a tool to get there', 'Never fall in love with the law, it's a jealous mistress' and 'Justice is abstract, law is a fact'. So much gravitas, no!

Then there are the intended puns placed cleverly in the script. For instance, the scene in which Akshaye compares 'daal, chawal, dahi' to 'defense, prosecutor and law', or the scene in which the judge clarifies he doesn't believe in 'one-size-fits-all kind of decision' when it comes to giving verdict in a case.

The movie starts with a scene where the protagonist is giving a lecture in a college and where he says that how law is a tool to attain justice and how is that not always possible and then gave example of Nirbhaya rape case where the boy who was just 2 months away to turn adult and was still treated as minor and was released after some years even after doing a gruesome act. The movie also tends to show the corrupt side of our judicial system.

The movie familiarizes the audience with our legal system, Section 375 shows how this senior lawyer puts in more research into knowing the personal traits and track record of the judge assigned to his case, than the file of his client. Section 375 was a well-timed film as in 2019 MeToo movement was still finding its ground. It rightly states, 'every false accusation of rape is another nail in the coffin of an actual rape victim'. This film raises important questions and leaves you thinking.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film at any point doesn't feel dragged at any point and sends out the messages it intends to, quite early on. It touches upon its main premise of making the audience aware of what Section 375 is about. As otherwise perceived, that 'no rape happens without a woman's consent', the film strongly emphasizes on the need to differentiate between 'will' and 'consent', the two main requisites when it comes to sex.

One of the main reasons that I chose this movie as the courtroom scenes are loaded with data, statistics, facts and figures laid out on a platter for you to digest at one go and not some unreal courtroom scene for example Sunny Deol's signature 'tareekh pe tareekh' monologue from Damini, or Amitabh Bachchan's rulebook on women's safety in Pink or Taapsee Pannu's speech on secularism in Mulk, because Section 375 has no such over-the-top loud or screaming scenes in the courtroom.

The film also brings you closer to the harsh reality of our system in which the rape victim is subjected to shamefully explicit questions. Questions such as 'What was the position while she was being raped, was there proper penetration, did the accused ejaculate' and so on and so forth, would make you cringe.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The climax of the movie shattered a lot of people as no one was expecting that, for me there is nothing where the movie went wrong but it actually made me think whether the judgement was right and after knowing the truth of the men that he actually didn't rape her and still got convicted under section 375 just because he had the influence over her as he was her boss and he held dominant position in their relationship. The judgement given by the bench was actually very unjust for the accused as he is being charged with something he hasn't done, and as the protagonist in the end says that it's a business of law and not the business of justice which tells that how we don't do justice to a lot of people because for lawyers and judges the judiciary system is somewhere just about the law but I think it should be more about justice.

It validates and legitimizes the views of many, who perhaps would use this film as a reference point to proclaim, “Not all men”. The film not only provides validation to all those dismissing sexual harassment cases as having ulterior motives but also does great disservice to women, who have only recently had the courage to risk social stigma and share their stories with the world.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Films which are related to legal plays an important role in the society as it gives some kind of legal perspective to the audience. Hence it is a responsibility of a film maker to make it as close to reality as possible as and the film have proved to do that. The film gives you a deep insight into what goes on in the minds of those holding the position of power and who think it’s normal to violate a woman’s mind and body with or without her consent.


The film not only provides validation to all those dismissing sexual harassment cases as having ulterior motives but also does great disservice to women, who have only recently had the courage to risk social stigma and share their stories with the world.

The movie shows the harsh reality where the alleged rape that inspires events in *Section 375* is replayed several times over, and photographs of the bruises on the victim’s private parts are displayed in unsettling close-ups. Because of this women will fear from going to the court if something like this happened to them as the know they have to face all this.

CONCLUSION

Identifying the significant flaws and good part of the movie we can summarize it by saying that with absolutely no doubt this movie was a perfect pack of entertainment and that’s what the audience look for in the movie and that’s what the movies are made for, to entertain the people. But if go into the right and wrong and how much legally correct or incorrect the movie was, then yes it does have some question marks. The movie ends with a good note as it makes us question and also makes us think everyone will have a different opinion on this movie it depends on there background and moral and ethics they believe in so, without passing any judgment here I will leave it upon the reader as we live in a democracy country, you may make your own decisions about whether the film is an engaging courtroom drama or a bilious defense of ingrained sexism in Bollywood.

In the end *Section 375*, which doesn’t simply raise questions and explore the grey zones (which is undoubtedly imperative), but picks a side and ventures onto demonstrating how “law was served but justice was denied”



THE ACCUSED (1988): A DEPICTION OF HORROR

Subramanyan H
Delhi Metropolitan Education

INTRODUCTION

'The Accused' is a 1988 American legal drama movie that was directed by Jonathan Kaplan based on a screenplay written by Tom Topor. The movie is based on the 1983 gang rape of Cheryl Araujo in New Bedford, Massachusetts. The movie shows Jodie Foster playing the role of Sarah Tobias, a waitress who is gang raped by three guys at a night bar. She decides to bring charges against both the rapists and the others who assisted in provoking the assault with the help of attorney Kathryn Murphy whose role was played by Kelly McGillis. The \$13 million budgeted movie became a critical and commercial success, earning over \$92 million globally, and was named as the 3rd best movie in the year 1988 by the National Board of Review. The movie's audacity and apt depiction of its subject-matter won acclaim from critics, who also recognised it as one of the first mainstream movies to deal with the horrors of rape and its effects on a victim's life.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie portrays Sarah Tobias, a waitress who was gang-raped in a night bar called 'The Mill'. The movie starts by her (Sarah Tobias) running out of the bar screaming for help after she was allegedly raped by 3 men. The starting also depicts a person informing 911 about the occurrence of the crime. Sarah Tobias was shifted to the hospital and was later approached by District Attorney Kathryn Murphy who assured her that she would fight the case for her. The District Attorney and a detective who was assigned the case visits the night bar along with Sarah Tobias in order to find the real culprits. Sarah Tobias identified the culprits who were 3 men out of which one was a college student. The movie then shifts its focus to the court room where the trial is being held against these 3 accused persons. It later shows how Kathryn Murphy had a deal with the attorneys of the accused persons to reduce the charges from rape to reckless endangerment. The deal was made considering the future of the college student who was one of the accused and whose life would've been jeopardized if the charges of rape were levelled against him. Sarah Tobias feeling betrayed, lashes out on Kathryn Murphy. Later, one of the persons who encouraged the crime by cheering and egging on the assaulters noticed Sarah Tobias at a mart and humiliates her badly which affected her pride as a woman. Later when Kathryn Murphy, the District Attorney came to know of this incident, she felt guilty of making the deal to reduce the charges from rape to reckless endangerment. To cover this mistake of hers, Kathryn Murphy decided to sue the inducers as well for the offense of criminal solicitation, which if proved will

successfully result in reversing the charges of the convicts from reckless endangerment back to rape. Later, the offense of criminal solicitation was successfully established followed by the heinous offense of rape. The 3 convicts who were prosecuted for reckless endangerment were also sentenced later for the offense of rape. All in all, the entire movie gave many lessons to the viewers the biggest of which was that the bystanders who encourages, entices or induces the crime shall be equally guilty of the crime.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The movie really had a professional touch to it. One of the main arguments the movie depicted was that although a young woman may act improperly, even recklessly, she still should have the right to say “no” and be heard. The scene where the Attorneys of both sides make a compromising deal to secure the future of the college student showed the reality because it somewhere shows the truth of litigation. Also, the movie displays “no character assassination” of Sarah Tobias in the court room and this was also a positive message for the viewers as it showed a women’s pride and dignity is above many things. One other aspect which was portrayed very nicely was that the District Attorney was not at all supported by the Chief District Attorney when she explains that she will be suing the bystanders as well who encouraged the crime. This was a realistic part because most Attorneys will shove off this aspect (as portrayed in the movie) stating that who would sue a person for just watching a crime. Still District Attorney Kathryn Murphy goes ahead and successfully sues them for criminal solicitation. This was one of the main lessons portrayed in the movie which depicts that each and every person who induces, entices or encourages the crime is equally guilty of the crime. In the words of Martin Luther King Jr. *“the ultimate tragedy is not the oppression and cruelty by the bad people but the silence over that by the good people”*.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie depicted realism in most parts but it should’ve focused more on punishing the real culprits for the heinous act rather than focusing much of its time on punishing the encouragers for the offense of criminal solicitation. The devotion of time to a particular scene in the movie demonstrating the actions taken by the court towards penalising the accused persons would have had a much more impact rather than keeping it for a brief span of time. Another not so positive impact felt in the movie was how the District Attorney who was supposed to help Ms. Tobias instead interrogated her character on a number of issues, including whether she had smoked marijuana, whether she was intoxicated at the time of the assault, and whether she had ever engaged in any previous sexual activity, all of which were later answered in the affirmative. Sarah Tobias was also questioned about her attire, which implied an assessment of whether or not she was donning a provocative dress. Although these were questions an attorney would normally ask from his/her client who was a rape survivor but still it would create an impression in the mind of the viewers that somewhere or the other the victim could also be partly blamed for the said act.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

As shown in the movie "The Accused," rape victims are frequently held responsible for their own crimes. They had to be at fault in some way, right? When the crime was committed, how were they acting? How did they dress? Were they intoxicated? Do they maintain a neat and orderly personal life? So many questions arise. When a heinous crime takes place such as rape, the first question that arises is who did it and the second and most important question that follows is as

to who should be blamed? Rather than thinking a “rape as a rape” the ability of the society to judge and play the blame-game begins. The character questioning of a rape victim shows that how certain elements could impact the perception of a woman in the eyes of the society and whether or not she could also be partly blamed for the said act. Still the movie was a strong depiction that both wrong doers and inciters would be held responsible for a crime and that a person watching silently would be the guiltiest of them all. In the words of *Albert Einstein*, “*If I were to remain silent, I'd be guilty of complicity*” was the main moral of the movie.

CONCLUSION

The movie excellently portrayed how big the offense of rape is and how it affects the pride of a woman. It also displayed the societal evils faced by a rape victim and how nobody wants to associate with one because they have already labelled the victim with the “prostitute” tag. It is to be wondered as to who will find the movie more uncomfortable, men or women. The violence of the assault scenes will make both of them shudder. A truth that most women already know, however, will be revealed in the movie for the opposite gender that sexual harassment or rape is a sort of crime that isn't like various other crimes. It is one that leaves obvious scars and can make its victims feel like they can't move around freely and casually in society, whether it's done bluntly in a saloon back room or quietly in an everyday circumstance. It is a sort of confinement. Finally to conclude, it can be said that the movie was great as a courtroom drama depiction whilst showing every perspective of the crime of rape and its aftermath.



THAPPAD

Sathya Sruthi S

Symbiosis Law School, Hyderabad

INTRODUCTION

Thappad is a Bollywood movie directed by Anubhav Sinha that was released in the year 2020. The movie tells the story of a woman who is portrayed by the lead actress Tapsee Pannu whose seemingly perfect life is shattered after an incident with her husband. The film questions the norm of typical Indian society where women are made to accept their fate as housewives who have no right to question the behaviour of men and what they do. It is actually about relationships, love, how we take each other for granted, and how one's actions may seem inconsequential but might completely change relationships. This film describes and gives importance to the self-respect and dignity of a person regardless of gender, age or relation. The film also highlights that violence of any form is a crime regardless of whether it is committed by an outsider or inside your own house.

ABOUT THE FILM

Cast & Crew: The film 'Thappad' is written and directed by Anubhav Sinha under the banner of the T-series. Tapsee Pannu plays the role of the lead female actress whose name in the film is Amrita Sabharwal. The lead actor in this movie is played by the actor Pavail Gulati who portrays the character of Vikram Sabharwal who is the wife of Amrita.

The movie starts by portraying Amrita and Vikram as happily married couples who lead normal life. Amrita is a sparkling woman and a homemaker who spends her day looking after her husband and his family. The plot of the film takes a turn when Vikram slaps Amrita at a party that is hosted by them in the rage of an argument he had with his superior. Amrita no more tolerated his abuse and despite overwhelming opposition, takes on a difficult fight by filing for divorce against her husband.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

As usual, the cinema is in its quest to describe real-world phenomena.

Thappad's essence is not 'only' the slap, as the title implies, but rather the structural entitlement enjoyed mostly by men in intimate relationships. The video takes you on a trip, investigating that sense of entitlement and interrogating the societal dynamics that allow it to infiltrate intimate relationships to the point that it takes physical violence to recognize years of disrespect, insensitivity, and neglect.

From the opening scenes of the film, it is evident that the protagonist, Amrita, and her husband, Vikram, only have room in their shared lives for his hopes, ambitions, and work. The women in the house live their lives around ensuring that Vikram has all he requires. The systemic patriarchal division of labour is reproduced, with males doing 'labour' and women doing 'duty'.

Just a single slap has changed the status. Vikram just loses his temper because he did not get a promotion and this one slap has made Amrita take action against it as it was not right and not lawful, no law gives the right to men to slap women and just bring out their emotions on their wives even they apologize or it is because of love. It is only because they have some self-respect and esteem to maintain and not to lose in front of their husband.

Thappad is not about domestic violence that its title may indicate. It is rather, a critique of patriarchy in the subtlest of manner where a husband's slapping of his wife, in public or in private space, planned or in the heat of the moment, humiliates and insults not just the victim but also the victimizer. It shows him up as less than a human being because though he is shocked that his wife wants to leave home, it never occurs to him to apologize to her for his behaviour. By the time he realizes this, it is already too late. The slap is a reminder for the wife Amrita (Taapsi Pannu) that her position as wife, daughter-in-law, and so on is more a put-on than she ever imagined.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The negativity or drawback of the movie is that the screenplay though strong is a bit slow. The character of the lady lawyer who represents Amritha (Tapsee) could have been more morally strong and independent. The brevity could have been brought in many scenes instead of explaining even the nuance common things. The movie could have also given some better court scenes that would prove the significance of lawyer and a better understanding of court proceedings in family matters. The finishing of the movie may have been with little more clarity both the divorced husband and wife driving in opposite directions and both filled with tears and she asks herself so many times whether she has taken the right decision rather than being certain of her choices makes the viewers and critics at some point feel maybe it's just a slap and she could have forgone and lived a happy life which is a great flaw of the movie.

STATS AS PER UNICEF AND OTHER KNOWN WEBSITES

In India, one out of every three women is a victim of domestic violence. Fear of retaliation for reporting domestic violence is so high that the proportion could be closer to two out of every three women. For a long time, domestic violence has been accepted in Indian society.

According to a 2012 UNICEF poll, more than half of boys believe a husband would be justified in hitting his wife if she burned the food, argued with him, went out without notifying him, neglected the children, or refused sexual intercourse.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Moving into the legal aspects of Thappad has raised a great image and also suggesting at the improvements that are needed in the legal system. This film has given a law awareness to women who face different torments caused by men and others and the legal remedies available to them irrespective of category they fall as everyone is equal before the eyes of law clearly portrayed from the household servant brutally beaten up by her husband to a lawyer herself being subjected

to marital rape. Movie also showcases that law is what a prudent man wishes it to be it more about analysing taking into all evidences laid till hearing to both sides and some aspects that may not deem fit be lawful yet need to be carried on to get the right justice. Amrita (Tapsi Pannu) trying to get justice through divorce by a single slap may seem absurd but at the same time needs more than that to bring a reasonable cause for divorce. The aspect of getting maintenance despite amrita coming from a higher class is actually focused to promote awareness for women who want to fight for their rights and from an economically lower background too.

The choice of her wanting to play a fair trial despite the advice of her lawyer telling her how the legal system works is not because the legal system is flawed but because the law is not only based on facts and statements but on circumstantial evidence, witnesses, and more reasonable cause. In most cases, such women's testimonies are disregarded, and are accused of filing false cases. Marital rape which is also on a lower note in the movie showcases how a woman suffers from this torment and domestic violence yet needs evidence and brutal incidents to prove her case and marital rape is still not legalized as a crime in India.

The process of trial for divorce in India itself is very tiring and emotionally distressing. Divorce can take place either by mutual consent by both parties or by proving that either one of the parties is at fault. Due to an enormous caseload, the judiciary is unable to adjudicate contentious divorce cases in a timely or even acceptable manner.


CONCLUSION

Take away from the movie: The movie is a breakthrough in gender bias and discrimination against women. It has saliently proved that the inner emotions of all human beings be it a male, female, rich, or poor are the same if being humiliated in the presence of a gathering. The various themes of adultery, domestic violence, and marital rape are altogether shown in one movie against different sects of women from the household worker to a wife of a famous journalist.

Feel of the Movie: The movie being a simple middle-class and transited upper-class family drama, can easily relate to millions of wives as a portrait of ourselves.

Message to the Society: To a majority male-dominated Indian Society wherein slapping a wife when the husband is annoyed or angry is to be taken for granted, it's an eye-opener. The basic curtsey of apologizing or saying 'sorry' by a husband to a wife is the feeling of triumph for society. Mothers who teach their girl children to be passive, subordinative, and adjustive for the well-being of society, are also duty-bound to teach their sons to respect women. The fault of society tagging a divorced person immoral or unsuitable for the society by mere stigma.

The movie has the takeaway of permitting women to make the decision, say no, and demand respect in public and personal life. The urge to promote women to live independently, the portrayal of showing a household worker deciding her wants to a wife from a higher class with dreams wanting to follow her decisions is well shown and reveals that no matter in which class, society, the profession you belong the right to choose and make your decisions lie within herself and not anyone. The rating for this film was 4.5/5 and 8/10. The points in some ratings were low due to the whininess and lack of brevity at some scenes. Finally quoting Emma Watson "Its time we see gender as a spectrum instead of two sets of opposing ideals".



UNPACKING THE THEMES OF THE SHAWSHANK REDEMPTION: A DEEP DIVE INTO THE ICONIC MOVIE

Sanchit Sinha
NUSRL, Ranchi

INTRODUCTION

“Hope Is A Good Thing, Maybe The Best Of Things, And No Good Thing Ever Dies.”

The fast-paced development of the world has led to a busy lifestyle for individuals, causing them to neglect leisure activities. However, films and theatre have served as an escape from the monotony of daily life, offering a source of relaxation and inspiration. Moreover, movies have played a crucial role in raising awareness about social issues and promoting positive change. For example, films focusing on sports culture have seen tremendous support from viewers, especially in India. One such movie that has had a lasting impact on its viewers is “The Shawshank Redemption.” This movie provides an alternative way of thinking positively during difficult times and highlights the significance of a stable and orderly legal system. The director, Frank Darabont, has created a masterpiece that still holds relevance in today’s world, where legal issues continue to haunt the justice system. The movie is a reminder of the importance of maintaining trust in the legal system and its impact on the lives of individuals.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie’s events revolve around a well-positioned young banker named Andy Dufresne. His wife had extramarital affairs, and one night his wife and the lover were found dead, and all the

allegations went on the head of Andy as he was charged and convicted for the double-murder case for life imprisonment for two life sentences. As his failure to prove himself innocent and free of any murder charges could not come to his rescue, the law and legal system failed to do justice to Andy. He was sent to a prison called Shawshank, where the thrilling story of his willpower and hope started. Andy being a well-learned, educated and civilized person, was seen by other veterans and inmates of the prison as the last person to have a chance of survival. Over time, Andy made quite a good circle of friends with his inmates, but his friendship with Ellis 'Red' Redding grew more profound, and they started sharing a very amicable relationship.

Andy's life had stagnated, and he was a victim of brutal abuse in prison. He was brutally beaten up by a group of evil inmates who forcefully raped him and threatened to kill him if he protested. With days passing by, his life came to an eventful turn when his insight as a banker came to the notice of the prison officers who used his knowledge of taxation and banking for their interests. Sooner, Andy's position and popularity strengthened among the prisoners and he caught the eye of the Prison Warden. The latter used him to disguise and embezzle the money. Andy's selfless contribution to helping other inmates, even in such a destitute condition, made him a person of nobility among the prisoners. Sooner, he fell prey to a vicious circle of deceit and suppression from the prison warden as who started threatening him for not following his orders. Andy's plight increased even after his help to the prison official, and then came a thrilling escape of Andy from the fortified prison walls where he was incarcerated for twenty years.

His depiction of mental strength and willpower in challenging such abuse of legal powers surfaces a question that points to the judicial system's failure to do justice to the innocent. Even after their wrongful confinements, they are again pushed into the well of humiliation, abuse and harassment.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL ABUSE AND CORRUPTION

Miscarriage of justice is a prevalent issue in our society and the theme of the movie "The Shawshank Redemption" highlights the same. The movie depicts the failure of the legal system to recognize the importance of a fair and just system and how it impacts the lives of innocent individuals. The movie raises several questions about the legal system, such as the justification of life sentences and the need for substantial reforms in the legal system. The rigid laws and rules can only lead to more problems in society and the innocent individuals who are unable to provide evidence of their innocence will be the ultimate sufferers. The movie also raises questions about the purpose of imprisonment, which is not just to punish but to reform and reintegrate individuals into society. However, prolonged imprisonment and detachment from the outside world can have psychological effects on the freed individuals and become a burden on them. This issue has become a debatable topic in the debates of prison reform. In addition to the miscarriages of justice, the movie also highlights the physical and sexual abuse within the prison system. The weaker and more disturbed prisoners are often the victims of brutal beating, murder, and rape. The officials are in no position to bring solutions to these heinous crimes and the physical and sexual abuse often go unpunished. Solitary confinement is also criticized as a dehumanizing method of punishment that causes mental trauma to the prisoners. Corruption is also a prevalent issue in the legal system and when the protectors of justice are involved in corrupt activities, it

becomes difficult to trust the institutions. The movie “The Shawshank Redemption” is a powerful reminder of the importance of a fair and just legal system and the need for prison reform. The legal system must ensure that the sentence given to a prisoner is not just a punishment but also a means of rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

RELEVANCY IN THE PRESENT ERA

The movie “The Shawshank Redemption” brings to light a timeless problem that still plagues our legal system today. Despite the progress and development that our society boasts of, the root causes of injustice and corruption in the legal system have yet to be addressed. The movie’s portrayal of violence and brutality in prisons is a reflection of the reality that exists today. Gang wars, threats to the lives of inmates, and police brutality are just some of the issues that prisoners face. The excessive power given to the police and loopholes in the legal system have only worsened the situation.

Moreover, the issue of sexual abuse and rape in prisons has become a major concern in society. The position of authority that officials hold makes prisoners vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. The demand for sexual favours is a threat to the world's nobility, and the efforts to reform the system have not been satisfactory. Corruption has also brought the sanctity of the judicial and legal system to its knees, making people believe that justice can be bought and sold. This has led to the need for a deep cleansing of the corrupt officials and the revival of the public’s faith in the system. In conclusion, the movie “Shawshank Redemption” serves as a reminder of the ongoing problems in our legal system and the need for change. It highlights the importance of addressing these issues with determination and commitment so that justice and fairness can be served to all.

CONCLUSION

The movie sheds light on the numerous challenges faced by our legal system and highlights the need for people to be aware of these issues. Despite being neglected for decades, it is imperative that we address the problems within our legal framework to bring about positive social change and upliftment. However, change does not come easily and requires perseverance and a steadfast belief in the process. One major theme throughout the movie is the power of hope and belief in oneself. The protagonist, Andy, demonstrates this beautifully with his iconic line, “Remember Red, hope is a good thing, maybe the best of things, and no good thing ever dies.” Positivity and hope are essential in overcoming even the toughest of obstacles, as Andy’s unwavering belief in himself allowed him to steadily dig his way to freedom over the course of twenty years. This movie is a reminder of the great lessons in life that we often overlook in our fast-paced lives. Hope gives us the courage to face challenges and overcome them. This message has never been more relevant, especially in light of the past global pandemic of covid, where the hope of individuals and governments alike gave us a glimmer of hope for a better future. The movie touches on almost every aspect of our society that requires change and taking lessons from it can help us, as well as lawmakers, to understand the issues at hand and work towards creating a fairer and more just society.



GARGI – INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

Saloni Kothari

MMM's Shankarrao Chavan Law College, Pune

INTRODUCTION

Child sexual abuse (CSA) is a significant and an atrocious issue that affects many children in India, as well as in other parts of the world. The emotional trauma and anguish that follows sexual abuse can result in stunted growth and a range of psychological and emotional issues that some children and teenagers may never recover from. CSA is an alarmingly prevalent issue in India, with a shocking 53% of the country's children suffering from it, as reported by a study by the Ministry of Women and Child Development. Unfortunately, a substantial number of these cases go unnoticed due to societal shame and insufficient knowledge about the problem. The film 'Gargi' has meticulously acknowledged this issue with accordance to its subsequent repercussions. It plays from the perception of the accused which compels the viewers to be sympathetic towards the criminal only for the climax to be a bolt from the blue for which the audience was not prepared for throughout.

ABOUT THE FILM

The 2022 South Indian legal drama 'Gargi,' which unfurls like a gripping thriller, is under the direction of Gautham Ramachandran starring Sai Pallavi, Kaali Venkat, Aishwarya Lekshmi to name a few. The movie revolves around a girl named Gargi to whom the title owes its name to. Gargi is a school teacher who grew up in a humble and modest family. Her father, Brahmanandam, works as a security guard in an apartment building, her mother sells homemade dosa batter, and her younger sister Akshara is in middle school. Even if occasionally they struggle to make their ends meet, they are content with their life. However, their lives are thrown into chaos when Brahmanandam is accused, along with four other men, of raping a nine-year-old girl child and is taken into judicial custody. As the news started spreading in town, People began ostracizing Gargi and her family, Pelting stones at their windows and Protesting against her father . Despite this, Gargi remains determined to clear her father's name, as he has always been her hero. We see him protecting her from a abusive teacher in the past and encouraging her to stand up to evil. This incident is portrayed in flashbacks with parallel to the situation in the present to provide a rationale for Gargi's firm conviction to his father's innocence. As mentioned earlier, The family faces public backlash and consequently even a family friend, who is a successful lawyer, abandons them in fear of being defamed. However, a relatively unknown lawyer named Indrans Kaliaperumal offers to represent them, as he has nothing to lose reputation-wise. As for the trial, It was crucial to find out what he was up to from 6:00 – 6:30pm on 14th November to prove his innocence. It was in his defence that he was the first person to arrive at the location of the misdeed and he was the one who brought the girl back to her home and let her father know of the situation. During the first hearing, Indrans uncovers that the victim was mistakenly given a high dose of barbiturates, rendering her testimony inadmissible.

Later, He also learns from the victim's father that it was he who made the victim identify Brahmanandam as the culprit, despite her being in a catatonic state from trauma. This raises questions about the evidence and enables Indrans to secure conditional bail for Brahmanandam. The family was elated for the father's return. One of his friend visits the family to welcome Brahmanandam back. They spent some time together and later, the friend confesses to Gargi about what had actually happened on the day the crime was committed. Gargi starts to doubt her father's innocence when his companion unveils that he, not Brahmanandam, discovered the child first and alerted him. Gargi confirms this by showing the victim a picture of the fifth suspect. The child agitatedly confirms this person as the real culprit. This is the moment when Gargi is overwhelmed by the realization of the truth and experiences a complete breakdown. Despite dealing with the aftermath of the realization, Gargi displays maturity and rationality by assisting and supporting the girl child in identifying the fifth criminal in court. As a result, her father is found guilty and sentenced.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film manages to showcase both sides of the case with a point of view where we feel pity for the victim but can't help feeling empathetic towards the criminal due to the way he is being depicted as a sage since the beginning of the film. Perception and Conjecture illustrate a crucial role for whole of the movie. We let certain presumptions of the offender, that the movie portrays in order to make him look innocent, cloud our judgement in identifying and accepting his heinous behaviour. The movie, in addition to, addressing CSA with such a unique and peculiar outlook, also aims to underline certain social issues that prevail in our society. One such issue that is tackled in the movie is the Role of Media and how in the pursuit of being the first news channel to break the story to the world, They often impart partial or incomplete information leading to chaos and confusion not just among citizens as it might put an innocent through trail but also the court as the trial was a media trial. A particularly thrilling moment in the film worth acknowledging is when the prosecuting attorney questions the judge's competence based on her being transgender, to which she responds by saying, "I know a man's ego and a woman's pain. I am the best person for this case." This serves as a synopsis of the entire movie, as it showcases a woman's struggle to protect her father who lies to save himself out of his immodesty and to successfully get away with his abominable deed without any remorse. This movie sets a great precedent in portraying the vitality of prioritizing facts and evidences over our perception of someone based on our past experiences while evaluating one's culpability of such a monstrous crime. It is commendable how this movie is not trying to be just another social drama that is already prescribed for the spectators, Rather it allows the audience to completely absorb it and make a decision and formulate opinion of one's self.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The essence of this movie lies in the intellect and discerning power of the spectators. In my view, critiques of the film are open to interpretation and subjective. Nevertheless, I think there were some technical and societal shortcomings that could be acknowledged. Throughout the movie, Whenever the discussion of victim's experience occurs the focus is on the father of the victim, examining how he deals with the situation and how he interacts with his daughter. Granted that

the victim is a minor and her experiences are not fully explored since she may not fully comprehend what has happened, the father's behavior in the film could be perceived as controlling and manipulative at times.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Since the #MeTooMovement in 2018, people who stand for the #NotAllMen movement have often argued against feminists who say they unconditionally believe and support survivors by asking, "Even if the accused is your Family?" "Gargi is an answer to that question" Gargi's unwavering trust in her father from the start shows her determination to overcome any challenges in order to save him, highlighting our innate willingness to defend those we love when they are threatened. Upon realizing the true nature of her father, one might assume Gargi would continue supporting him as she has from the beginning. However, when she comes to terms with the fact that he is a rapist, she does not shy away from speaking out or feel ashamed. Instead, she joins forces with the survivor to bring her father to justice. That's the real acid test of her solidarity and inclination towards what's right. The film carries a powerful message, depicting the progression of our society's reality in which it takes time for us to believe the victim when the accused is one of us, but ultimately, justice prevails. The minor details depicted in the film, such as the indifference of the free legal aid center to assist the protagonist, lawyers having to take on additional employment due to a scarcity of opportunities in their profession, and attorneys withdrawing from the case out of concern for being publicly criticized, are reflective of the current reality we face. Even though they are only briefly shown, the impact of these minor details in the movie is profound, on aspiring lawyers and the general public. An issue that is also highlighted is the lingering effects that a victim of sexual violence can experience long after the incident. This can be seen through Gargi's discouragement of her younger sister from wearing yellow dresses, as she was wearing one when the traumatic event occurred. The long-term impact of sexual violence is an important aspect to understand and address, as survivors may carry this burden for years and even pass it on to future generations. It is crucial for society to provide resources and support to help survivors heal and to hold perpetrators accountable for their actions. By creating a culture of consent and respect, we can work towards preventing sexual violence and helping survivors move towards a place of healing.

CONCLUSION

The topic of sexual harassment is a delicate and sensitive matter, and when it is depicted in media, great caution and consideration must be taken. Gargi does an excellent job in portraying this issue with sensitivity and care, showing the story not just from the perspective of the victim but also from the viewpoint of the perpetrator and their family. The intention of the movie is not to generate sympathy for the guilty or their loved ones, but to present the reality of the situation and the struggle a person may go through to protect their family. It's important to understand that relying solely on emotions and disregarding admissible evidence can prevent you from accurately determining guilt or innocence in a legal case. By basing your judgment on the facts presented through proper evidence, you can ensure that the legal process is fair and unbiased.

The unique aspect of this movie is that it encourages you to form your own opinions and make judgments, only to later reveal that everything you believed may not be accurate, adding a captivating twist to the story. This is what makes the film so distinctive.



JOLLY LLB

Shubham Gupta

NMIMS, Hyderabad

INTRODUCTION

Jolly LLB is a movie which is a blend of a good court room drama and great sense of humor. It is based on Sanjeev Nanda hit & run case which happened in 1999. This movie shows the struggle of lawyers in district courts and how they desperately wait for a high-profile case to come. This movie shows the struggle of poor people in our judiciary system with its satire and also portraits the other side of the court where there is a huge number of lawyers with very less knowledge of their work. This movie shows that there is a huge gap in the lawyers' community and the sector is dominated with the few lawyers who somehow wins the case either by their skills or by their money. This article will deeply analyze the movie and tell you about all the aspects of it.

ABOUT THE FILM

Jolly is a *mofussil* lawyer in need of big-city business. Somehow, he manages to convince his girlfriend Sandhya and goes to Delhi's District and Sessions Court where he used to sit under an umbrella. Jolly was struggling for a good case in Delhi and one day he meets super- successful Tejinder Rajpal who was arguing for his rich client Rahul Dewan who was accused of a hit & run case where he killed six labourers with his land cruiser on the footpath. Later On, after reading the news and articles Jolly files a PIL against Rahul dewan for this Hit & run case. While he was struggling for witnesses and proofs a random guy meets him who was the only eye- witness for the case. After the first hearing, Jolly got to know that the eyewitness is just a trap for him, and he was working for Tejinder Rajpal. Jolly got an offer of ₹ 20 lacs for losing the case. Jolly accepts the offer and goes to his house with extreme happiness and so many questions in his mind. When Jolly's girlfriend hears all this from his mouth, she loses her temper and start shouting on Jolly and address Jolly as a broker and says, "what you are doing is not what lawyers do, this is something which brokers do". After listening all this Jolly's conscience and decides to fight the case for the labourers.

In the second half of the film, the court room trail got intense and Jolly starts fighting the case for winning. Jolly somehow manages to bring the accident video made by the police officer which shows that the accident was done by the Land Cruiser. Tejinder Rajpal comes up with a driver who confesses that the accident was done by him although in the cross examination of witness, Jolly proves that the driver is lying. When Jolly starts to investigate more, he finds out a labor who was the eyewitness of the case and tells him that the 6th person is still alive. Jolly brings up the witness to the court where initially he was denied presenting the witness but later on he gets the approval by the judge and a heated argument takes place between the judge and Tejinder Rajpal.

Tejinder Rajpal confirms with the police officer that the witness is genuine or not and he tries to put all the allegations on the police for not doing their work properly. In the end the Judge terminates the police officer and sentenced Rahul Dewan for 7 years of imprisonment.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film rightly portrays the conditions of district courts for the layman. It shows the struggle of lawyers with terms like “the lawyer who persists will surely succeed” and how district courts are overburdened with their work. It also rightly clears some major myths which were created by the typical Bollywood movies like, the lawyer has to give a prior notice before calling a witness and they just cannot call the witness without a notice, media reports are not admissible in court, cases are going on police officers themselves, how the bidding process in posting of SHO for a police station happens and how difficult it is for the lawyers to take out the evidence from police. The movie perfectly explains the concept of PIL to normal people who don't know law at all. Also, while bringing up the comedy the director keeps in mind minute details like the Hammer of the judge is called Gavel which shows that the film director had done enough research to portray the real image of the district courts with right terms. Then there were some other concepts like witness becoming hostile and big lawyers buying the small lawyers and how easy it is for the rich people to bribe the police officer and get their desired job done. Similarly, it shows the other side of the world where poor people are sleeping on roads and don't care about justice with dialogues like “the justice is very expensive for the poor people”. Overall, the movie portrays a perfect image of the society from which anyone can connect.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Although the film correctly portrays the image of court but to put some more drama they portrayed wrong image of the Judge like how the judge loses his calm and stands up and starts shouting, how the judge did not say anything while Jolly was using words like baloney and hogwash in court and how the judge allows the witness to appear without a notice. And also, to show Tejinder Rajpal as the one who can do anything as he is a big and rich lawyer, there was a scene in the end where he slaps the Sub-inspector in the court who was in uniform at that time and the Sub-inspector did not say anything and didn't even try to stop him. So, if there were no such drama in the movie to put some extra masala to the story then it could be a good courtroom thriller movie with a great humor.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

“The law maybe blind, but the judge isn't. He can see everything”. This dialogue by Justice Tripathy changed the mindset of people about the judiciary system and made people believe in the Judiciary system. Also, now there is a good Samaritan law for road incidents which came after a PIL was filed by Save Foundation when the movie was in making process. The film correctly shows how the poor people are getting suppressed with dialogues like “A poor man's life is cheaper than a rich man's car”. The movie shows how poor people don't care about justice as they find it very expensive and time taking, they are not aware of the fact that there are government lawyers who will fight their case without taking any penny, but the sad reality is that the government lawyers don't put much effort in the case as anyhow they are getting a salary from the government. In the end Jolly rightly says, even if they are poor, still, they are entitled for

justice as this right is given to them by the constitution of India and no one can take this from them.

CONCLUSION

Jolly LLB is a clever parody of India's corruptible legal system. Craftily produced, the movie is entertaining and thought-provoking to see! The script isn't particularly complex, but there's definitely room for a fantastic screenplay to flow. The narrative highlights the flaws in India's overall, fundamentally defective justice system by drawing heavily from reality. The story's obvious humour, however, continues. Since the plot is based on truth, it wouldn't be inaccurate to argue that Indian reality is in a pretty poor state. There is a small amount of "filmi drama" used, favoring emotions over logic, but if a movie can't bring about justice in India, which court will ever will? In the end it is a good court room drama movie with great behind the scenes of the court room and shows the struggle of the lawyers and the poor people in the judiciary system.



IT'S NOT ALWAYS A MAN'S FAULT

Aditi Pramanik

CMP Degree College, University of Allahabad

INTRODUCTION

“Who is going to believe you?”, “if only we too were this lucky”, “you want me to believe that a girl harassed you instead of the other way round?”, etc. etc., are some of the examples of the comments that a man is subjected to when he even dares to file a complaint against a woman for harassing him. India is a country where Article 14 guarantees right to equality to everyone irrespective of their caste, sex, religion etc. However, India is also a country which largely believes in notions of gender stereotypes and absolutely refuses to believe that a man too can be a victim in certain cases. This is the issue presented in the 2004 Bollywood movie ‘Aitraaz’. The movie successfully portrays the ridicule and the struggles that a man has to go through if he complains about sexual harassment against a woman or if a woman falsely accuses him of attempted rape charges.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie Aitraaz is about male sexual harassment and false rape charges and the struggles that a man goes through in consequence of these.

Released in the year 2004 the film is a directorial masterpiece of Abbas- Mustan produced by Subhash Ghai. Akshay Kumar plays as the protagonist Raj while Kareena Kapoor plays the role of his wife Priya. Awarded as the best villain by Filmfare awards Priyanka Chopra does justice to the role of antagonist Soniya Roy. Paresh Rawal and Anu Kapoor play supporting characters as advocates while Amrish Puri plays the part of Soniya's husband, Ranjit Roy.

The protagonist Raj is a software engineer working in ‘The Voice’ and married to Priya a lawyer. Problems arise when Raj's ex comes back in his life in the form of his boss's wife and new chairperson and Managing Director Soniya, who ultimately makes a proposition to Raj of sexual nature and on his refusal alleges him of attempted rape charges to force him to resign so that financial problems would make him agree to her demands.

Raj with the support of his wife files a case against Soniya for sexual harassment in response. Moving forward the film presents an excellent court room sequence where prosecution lawyer played by Paresh Rawal presents scathing comments and circumstantial evidences to sway the decision of the court in favour of Soniya.

Turning point in the case comes when Raj's wife Priya takes up the mantle of defence lawyer and presents some solid irrefutable evidences against Soniya which proves to be conclusive proof of Raj's innocence and Soniya's guilt.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film is an excellent portrayal of the ridicule that of a man has to go through who complains against a woman for sexual harassment and the utter shambles that his reputation is reduced to when a woman falsely accuses him of rape attempt.

Raj's everyday struggles of coming to terms with the changed perspectives of his colleagues because of the charges were compelling. The scenes of the movie where everyone advise him to just accept the allegations and compromise is on point, as similar situations do arise in real life where men have no choice other than to compromise and leave the city.

The concluding remark of the defence lawyer, Priya is the essence of the entire movie that a man can be a victim too. It's not mandatory that a man is always in the wrong, a woman can be in the wrong too.

The film presents a picture of grim reality where people today do not hesitate to wilfully misuse the laws made for their benefit if it suits them. Various reports and studies have shown that a substantial number of rape allegations and sexual assault allegations are in fact, false. Consequence of these false reports however prove to be very dire for the men in the scenario who often end up in prison or commit suicide. Even in the cases where truth comes out, much damage had already been done to the man and his family that the truth serves him no good anymore.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The film though an incredible effort towards the goal of shifting to gender neutral laws in India, however loses its thrust and devolves into a fight between a wife and a home wrecker halfway through the film.

The film would have progressed much more nicely if Soniya was not introduced as Raj's ex and was instead portrayed as a completely new character high on power, hell bent on achieving whatever she desires without paying any regard to anyone else's plight.

The glamour and spice factor of the tussle between the two female leads completely detracts the audience from the main focus of the movie which was to create awareness among them towards the issue of misuse of laws and necessity of gender-neutral laws.

The last dialogue of prosecution lawyer that is, Paresh Rawal where he commends and congratulates Raj and Priya while saying that he only lost because Raj was being defended by his wife instead of his lawyer is also somewhat misleading. The entire conversation paints the picture that Raj's innocence was immaterial and his wife's defence was the star of the show which is demotivating as it implies that the prosecution would have won the case otherwise, regardless of the truth of the matter.

Furthermore, Soniya's ambition and her choice of aborting the child in the past should not have been included in the film as it attracts the attention of some other groups which is entirely counterproductive to the issues presented by the film.

Certainly, the film should also have suggested in some fashion the changes that should be brought in the Indian legal system for curbing the presented issues.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film is beyond any doubt a first of its kind in India, that is, a film which at least addresses the issue of male sexual harassment.

India, after the decision of *Vishakha and others v. State of Rajasthan* has made great strides towards safeguarding women against sexual harassment at workplace by introducing *PoSH Act, Prevention of Sexual Harassment at workplace Act 2013*. However, all the laws and statutes only safeguards women and no one else. These statutes specifically single out men as certain culprit. These laws provide no recourse to persons of other gender facing similar issues which is disappointing. The only gender-neutral law in this regard in India is *POCSO Act, Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act* which deals with child victims only. The scenario needs to change as reports show that males and even people of other genders do face this issue and have no recourse for relief.


Even if no legal changes have taken place till now it still at the very least has made people a little more sensitive towards the problem and made them aware that there exists a problem in the first place.

CONCLUSION

I would like to quote Warren Farrell in conclusion that "sexual harassment legislation in its present form makes all men unequal to women" so, in spirit of equality it is now a high time that gender neutral laws be made. Many a country including America as well as European countries have already embraced the ways of gender-neutral laws and have been better for it. We too should start protecting humans instead of a definitive gender.

"It's not always a man's fault" is not just a phrase or claim, but a thought and an initiative to make justice available to everyone and to not vilify a gender or a class of persons.

The film 'Aitraaz' do indeed provide food for thought regarding the detrimental effects of gender biased laws and it is now our duty to ponder over the message of the movie instead of changing channels and moving on.



PHILADELPHIA: A LESSON ON THE ORDEAL OF HOMOSEXUALITY THROUGH JUXTAPOSED VALUES

Hridyanand Ojha

Institute of Law, Nirma University, Ahmedabad

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice is a dangerous sentiment that often borders on sheer contempt and blinds a man to his fellow's suffering. On a collective scale, the apathy and exclusionary attitudes it breeds can have dire consequences for the fabric of a democratic society for it presents a grave affront to persons' right to live with dignity.

'Philadelphia' is one such tale exploring the journey of two lawyers – a homosexual and a homophobe who join forces amidst a quagmire spawning from the stigma surrounding homosexuality and AIDS. Through their fight to uphold the law and justice, the film provides a glimpse into the plight of homosexuals who are denied a space in society and the far-reaching impacts it has on their everyday life and well-being.

The film evokes particular interest due to its premise and its grounded and human approach convey the responsibility we owe to all people, regardless of identity.

ABOUT THE FILM

Andrew Beckett is a promising senior associate who works at the top law firm in Philadelphia. His track record is impeccable, and he gets the biggest break of his life when he's selected to handle a most significant case for the company. However, tragedy ensues soon thereafter when a partner at the firm notices a lesion on his face, and sometime later the documents and data of the case are found missing. The Board fires him for alleged negligence and messing the case up, but Andrew recognizes that it was a conspiracy and that he was fired due to their suspicions of him having AIDS and being a homosexual. He is therefore compelled to seek help from another advocate, Joe Miller, who is a homophobe to file

a wrongful dismissal suit. Although Miller refuses at first, he is moved when he finds Andrew preparing his own case. He agrees to help Beckett, and the story delves into their legal battle and Miller's own personal journey of transformation in the background of Andrew's deteriorating health and the prevalent stereotypes around homosexuals.

The film conveys what it needs to through a very ordinary atmosphere - focusing on the passive discrimination faced by the community. This is reflected by the uneasy sideways glances shot by people at Andrew for his lesions, and the suspicious eyes reviewing him - as if searching for a way to blame him. The film is mostly subtle in displaying how homosexuals are unwelcome in public spaces, such as the library scene where Andrew is asked if he'd be 'more comfortable' in another room - although it doesn't shy away from more direct signals. Characters repeatedly, and in a very casual manner, pass derogatory and homophobic slurs and jokes - which brings out just how normalized the particular behaviour is in society and how it is deemed harmless. In contrast, it does rely on strong imagery and dialogue to convey the consequences of this behaviour on the community itself. Be it the opera scene displaying Andrew's passion, or Andrew's testimony where he collapses, the film evokes strong emotion when it needs to turn the audience around by expressing the toll this denial and mockery of their identity takes on their psyche and health. Without virtue signalling, the film contains just the appropriate elements needed.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Where the film shines is its depiction of its gay characters that dispels held stereotypes. Its portrayal of them as harmless people in need of intimacy and affection just like everybody else, while not making their sexuality its focus and also canvassing other emotions they feel such as anxiety for a loved one, appreciation of music etc. can make an otherwise prejudiced person soften up and be more receptive to them.

In this light, its central plot decision - the unlikely pair of Andrew and Joe - is particularly brilliant because it conveys the potent message that a personal affiliation with someone of a community may be able to do far more than organized activist movements to change one's opinions. It's a good display of the interplay of obedience-based social influence and informational social influence in play. In the former, people conform to certain beliefs because of commands by a higher authority, and in the latter conformity comes as it's comfortable when one doesn't know better. Miller acknowledges that he was taught right from childhood that gays behaved a certain way and shouldn't be interacted with - and due to his limited knowledge and need to obey he held those beliefs. However, as proposed by Wood, when a minority presents information not earlier known by the majority, the minority catches their attention and makes them accept their beliefs. Miller, after coming to see gays for himself, confronts a reality he wasn't privy to - altering his views for the better.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Whilst delivering its message, the film compromises on the legal battle aspect and ends up being a Courtroom drama for namesake. Joe's conduct in particular is often not befitting of the professional ethics of the field. On multiple occasions, Joe openly passes derogatory homophobic slurs and attempts to comment on the character of the witnesses and isn't rebuked by the Judge. Such behaviour would otherwise be deemed outrageous and an advocate may even have penalty imposed if not his license suspended for the same. Furthermore, Joe also fails to display any tact in proving his

case and relies far more on rhetoric and potential slip-ups from the witnesses in his favour rather than on any substantive legal argument which makes him seem an incompetent and weak protagonist in this regard. One can root for him only because he is fighting a just cause.

Further, due to being a character-driven film first, it misses out on exploring the merits of the case. This is especially evident when we're shown a time-skip and the verdict is declared and nothing is known of the reasoning through which the conclusion was reached. It leaves the impression that the judges were influenced solely by the social issue in consideration which is an inaccurate representation of the decision-making process. The film also sprinkles legal terminology and proposes interesting ideas like the prohibition of discrimination on basis of AIDS under the Federal Rehabilitation Act, and duty of disclosure to employers - but doesn't address them.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Philadelphia emerged as a cultural sensation because, while spatially, it was a reflection of the period it belonged to, i.e., the rampant spread of AIDS in the US, it ideologically transcended that boundary by turning the conversation around on homosexuality and AIDS from the usual beliefs characteristic of that time. Its success lay in the delicate balance it struck between the situation and its ambitions. At an age when these topics were deeply closeted and unanimously deemed repulsive, it addressed them in full force and did just enough to create a space of open dialogue about these issues and to prompt people to engage in the same without stretching its boldness too far.

Although criticized for being too soft on its depiction of homosexual love and reprimanding of bigoted values, it nonetheless opened the floodgates for the cinema of the future to carry forward the perspective it established. If anything, its effectiveness lay in its moderation and how simply it made people see the error of their ways for anything more self-righteous and radical would not even have seen the light of day let alone accepted and talked about disabling even a head-start onto progression.

CONCLUSION

Philadelphia ends up being an impactful Courtroom drama because it understands the reciprocity between societal values and Court judgments. Andrew's triumph over the firm reminds one that the Court is more than an institution functioning on mechanical evidences - it is aware of the lived realities of different classes of people and pays respect to that in its appreciation of the facts in order to deliver justice. Despite its failure to showcase the proceedings, one can appreciate that the Court emphasized on the discrimination done to Andrew over his duty to disclose - if he even had any - to the employer.

It also brings to the fore the fact that society develops at a pace slower than law. Laws such as the Federal Rehabilitation Act often imbibe progressive values well in advance of the time when society is ready to accept them. And as interpreters of the law, it takes the wise and discerning minds of judges to herald the ideological shift gradually by stressing the primacy of the basic rights of a person rather than falling victim to personal judgement and group conformity.

Although it lacks on the legal side, it nonetheless doesn't need technicalities for effective storytelling. In its personalized manner, it provides a chance to the audience to reflect on their values by showing the mirror to them and making them sympathize with those they exclude for indeed if the society is to be truly equal, it must come from within than being imposed by the law.



THE MOVIE – NAANDHI – IT'S SOCIO LEGAL IMPACT

Karingula Jyothsna

University College of Law, Osmania University

INTRODUCTION

NAANDHI Film was Released on 19 February 2021, Naandhi opened to highly positive reviews. The film is a commercial success, grossing over ₹9.5 crore at the box office. A Hindi remake has been announced with Ajay Devagon as the lead under the production of Dil Raju.

Producer 'Naandhi' Satish Varma won SIIMA 2022 Best Debutant Producer

Award (Telugu category) for Naandhi And also Sakshi Excellence Jury Special Recognition Award 2021 has been awarded to producer 'Naandhi' Satish Varma for the movie Naandhi on 21st Oct 2022.

Through films so many directors created a legal awareness to the public to know the laws better.

The film speaks about importance of Section 211 of Indian Penal Code.

Not everyone who is accused of doing a crime is guilty of doing it. But how does one determine the truth? What happens when the fate of a man, who is accused of murder ?

ABOUT THE FILM

Surya Prakash is an honest software engineer, living with his parents. His only aim is to fulfil the dreams of his parents, which they sacrificed for his upbringing. Soon, Surya gets engaged to Meenakshi. Meanwhile, tensions arise in the state, after the death of an honest and truthful lawyer Rajagopal. The police are under immense pressure to arrest the murderer. The in-charge of the case, CI Kishore, pulls Surya into the case, arresting him by falsely accusing him of killing Rajagopal. This is after he gets a contract, worth 10 lakhs INR, which Surya actually took as a loan, for buying a house. Kishore creates and plants fake evidence. Surya is astonished as all the people, who can prove Surya's innocence, turn hostile, after being threatened by Kishore. Surya becomes an undertrial prisoner and Kishore tortures him to make him accept the crime, but Surya stands his ground. Surya's parents murder turned suicide, devastates Surya. At the funeral ground, Kishore reveals that he lightened the matchstick. Surya becomes infuriated and beats up Kishore, due to which he is charged with another case. Helpless, Meenakshi leaves Surya and ends their relationship.

After four years, Surya's case is still in court and he is a broken man. He meets Radha Prakash, a controversial YouTube star and narrates his story. Later, Advocate Aadhya comes forward and succeeds in bailing Surya, but Surya brutally thrashes up some imprisoned goons, who beat him up, with no reason, as per Kishore's plan. Surya again ends up in jail. Radha Prakash is revealed to be Aadhya's brother, and he recorded the incident, in which the goons mistreated Surya. The video gets uploaded on the Internet, resulting in a Human Rights Officer meeting Surya in jail. Upon Surya's

request, his case goes to the Fast Track High Court, with Aadhya as his defence Lawyer. Aadhya proves Surya's innocence and he is acquitted of the accusations. Aadhya and Radha Prakash are revealed to be Rajagopal's prodigies. Surya decides to take revenge on Kishore, using IPC Section 211. Satyamurthy becomes Kishore's defence lawyer, for the case. Surya abducts Chandraiah, Kishore's assistant, who testified against Surya in Rajagopal's murder case. Chandraiah reveals that Kishore bribed two goons to kill Rajagopal, but upon pressure from the opposition party, he decided to capture them.

The goons learned of the truth and escaped, which caused Kishore to pull Surya into the case, using a co-incidence as evidence. Chandraiah accepts to reveal the truth in court, but he is kidnapped by the henchmen of ex-home minister Naagender, who is revealed to be the mastermind behind Rajagopal's murder. Aadhya requests the judge to give them more time and he accepts. Chandraiah is killed by Kishore, who fakes a report that he died in riots. Aadhya and Surya find out that Naagender ordered Kishore to kill Rajagopal. Before Rajagopal's death, five years ago, Naagender's land scandals was brought to light by the government. To divert the media's attention, Naagender got Rajagopal killed, because of his popularity and good image amongst the people and in the state. Aadhya and Surya nearly succeed in exposing Naagender and request permission to tap Naagender's phone calls, to prove him guilty. A night before the court appearance, Surya is kidnapped by Naagender, who blackmails Aadhya to withdraw the case, but upon being inspired by Surya, Aadhya carries on with the prosecution. Though injured, Surya successfully frees himself, defeating Naagender's henchmen. He reaches the court, where he is admitted to the hospital and is saved from his injuries. Naagender and Kishore are successfully proven to be guilty, by Aadhya. They receive a life imprisonment and death penalty, respectively.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

There are many scenes that got right with the film, from excellent screenplay to wonderful performances by all the actors. The thing which I found most interesting is the discussions around the case engaged the audience throughout the film. The film marked long lasting impact in the society when the hero availed Defense counsel from the Legal aid service. This is one of the things that every common man should be aware of about legal services or things. It's not necessarily every one's financial position should be supported to keep an advocate. But law provides the legal service free of cost.

Now everyone in the society comes to know that there is a section called 211 of IPC which indeed helps them to complaint against the person who intentionally caused hurt and made false allegations on them making them suffer physically and mentally. Claiming for call recordings, the defence lawyer quotes the case of *Suresh Kilmadi v. CBI*, which is a land-mark judgement in that aspect. The film indeed shows deep research, as every statement made in a courtroom actually makes sense and in many ways resembles the actual court scenario. The witness presence in a dharna where lati charge done and his spectacles broken, was also spotted by the defence counsel with a keen observation on all the evidences gathered helps the audience to trust on the advocate and legal proceedings constituted. This enlarging the legal support given to the accused and creates a trust on law to the public with transparency all over. Though police brutality shown towards common man, at the end justice prevailed over evil. The dialogues were quite appreciable as at one instance it was written "IPC was made not just to punish the offenders, but also to meet the ends of justice as well". The defense counsel tried to question every aspect of the case and through discussion goes on to change everyone

else's opinion on the case by establishing hero's innocence by providing an alternative explanation to each circumstance in the courtroom.

WHERE THE FILM GOT WRONG

Section 211. False charge of offence made with intent to injure.—Whoever, with intent to cause injury to any person, institutes or causes to be instituted any criminal proceeding against that person, or falsely charges any person with having committed an offence, knowing that there is no just or lawful ground for such proceeding or charge against that person, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both; and if such criminal proceeding be instituted on a false charge of an offence punishable with death, [imprisonment for life], or imprisonment for seven years or upwards, shall be punishable with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, and shall also be liable to fine.----- though the police knows it very well about the sections they continues to gather false evidences of small size shirt, knife without any fingerprints of accused etc. when they provided in courtroom. Secondly, as in film it shows the 3 incidences the accused is followed the human activist the deceased, cannot be called as evidence in real life. Thirdly, the harassment towards the hero's parents and murder of them showing it as suicide is not admissible under any law.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

If we speaks about the positive socio-legal impact on the film, Sentiment plays a vital role in the film as hero bought gifts to parents on his first salary received. This is a thin layer between every parent and children which internally connects them. It also shows one should control anger and include patience as a habit in their lives. A friend in need is a friend indeed. The film speaks about childhood friendship too which stays with us life long. Throughout movie tragedy emotions carried out as the main lead lost job, parents, financial and social status., etc. this memorise the audience Russia Ukraine war which losts financial, social, lifes of many people in the preceeding country. Likewise it was heart touched to the audience. Moreover, it shows how news is manipulated, it shows how new stories in news makes us forget the old ones which in any sense should not be ignored. As there is a saying today's newspapers are tomorrow's waste papers, the news became too. But, as the days passed by no one seemed anymore interested in the news as it became old. All the rules of law is equal to all whether it's a common man or a politician or a police official. These shows transparency and justice still prevails in the legislative, which makes an individual to step up the doors of court at times with no hesitation and fear. All are equal before Law.

CONCLUSION

All are equal before law whether rich or poor, whether great official or common personnel. Let's light such small flames that increase the good instead of sitting and criticizing the darkness around us. We should take inspiration from the lives of such people. Such things will teach our youth moral values. Law is made to provide justice, maintain public order and safety in the society. Though some of them tend to misuse the law by making false allegations. Beating the accused to make him obey that the crime was done by him falsely constitutes the police inefficiency to rightly catch the culprit. 'Section 211' is not just a remedy for a common man, but his right to plead the court to punish the actual offenders and those who have put false acquisitions on him no matter who he is. Under civil law also the person can file suit for damages under order 7 rule 1 CPC (civil procedure code) for the loss beared.



NO ONE KILLED JESSICA: INJUSTICE TO JUSTICE

Ring Baliyan
CCS University, Meerut

INTRODUCTION

In the words of famous philosopher and jurist John Rawls, Justice as fairness provides us what we want. It has no social indicators and thus it is not so easy to define.

No one killed Jessica as a movie has painted the picture of justice in a male driven society by a woman. The film was released in 2011 when there were not enough female led films. The movie is based on the high profile murder case of Jessica Lal by an influential politician's son. The victim was denied speedy and fair trial due to witnesses turning hostile and evidence tampering. Raj Kumar Gupta, the film's director has remarked that cinema is not created in vacuum. Real is reel and reel is real.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film 'No one Killed Jessica' is the struggle of a sister in seeking justice. The case which appeared to be just an open & shut case turns out to be a massive surge among the public which no one has seen before. The journey of Jessica's sister played by Viday Balan is characterised in the most sensible manner as she has been helped by a journalist who is played by Rani Mukherjee.

A nuclear family of 4 survived by two daughters Jessica and Sabrina, where Jessica is an extrovert who landed a job, and was planning to move to Dubai. The film has a lot of realism. A mother lost her daughter, sister lost her sibling as Jessica was shot dead from point blank range by a drunken brat, who has got political affiliation in the country. He shot her because she, "a bartender", refused to provide drinks to him and his friends, who were sons of politicians, at a high profile party in New Delhi. Sabrina goes door to door seeking justice for her sister. In the party of 300 people, only 7 people came to accept that they were at the party when the murder happened.

After 6 long years of court battle, the suspect got scot free and the case was closed. It seems justice died then and there. But Sabrina fights back and then Meera, a journalist who is played by Rani Mukherjee comes to the light and conducts a sting operation on the witnesses who were hostiled by the politicians. People were engaged and this case was again given the voice of Unity. Taking *suo motu* cognizance of the matter it was appealed in the Delhi High Court and fast tracked. Later the murderer who was acquitted was convicted and justice was served to the Lal family. However, both the parents of Jessica were no more alive to relish the verdict. There's a delight of justice and fairness in the country.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

As brought out by Jurist of historical school, Savigny, law is an expression of general will of the people. If the deliberate action of the law goes beyond the general will, then, in such a case, People have got the power to overthrow the person in authority. The powerful dialogue and strong screenplay is something that is to be appreciated about this movie. As stated by Vidya Balan “pistol in his hand and power in his head”, “who is he to decide that someone's life is cheaper than a glass of his drink”. The film has clearly pointed out how high class society in metro cities like Delhi are eager to buy anything with money. They try their best to buy justice at the cost of other's lives and dignity. Indeed, justice is not that low-price.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Sadly, we don't see much interaction between two lead characters i.e Rani mukherjee and Vidya Balan. In the initial stages it is Sabrina who leads the story. In the latter half of the movie the media dramatised it too much, which could have been kept tight rope. The movie went wrong when it came to a media trial. There is no such thing as a media trial, because the word is a misnomer here, trial can happen only in court and not in a media house. Nevertheless, in the end, the media plays its part in helping to get justice to Jessica's family.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Power should be in the hands of people and not select few. This can make people voiceless and they would be oppressed at the hands of the wealthy and elite. In democratic country like ours, the power lies in the hands of the people.

The issue of eye witness turning hostile, would not only impair the case of prosecution drastically but also deny justice to the victim. This would cause unjust acquittal of suspects and this is nothing but an insult of the investigative process.

Another issue that has been pointed out in this movie is Evidence- Tampering. It is an act where the person either alters or conceals or destroys the evidence with the clear intention to interfere with the law- enforcement agency.

Also, the movie highlighted the fact how our judiciary is overburdened and stretches the case for 6 long years.

CONCLUSION

In nutshell, the movie is the full “Bang-for-the-buck” as the infamous miscarriage of justice has been wonderfully dramatised by the director. The movie begins with song playing in the background humming how the city Delhi, metaphorically extends to wealthy fumes of power that erupts from every corner of the city no matter which turn you take, you are bound to fall in its ambit. No matter, Legislators, executors and adjudicators all lie in corollary also, the rule breakers.



SECTION 375

Advait Sharma

National University of Advanced Legal Studies, Kochi

INTRODUCTION

Rape is a pervasive issue in India that affects individuals of all ages, backgrounds, and ethnicities. Despite efforts to prevent and address sexual violence through legislative and policy measures, the number of reported cases continues to rise. The problem is compounded by a culture of victim blaming, inadequate support for survivors, and an ineffective justice system. The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the situation by leading to an increase in incidents of domestic violence and child abuse. However, the issue of rape in India extends beyond just the perpetration of sexual violence, as it is often misused for purposes such as blackmail, revenge, and settling personal or political scores. False accusations of rape can have devastating consequences for the accused, leading to ruined reputations, careers, and even vigilante justice. This problem undermines efforts to address actual sexual violence, discrediting the seriousness of the crime, misleading public opinion, and detracting resources and attention from survivors. The situation of rape in India remains a pressing concern and requires immediate attention from government, civil society, and stakeholders.

ABOUT THE FILM

"Section 375" is a 2019 Bollywood movie that explores the legal definition of rape in India and the impact it has on the lives of the victim, the accused, and their families. The film is named after Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code, which defines rape and sets out the punishment for the crime. The movie highlights the difficulties that arise in prosecuting rape cases, particularly when it comes to proving lack of consent. It also touches upon the societal stigma and discrimination that rape victims often face, and the pressure they may face to keep silent about the crime. The movie has had a significant socio-legal impact in India by raising awareness about the complexities of the law and the justice system when it comes to rape cases. It has also sparked important discussions and debates about the need to reform the legal definition of rape and to provide better support and protection for rape survivors. Overall, "Section 375" is a thought-provoking film that sheds light on the socio-legal challenges faced by rape victims and the need for a more just and equitable system that is better equipped to handle such cases.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

As per watching the movie, it presented almost what the ground reality is case is put on trial. These four points were approximately same of what happens in a real courtroom when a case is put on trial i.e., -

- Ambit of Section 375 – From the proceedings in the movie, in the session court, it was seen that the Hon'ble judge stated *"statement of victim is enough to prove the conviction if it inspires the*

courts confidence”, here the medical report and DNA report confirm the same charging the accuse with imprisonment of 10 years within the ambit of section 375 IPC.

- Constitutional right of convicted accuse – It can be challenging for lawyers to represent individuals accused of rape, as they may face societal pressure and accusations of defending the wrong person. However, it is a fundamental right of the accused to receive a fair and proper legal defence. This film showcases a woman using the law for her advantage rather than it being used as a means of protection. Despite the changing political correctness, providing a legal defence for the accused remains a constitutional obligation.
- Exception of basic legal foundation – whenever any proceeding is taken up in the court of law, the burden of proof is always on the prosecution but section 375 refutes the same idea as the burden of proof is on the accused.
- Abuse of Power - The movie sheds light on the harsh reality of police officers abusing their authority and disregarding proper legal procedures. As depicted in the film, the First Information Report was recorded at 1:00 pm without the presence of a female officer, and the suspect was arrested at 7:00 pm, revealing a delay of 6 hours. During this time, the police officer made a phone call to the suspect, attempting to settle the matter for a large sum of money. The police also unlawfully took the suspect's mobile phone without a court-issued warrant, contaminating and tainting the evidence.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

In the Indian legal system, the principle of precedents plays a crucial role. It refers to the practice of courts following the decisions made in similar cases in the past, especially by higher courts. This principle helps to maintain consistency and fairness in the administration of justice. When a case is presented before a court, the judge(s) may consider the precedents set in previous cases to guide their decision-making process. However, in the movie, the judge is shown to have a different approach to the principle of precedents. The judge declines to follow a previous decision made by the same judge in a similar case, stating that he does not believe in the philosophy of "one size fits all" decisions. This means that the judge believes that each case should be treated as unique and evaluated on its own merit, rather than relying on previous decisions in similar cases. It's important to note that while the principle of precedents is an established practice in the Indian legal system, there is room for judges to interpret and apply it differently. Some judges may adhere strictly to previous decisions, while others may give more weight to the unique circumstances of each case. Ultimately, the interpretation and application of the principle of precedents is subject to the discretion of the individual judge.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film "Section 375" presents an accurate representation of the current state of rape trials in India and raises important questions about preconceived notions and biases regarding such cases. It highlights the difficulties and complexities of the laws and procedures surrounding Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code. Through the appeal in the High Court, the film demonstrates how defence counsels can manipulate evidence to argue for consent, but the victim still wins the case. The film indirectly raises the need for reforms in the definition of rape and the procedures involved in such cases, with the aim of creating stronger laws to prevent future incidents. In terms of socio-legal impact, the film

has been praised for raising awareness about the significance of consent in sexual relationships and the requirement for a just and impartial legal system that protects both victims and accused. The film has sparked meaningful debates and discussions on social media and other forums about the issue of sexual assault and the role of the law in addressing it.

CONCLUSION

"Section 375" is a crime-thriller film that delves into the Indian Penal Code's Section 375, which defines the offense of rape. The film brings to the forefront the challenges faced by the Indian legal system in determining the truth in cases of sexual assault. Through its complex and nuanced portrayal of the characters, the movie shows the conflicting perspectives of both the accused and the accuser, and the impact that societal norms and biases have on the administration of justice. One of the key themes explored in the film is the question of consent and the extent to which it is given and understood. The movie shows how power dynamics can shape the understanding of what constitutes consent and raises important questions about the need for clear communication in sexual encounters. The film also highlights the challenges faced by survivors of sexual assault in seeking justice, including the stigma and trauma that they face. In addition, the film sheds light on the role of the media in shaping public opinion and influencing the outcome of legal cases. Through its portrayal of the media circus that surrounds the case, "Section 375" highlights the need for responsible journalism that focuses on the facts and evidence rather than sensationalizing the story for the sake of clicks and ratings. Overall, "Section 375" is a well-made film that provides a nuanced and balanced view of the complexities of the Indian legal system and the challenges faced by survivors of sexual assault. The film serves as a thought-provoking commentary on the state of the Indian justice system and the need for reforms to ensure that all individuals receive a fair and impartial trial.



MIMI

Leesha Goyal

National University of Advanced Legal Studies, Kochi

INTRODUCTION

Mimi movie has released in 2021 and it is based on the surrogacy and surrogate mother problems and challenges. Surrogacy means it is a practice in which the women agree to give birth to a child on behalf of another person or couple. The women who give birth to child is surrogate mother. In India surrogacy regulation act,2021 is prevailing to deal with the surrogacy matter. There are two types of surrogacies:

1. **Altruistic surrogacy:** It involves no monetary compensation to the surrogate mother other than the medical expenses and insurance coverage during the pregnancy.
2. **Commercial surrogacy:** It includes surrogacy or its related procedures undertaken for a monetary benefit or reward (in cash or kind) exceeding the basic medical expenses and insurance coverage.

Surrogacy provides hope to those persons who cannot be become a parent, to become a parent.

ABOUT THE FILM

John and Summer are an American couple who cannot conceive. They visit Rajasthan in search of a surrogate mother. Upon meeting local dancer and aspiring actress Mimi Rathod, they feel she would be a perfect surrogate for their child. They convince local taxi driver Bhanu Pratap Pandey to recruit Mimi to be their surrogate, with a promise of ₹20 lakh. Mimi, who wishes for stardom in Bollywood and goes to Mumbai but doesn't have the financial means required to chase her dreams, agrees after initial hesitation. The IVF procedure succeeds and Mimi becomes pregnant with John and Summer's child. In order to hide the pregnancy from her parents, Mimi lies to them that she is going to Mumbai for 9 months for the shoot of a film. She starts living with her friend Sharma. Bhanu is asked by John and Summer to take care of Mimi during her pregnancy. After 7-month a routine check-up reveals that Mimi's unborn child has down syndrome, leaving John and Summer devastated. They abruptly leave for USA, saying they don't want the baby anymore and suggest Mimi to abort it. Disheartened, Mimi rejects the idea of abortion and decides to carry the child to term. Visibly pregnant now, Mimi returns home and lies that the child belongs to Bhanu when asked about its father, causing more problems as Bhanu's wife lives in Delhi who hasn't seen him for months. Mimi gives birth to a healthy boy Raj, revealing the earlier test result was false and also evoking curiosity and bafflement among people because of the child's fair skin, which didn't resemble his supposed biological parents, making him a locally adored wonder. When Bhanu's family shows up in Rajasthan, confusion and chaos ensue. Eventually, Mimi comes clean about the surrogacy and her family accepts the child. She becomes deeply attached to Raj, giving up her Bollywood aspirations to care for him. After 4 year Raj has grown up as a kid, doted upon by

Mimi's parents and also attracting attention and sometimes bullying from his schoolmates for his 'different' looks. John and Summer return to India after seeing a video of Mimi and Raj on Facebook. They say that they've changed their mind and want to take Raj back to America. Mimi confronts Summer, saying Raj is her child now, and refuses to give him back. However, John threatens legal action as Mimi had signed surrogacy contract and has no legal right over Raj as long as she was paid for her services. Bhanu and Mimi's parents prepare to fight it out in court, but Mimi rejects this notion and decides to give Raj back to John and Summer as she doesn't want Raj to face the struggle of court cases. On the day of John and Summer's flight back to America; Mimi, Bhanu, and her family meet the couple to send Raj off with them but are surprised to see John with a child Tara, who summer claims as their daughter. It is revealed that while coming back from Mimi's house, they came across an orphanage and felt a connection with Tara, who they saw crying from behind the orphan gate, and adopted her. Summer explains how after seeing Mimi with Raj, she realized parenthood has nothing to do with blood but everything to do with love and care. They leave Raj with Mimi and her family, recognizing he is her son in every practical sense and belongs with her.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

- **It aware people with surrogacy:** through this movie many people who doesn't know that surrogacy is also a method by which they can become parents they also get knowledge about this method. This movie also aware people with the feeling of surrogate mother means to become surrogate mother is not easy they suffer many social problem and society at every point of time taunt them.
- **It show women freedom of expression and speech:** as above mention Mimi take decision to become a surrogate mother by self this show her freedom of expression and speech which is secured under article 19 of Indian constitution and inspire many women to take own decision even that decision also for which society criticize them.
- **It appreciate the women empowerment:** as Mimi take that decision to become Bollywood actress that inspire many women top work for her dream and achieve it.
- **It shows women liberty:** Mimi live her life as her own wish as she is a bar dancer many people taunt her for this still she live her life according to her wish
- **Supportive family:** when American couple left the baby then in this situation her family give to much support and adopt that child as their child.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

- **It promotes commercial surrogacy:** It includes surrogacy or its related procedures undertaken for a monetary benefit or reward (in cash or kind) exceeding the basic medical expenses and insurance coverage. As Mimi ready to become surrogate mother in return of money. In India commercial surrogacy is ban only altruistic surrogacy is allow means only those women can become surrogate mother who is ready without any monetary interest because if there is any monetary interest present then there may be chance that women get influence with that amount and this consent is not consider as free consent that is why commercial surrogacy is ban in India.

- **Movie get wrong when American couple abandon child:** when American couple knew that the child has some syndrome then they abandon that child and Mimi deliver and nurture the child alone with her family but when the American couple became aware that the report is false then they return back to bring that child but child deny to go with them. this scene give wrong message to public as if surrogacy child have some abnormality then abandon it .

SOCIO - LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

After this movie the parliament pass the surrogacy regulation act 2021 and in this act they make many provisions regarding surrogacy. This act apply on whole country. This act contains 54 section which is related to surrogacy. This act give many provision like

- Prohibition and regulation of surrogacy clinics
- Regulation of surrogacy and surrogacy procedure
- Registration of surrogacy clinics
- It forms national reproductive technology and surrogacy board and state assisted reproductive technology and surrogacy boards
- It gives provision of appropriate authority.
- It gives provision for the offences and their penalties.
- It gives other power to the authorities under this act

Through this government prohibit the abundance of child parent have accept the child even if the child has abnormality if they do not accept child then this is consider as offence and they will punish for them. and this act also prohibit the commercial surrogacy in India and if still women so commercial surrogacy then they will punish with imprisonment which may extend to 5 year and with fine which may extend to 5 lakh rupees for the first offence and for subsequent offence with imprisonment which may extend to 10 year and with fine which may extend to 10 lakh rupees.

CONCLUSION

This movie is good as this give very much information about the surrogacy. Surrogacy is a process in which one women get ready to give birth child for the another couple who do not become a parents and want to become a parents. In India only altruistic surrogacy is allow means women can surrogate mother without any monetary interest only medical compensation is provide to women and in India commercial surrogacy is prohibit whoever do this surrogacy then they will punish and the child from this consider legitimate child of that couple. Surrogacy should always do with the consent of women if any women has forced to become a surrogate mother, then it considers as cruelty to them and that person may get the punishment for this.



ANKUR ARORA MURDER CASE

Kiran Singh

Chanakya National Law University, Patna

INTRODUCTION

The film centres on a young patient's death brought on by medical malpractice and the victim's mother's fight for her son's right to justice. The film's unique proposition is that the makers have chosen an important subject which concerns everyone. It is based on a critical and correct issue. We all face medical negligence at some point in our life or our family members go through such unsavoury experiences. Whenever this issue is talked about, someone or the other begins narrating his or her own story. People can relate to it. The movie can help commoners get a better perspective of medical malpractices.

Apart from pointing out the complexities of the medical profession, the film has an emotional quotient too as a mother loses a child. Makers have raised moral and ethical questions through the film. It is based on true events and tries to bring attention to the distressing problem of fatalities brought on by medical malpractice. Medical Negligence is a serious issue and has not been discussed well in the society. This movie focuses on this issue and tries to raise awareness.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie opens with a young doctor voicing the *Hippocratic* oath.

The next scene introduces Dr V. Asthana, who is an excellent and renowned surgeon. He is shown to save the life of a business tycoon after a life-threatening accident. This is covered by the media bringing the doctor and the hospital tons of fame and applauds. Romesh Sharma, a young medical intern who dreams big, is the young physician. He is a man of principles and lives true to the Hippocratic oath. Dr Asthana is his inspiration. But he soon realises the horrible truth that a good surgeon is not always a good person.

Nandita Arora, Ankur's mother, admits Ankur in the hospital on the advice of Dr Romesh. The eight-year-old was suffering from appendicitis and had to be operated. During the operation, however, Dr Asthana forgets to use the rice tube to empty the boy's stomach. This causes the boy to vomit food after the surgery because of which his respiratory system collapses, and he falls into a comatose state. A few days later, he passes away.

Dr Romesh, along with Nandita Arora, her friend Ajay Shetty, their attorney Kajori Sen, embark on a tumultuous battle for justice against his mentor, the hospital, and the love of his life. The first witness that Romesh and Kajori present is the ward nurse Rosina. She had prepared the report of Ankur before

the surgery and had also informed Dr Asthana about the boy not being “nbm” or “nothing by mouth” or an empty stomach. Ankur had eaten a few biscuits an hour before the surgery. When she brought in court, however, she refuses to acknowledge the same.

The next evidence that the quartet finds are the vomit traces on a silk thread that Ankur was wearing during the operation. The thread had the DNA samples of Ankur. Romesh informs that had Ankur vomited before the operation, the same would have been mentioned in the report. He could not have vomited after the operation as he had fallen into coma. Therefore, the only time he could have vomited would be during the operation. This would have proven the claims of Nandita against Dr Asthana. They send the samples to a Forensic Lab. However, every piece of supporting documentation against Dr Asthana was stolen outright.

Dr Riya, who witnesses the operation also gives false evidence in court. With a guilty conscience she decides to resign. She and Dr Asthana then engage in a debate in which Dr Asthana declares himself to be the God who should be absolved of his transgression. It is revealed in the hospital the next day that Riya had shot the confession outburst by Dr Asthana on her mobile and presented it to the court.

They win the case, and Dr Asthana is placed under custody. Romesh and Riya are seen reuniting in the final scene, and Nandita is shown recalling her past with Ankur.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The movie has been excellently filmed and all the actors were remarkable at carrying out their roles. The actors softly touch the hearts of the audience. They are particularly successful in evoking sympathy for the young victim’s mother. The entire medical premise of its plot, as well as the courtroom proceedings is a true masterpiece that exposes the obscenely selfish aspects of this noble profession. Seeing a reputable doctor conduct a little procedure with a distracted attention span and excessive confidence that results in uncontrollable negative outcomes makes the viewers nervous. It even makes you wonder if have we also lost this wonderful, God-like profession in our blind society’s current drive for money? However, the movie tries to restore the faith in the medical profession by portraying Dr Romesh who is willing to go to any lengths to live up to his profession and Hippocratic oath. Faith is also restored in the legal system when Dr Asthana is sentenced to imprisonment.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The director makes mistakes while putting the heart-breaking story on film. The excessive dramatization and over-the-top, naive conversations make it difficult for viewers to fully engage with the film’s emotional content. The screenplay is written in a disorganised manner, and the editing might have used a little tidier work.

The climax follows the overly used weapon in Bollywood. Bollywood propagates that there was no longer a need for the police to hide behind the curtains at the bad guy’s home after video cameras became commonplace. Sting operations got simpler and the villain’s confessions could be broadcast live after cameras started coming standard on phones. In this movie too, the villains sent henchmen to erase that proof the heroes worked hard to obtain. And they were successful. Hence, in order to meet justice, the hero only needed to urge his companion to shoot a confession from the villain. And his plan is also successful as Dr Riya records a confession of Dr Asthana on her mobile phone, which

serves as ultimate evidence. This is unrealistic depiction of how law and life altogether actually function.

Although not a terrible movie, it is certainly disappointing. The film is a spiced-up version of a true story about a child who died as a result of medical malpractice. The second half of this drawn-out film drags on far too long, killing whatever high the first half had generated. A shaky writing and uncertain climax do irreparable harm to the movie.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

In our country, we choose to enjoy a dream world with some action, dance, and music, starring our favourite actors, rather than to see or discuss the real problems. Because of this, neither the exhibitors nor the audience are interested in investing much time in unconventional ventures. To put it bluntly, they do not want to WASTE their time on movies that are so deep, didactic, and socially significant. The makers should be applauded for having the vision to finance such a movie for a market that has a reputation for being distant and discouraging this type of filmmaking for the past few decades.

For a legal perspective, recently, there has been a rise in patient rights awareness in Indian society. The recent surge in lawsuits alleging compensation for suffering brought on by medical malpractice, tainted consent, and confidentiality breaches resulting from the doctor-patient relationship makes this trend obvious. However, most Indians are still unaware what medical malpractice is and that it is a punishable offence. This movie adds to the prevailing situation by spreading awareness about the subject.

The movie also raises two intriguing medical issues:

1. What are the risks of having surgery while still having food in your stomach?
2. Is it considered medical malpractice when a doctor performs a surgery even if they are aware that the stomach is not empty?

The movie's climax provides an answer for the audience.

CONCLUSION

Additionally, sometimes the errors they make are so harmful that the patient must deal with issues and endure excruciating discomfort. The use of equipment and medical tools in the health care industry should be done with due care and caution because it could result in a consumer damage, which could then lead to a complaint being filed against the doctors and the other authorities concerned. However, there is no law that can hold the makers of such defective equipment responsible for the losses.

Due to certain significant medical malpractice incidents where patients were permanently crippled, people are losing faith in the medical profession. For the medical industry, some serious reflection and analysis are necessary. In terms of self-governance, it has failed totally. It is necessary to establish and change medical ethics in order to practise absolute righteousness.



ONE RATIONAL MAN V/S. 11 ANGRY MEN

Nitin Kishore

National Law University, Jodhpur

INTRODUCTION

K N Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra (1962) popularly known as India's last jury trial, made its way into pop culture through multiple Bollywood movies such as *Rustom* (2018). However, jury trials have existed for time immemorial, and continue to exist in the west. It remains one of the most hotly contested legal proceedings, and has garnered centre-stage in legal discourse given the recent jury trials of Kyle Rittenhouse (Homicide) and Johnny Depp vs Amber Heard (Defamation).

Jury trials are seen as a mechanism to ensure checks and balances, thus an integral part of the democratic ideal, but whether they carry merit is another contentious issue, this article won't be delving into. Rather, this piece will analyse the process of a jury trial and how the jurors deliberate to arrive at their judgement in the United States with reference to a film.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film chosen for the same is '12 Angry Men' (1957), a Hollywood classic directed by Reginald Rose. It laid the groundwork for all successive successes of courtroom/ legal dramas in pop culture such as 'Law and Order', and 'Suits'. The impassioned turmoil and the symbolism of the criminal justice system, gave the film a long life span and thus it is still revered as one of the most gripping plots and storyline despite having a short run time.

The film is set in the mid-20th century on a hot summer day in New York, where a jury of 12 men are holed up in a room, to decide the case of a young boy who is alleged to have murdered his father. The movie begins with the judge outlining the basic guidelines the 12 jurors need to abide by and the responsibilities they possess. The judge emphasises that if they find the alleged guilty, he would be penalised with a death sentence, and if they chose to find him not guilty, he would be acquitted, there was no middle ground. Regardless, the verdict had to be unanimous.

When the foreman (the head juror) takes the preliminary vote, juror #8 is the lone holdout against the reflexive vote to hold the kid guilty. As the deliberation progresses, slowly each of the other jurors fall in line like a domino chain as further inferences are brought to light. In essence, this courtroom drama is all about a story where one man with the skills of rational thinking and persuasion, changes the opinion of the other 11 jurors to find the boy not guilty on the account of the murder of his father. Juror 8 achieves this through critical examination of the facts and evidence, going beyond the superficial layer and not taking everything at face value.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The most fundamental aspect the film gets right, is what kind of individuals serve on the jury. The film highlights a diverse jury panel, with multifaceted personalities, coming from different backgrounds; it's hardly an amalgamation of like-minded perspectives.

Secondly, right from the very beginning the concept of reasonable doubt is reiterated i.e. if the jurors unanimously seem to have even reasonable doubt that the alleged might not have been the murderer, they will have to find the defendant not guilty, even if they aren't entirely convinced. These exact seeds of reasonable doubt are carefully sown in the minds of the other jurors by Juror #8 throughout the course of their deliberations.

The third legal principle, accurately highlighted in the film, is one of the "Burden of Proof". In a case of homicide, the prosecution has the burden to prove that the defendant is the one true murderer and not vice versa (reverse onus isn't applicable). They need to prove this beyond reasonable doubt through undisputed evidence, valid testimonies and persuasive arguments. The evidence presented by the prosecution such as the knife (alleged murder weapon) and testimony of the lady across the street, the old man upstairs - are examples of chinks in the armour of the prosecution which are critically evaluated by the jurors.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

One of the primary rules for a juror is that they aren't permitted to conduct any private investigation or their independent research. This is violated when the Juror #8, displays a knife that he recently purchased which is similar to the alleged murder weapon, sowing reasonable doubt with respect to it being unique and thus by extension the weight of the shopkeepers statements reduces.

While the verdict needs to be arrived at from the facts and evidence presented and legal principles advanced, multiple jurors commit the error of making assumptions or creating even incidental facts. For instance Juror #8 casts doubt on the old lady's testimony as she wasn't wearing her spectacles at the time of her witness of the incident, and due to her old age it brings up probable cause for poor eyesight.

Furthermore, persuasive value is attributed to arbitrary factors which shouldn't be considered by the jurors. These include the background of the alleged, his past criminal record, his

communication by extension of his incoherent ramblings. Additionally as deliberations make headway, they continue to violate the spirit of an impartial juror as they don't follow the guidelines they are obligated to.

Finally, the jurors pay heed to factors such as the lawyer of the defendant not being committed enough to deliver a strong defence case, since he was being paid poorly. However in no instance should such facts be brought into consideration since they don't speak to the merits of the case presented to them, which is the sole outline they are to go off on.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The socio-legal impact of this film transcends all boundaries, it highlights systemic issues and fundamental gaps in the criminal justice system and raises alarms to multiple facets present in it.

The most important flaw elicited is the role prejudice plays in the decision making process. Juror #10 has preconceived notions on the social class and race, the alleged belongs to, he is often seen using statements such “he’s one of them” and Juror #3, the last one to overturn his stance, had let his tumultuous relationship with his son cloud his judgement. These point out how big a role prejudice can play to the point where it may even influence wrong decisions on improper grounds.

Certain scenes are written in a manner where the characters appear to be entrapped, making the audience relate to it and develop a feeling of empathy towards the boy. This entrapment is a metaphor for the world and life of poverty and conflict in the slums of America where they are often targets of racist undertones and bigotry.

It further generated awareness about the need to not rush into conclusions, especially when given a task of such a high degree such as serving on a jury and to carefully examine every evidence presented, always checking if there is room for reasonable doubt.

CONCLUSION

The film, though it might not have been a perfect representation of the jury system, raised awareness on its working, pointed out important flaws and most importantly inspired an entire generation of lawyers and judges, reigniting a passion for law. It forced debates and discussions on justice and attempted to garner attention to the constitution right to a free trial.

Much of the film’s core legal concepts displayed on its forefront such one of reasonable doubt and burden of proof ; and the socio-legal impact of prejudice it highlighted could be extended to different justice systems around the world as well, where the mechanism for delivering justice might change but the core principles remain the same. Despite its inconsistencies, it remains one of the most accurate courtroom dramas when judged through the yardstick of relativity.



NO ONE KILLED JESSICA

Sundarum Singh Sengar

ICFAI, Jaipur

INTRODUCTION

Jessica, a bartender at an elite event in New Delhi, refuses to serve three men (Manish, Vishal and Lucky) alcohol after the last call. Manish, who is the son of a politician, shoots her in the head in response. There are dozens of eyewitnesses,. Manish is taken into custody by the police and investigations begin. Inspector N. K. informs Sabrina that one of the two bullets that were sent for verification has been replaced. Sabrina's repeated attempts into getting the witnesses and evidence in order to prove Jessica's crime fail one by one. The court case runs until 2006. Due to lack of evidence and witnesses, the court acquits the culprits. Meanwhile, reporter Meera Gaity finds out about the acquittal through a newspaper. Having expected Jessica's case to be an open and shut case, Meera is shocked, takes the matter in her own hands, and plans to get justice for Jessica. With the approval of her editor, she performs various sting operations and exposes the failure of law and order in the country while raising questions about the police and the authorities. Inspector N. K. helps Meera by sending her the tape of Manish where he confesses his crime. Meera uses the clip to publicly exploit the cases and starts to build up pressure on the system and Manish's father's political party. Soon, the public, having followed the case on television, decides to protest against the cover-up by the powerful and bring justice to Jessica.

ABOUT THE FILM

Jessica, a bartender at an elite event in New Delhi, refuses to serve three men (Manish, Vishal and Lucky) alcohol after the last call. Manish, who is the son of a politician, shoots her in the head in response. There are dozens of eyewitnesses, but as Jessica's sister, Sabrina, discovers, they are either conveniently forgetful or willing to sell their testimony to the highest bidder, leaving an open-and-shut case hostage to greed and political influence.

Here, Vikram Jai Singh (prime witness) is considered as direct evidence because he has witnessed the murder. As we all know one should always provide best evidence. In this case, as Vikram is eye witness, it is considered to be the best evidence.

In the present movie, when the accused is arrested by the police he privately confesses during the investigation on tape that he has shot the gun only as a warning shot but it accidentally hit her head because he had eye power and he was not wearing spectacles or lenses at that time. This statement or information stated by the accused in the custody of police cannot be proved against him because according to Section-25 and Section-26 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872 the confessions which are made by the accused to the police officer while in their custody cannot be used against him.

The original head investigator found out that the ballistic report from the forensic labs has been tampered and the bullets were changed. Section-45 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872 – talks about Opinion of experts in the present movie, Forensic ballistics expert was asked to find out whether the two bullets shot by the accused belongs to the same gun or not? In India even the expert witnesses of the various forensic disciplines do not have any protection this led to the intimidation of witness has been taken place therefore the expert has tampered the evidence by changing the bullets and stated it in the favour of the accused. This is the loop hole in our judicial system that Tampering with the prosecution is not taken seriously. There has been no investigation into the question that who caused the witnesses to turn hostile. Surely, it is time for judges to commence such investigations, before an acquittal can be pronounced.

The court of District and session Judge has to Acquit the accused persons on the basis of lack of evidences and no chain being formed for the circumstantial evidence. Section-3 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872 - Circumstantial evidence. In the present movie, though two people gave testimony in favour of the victim but the chain of evidences which is mandatory to be formed is not formed because the gun used by the accused to shoot the victim is found in the car and there is no proof that the said gun is used by the accused to shoot and many witnesses during cross examination stated that they are not sure whether the person who shot the victim is Manish Bharadwaj or not, along with this the prosecution failed to establish that the bullets found are of the gun used by the accused because during the cross examination the forensic ballistic expert stated that the two bullets are from different gun. Therefore the chain of evidences is not formed and the circumstantial evidence is not conclusive as the chain is broken.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Manish, who is the son of a politician who killed the Jessica Lal by the Gun Manish is taken into custody by the police and investigations begin. Inspector N. K. informs Sabrina that one of the two bullets that were sent for verification has been replaced. Also Inspector N. K. helps Meera by sending her the tape of Manish where he confesses his crime. Meera uses the clip to publicly exploit the cases and starts to build up pressure on the system and Manish's father's political party.

Soon, the public, having followed the case on television, decides to protest against the cover-up by the powerful and bring justice to Jessica. A number of phone calls, SMS, and voice messages are sent through the channel in support for Jessica. Meera uses this public support to reach out to the government and the President for their help. A candlelight vigil march is organized for Jessica by the people of Delhi to stand for her and demand justice.

In the above case other than these Sections Manu Sharma was also found guilty under Section-302 of Indian Penal Code,1860 for the offence of Murder of Jessica Lal and also found guilty under Section-27 of Arms Act and Section-201/120B (Criminal Conspiracy) of Indian Penal Code,1860. The case is promoted to the Supreme Court, where Manish is found guilty and is sentenced to life imprisonment. His allies, Vishal and Lucky, get punished with four years in jail.

Just because of Media trial Jessica Lal got the Justice

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Manish, who is the son of a politician, shoots her in the head in response. There are dozens of eyewitnesses, but the eyewitnesses was denied to police about that Manish had not killed the Jessica Lal. Just because of Son of Politician Manish was release by Jail. And after some years Jessica Lal Sister lost her hope about the Justice for her Sister Jessica Lal.

Witness turning hostile - A hostile witness is a witness who from the manner in which he gives his evidence shows that he is not desirous of telling truth to the court.

This is the loophole of our judicial system that Methods of crime investigation have not improved; indeed there is no desire to investigate in a scientific manner. Witnesses will and do turn hostile. But investigations must proceed independently of eyewitnesses to draw conclusions based on a chain of circumstances that led only to one conclusion. A very major question that begs an answer is why was Manu Sharma granted bail? This is what enables witnesses to turn hostile, the opportunity provided to the accused to access witnesses other than that there is no witness protection program in the country.


SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

In the Jessica Case the trial court verdict holding the accused to be not guilty appeared unconvincing, as key eye witnesses had hostile. The high court however turned on circumstantial evidence to convict lall's, Manu sharma who is still serving his sentence of the life imprisonment.

A number of phone calls, SMS, and voice messages are sent through the channel in support for Jessica. Meera uses this public support to reach out to the government and the President for their help. A candlelight vigil march is organized for Jessica by the people of Delhi to stand for her and demand justice.

CONCLUSION

The Jessica murder case is termed as a noteworthy case as many elite people were involved in this case. If the accused had controlled his anger, Jessica would have been alive today. Being the son of a politician; he didn't have any fears of being caught and even dear of going to the jail. If the media would not have interfered in this case; Jessica would not have received justice till Today. The media gave a whole new turn to the case which lead to the life imprisonment of Manu Sharma.



DARK WATERS: THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SOUL IN THE FACE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DECADENCE

Kratin Shastri

Institute of Law, Nirma University, Ahmedabad

INTRODUCTION

The depravity of corporations that hold all the power and no responsibility, that consider exploitation a small price to pay in the greater scheme of profiteering is not lost on anyone. The influence they yield over not just the masses, but also the Government and the professional fraternities through rampant corruption too is common knowledge. In such cases, one has no choice but to subdue themselves to their will that keeps steamrolling on.

But occasionally, some people dare to lift the veil on their tyranny - to stand up for the little guy. Dark Waters is one such inspiring story about a corporate defense attorney turned savior who attempts to uncover a public health scandal being perpetrated by a chemical manufacturing company. A poignant tale about perseverance for what's right in the face of insurmountable adversity, it explores the lengths a man can, and must go, to follow his conscience.

ABOUT THE FILM

Robert Billott is a corporate defense attorney, who gets asked by a Wilbur Tennant, a farmer from Parkersburg to look into animal deaths on his farm which he suspects is because of DuPont, a large chemical manufacturing company. Although Rob hesitates at first, he checks in after Tennant says he knows his grandmother. Upon perusing the videotapes provided by Tennant of various tumours and other conditions experienced by his cattle before dying, Rob asks DuPont's attorney to have an EPA done in the matter. Although the EPA attributes the deaths to poor conditions on the farm, Rob witnesses first hand a cow going insane - something that can't happen due to poor farm management and ordinary pests. This makes Rob look more in-depth in the matter upon which he uncovers that

DuPont had been dumping PFOA into Tennant's farm - a chemical unregulated by EPAs. He discovers that the chemical has carcinogenic effects, and was covered up by DuPont in a bid to sell Teflon - a metal containing the chemical widely used in several household appliances. Therefore, he brings a class-action lawsuit to bring justice for all of the town that had been affected by the dumping of PFOA.

The film expands upon the lengths to which DuPont goes to save its skin. From searching Wilbur's house to get a hold of the evidence he provided to Rob, to manipulating the Health Department official to issue a notification in their favour about the extent of PFOA deemed safe - DuPont actively takes extra-legal steps to stop Rob from winning the case. Furthermore, it explores the dark past of DuPont, wherein it fired women employees whose children suffered birth defects and erasing their records, and continued employing people after it despite the hazardous nature of the waste. The gravity of the issue is conveyed by the murky colours and the absence of background music in many places which make the atmosphere tense and impactful. Furthermore, the repeated display of the mountain of technical documents Rob has to go through bring home just how many secrets companies keep. The movie excellently fulfils its intent to create concern in the audience through these scenes, and more - such as the decision of DuPont to renege its agreement and exhaust Rob's resources through further litigation which induces hopelessness and makes one know what exactly they are up against to protect their lives.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film's portrayal of the legal profession isn't mere caricature, the filmmakers clearly did their homework. Rob highlighting C8 and the procurement of 55 tons of steel drums in DuPont's documents brings out the eye for detail that a lawyer must have - separating the relevant from the irrelevant. Furthermore, he also goes through a mountain of documents and grills the DuPont CEO on the scientific studies their company cited - bringing out the inconsistencies between what those studies concluded and what DuPont claimed. This represents just how extensive and thorough lawyers must be with the opponent's case as well and on the evidence. The film further encompasses the multidisciplinary nature of the profession and how adaptable one must be. Despite Robert admitting that he was weak at Chemistry, he still has to go through the nomenclature of hazardous chemicals to identify what exactly it is that DuPont had been disposing, as well as consult experts to understand its effects on human health - and has to read through entire scientific studies. Going through the technicality of the case elevated it from being one of simple environmental compliance - to one about a larger ethical disaster - which highlights the ever evolving nature of issues in the profession. Robert working after-hours in the office -sacrificing on his life with his family also aptly capture how absorbing a lawyer's job is. Nuances like DuPont playing on the limitation period also make one immensely appreciate the effort put in background research.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The film does not pull back its punches when it comes to antagonizing DuPont attributing every conceivable act of deceit and corruption to it. It does not even provide an explaining chance to them, and the other side of the picture is grossly underrepresented. This makes the film come across as much more of a sermonizing piece of work rather than a legal drama. While the film is based largely on fact, it is not difficult to appreciate why it may be considered to be agenda-driven and created for political brownie points considering the sheer unilateralism of the stand it takes. Furthermore, this decision of its to have a linear story progression with defined and absolute good and bad sides may

also be one of the reasons that it hold it back from being genre-defining as it re-treads the same grounds as its predecessors, depriving it of any potential nuance it may have had. In the lack of any substantial defining features of its own, it naturally finds itself overshadowed.

Also, due to the highly geographical and personal nature of the story, it fails to convey any larger sense of global emergency based on the events it takes from. It relies far more on the emotional cues of the illnesses suffered by the characters to create insecurity in the audience's mind, than on the substantial existence of a threat. In the lack of evidence on sustained impact on human health, the film's message becomes a moot point.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM


At an age where the corporate form of business is the most pervasive and accepted one, a film like this would perhaps not leave a revolutionizing impact - understandably so. Regardless, its relevance does not stand jaded as it does its part in stirring up the conversation we all need to have. This is evident from the fact that it has ruffled some feathers, namely of DuPont and Ohio Manufacturers' Association, who have attempted to de-legitimize the film by claiming that it perpetrates myths and fiction. Furthermore, contrary to a Victorian EPA, the Department of Health in Melbourne claimed that no significant risk of harm existed in the waters. If a film is raising certain questions that are being attempted to be stifled, it surely has some substance to it.

At a more personal and community level, it has rekindled conversations about the extent of damage caused and has created apprehension in people's mind regarding using the company's products. Where most films are discarded at face value, even denting people's psyche and encouraging them to rethink is a triumph. Thus, the impact may not seem enduring now, but in retrospect it may have left an indelible mark.

CONCLUSION

Dark Waters serves as a stark reminder of the grave reality that permeates our everyday life of how large entities like Government and corporations can do whatever they see fit to our lives and get away with it. It provides a glimpse into the depths of treachery and connivance they go to serve their own interests and maintain their hegemony even if it ruins innumerable lives. Most of all, it makes a potent statement on the level of faith that we should pose in them and control we must surrender, for in the end we are the sole custodians of our safety.

Alongside all this, however, it is also inspiring for the hope it instils in people regarding the existence of good inside men's hearts. It is a testament to the lengths of change an individual can bring when they invest their heart and soul for a cause. Amidst the skepticism surrounding lawyers, Rob Billott's story serves as a shining reminder of what the profession stands for - and its cornerstone values. It reminds one of the conscience that underlies each one of us; even those tasked with defending the notorious. Rob lead a comfortable and happy life, and he sacrificed it all to stand up for the little guy. He chose to wake up from his obliviousness to the filth of the corporates, and take action. Thus, however deep in the waters we may be, it is never too late to turn around and do the right thing.



THE RISE OF THE BANDIT QUEEN: A LOOK AT PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Anubhav Sharma

Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi

INTRODUCTION

Discrimination against women has been one of the blots which have blemished humanity since aeon. Whether we talk about, ancient civilizations or kingdoms in the medieval period or modern-day society women are always humiliated, discriminated and abused. Directed by one of the most prominent writers, Shekhar Kapoor, the film "Bandit Queen" is a critically acclaimed film that shows the plight of a woman born in a lower caste. The protagonist is forced to marry at the age of 11 and is subjected to repeated sexual abuse firstly by her husband and then by different members of society throughout her life. Through a combination of intense drama and poignant thespianism, the film examines the issue of gender oppression and how our legal system is inefficacious in achieving the goal of gender equality. The Film exquisitely depicts the life of an ordinary woman born in Indian society, the various prejudices and discrimination which she experiences and how such prejudices, molestation, torments can turn an innocent girl into a dreaded dacoit.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film opens up in 1968 in a small village in U.P. Phoolan Devi, the protagonist of the story, at the age of 11 is forced to marry a man named Puttilal who was 20 years older than her. Since the inception of the marriage, Phoolan was abused by her husband both physically and sexually and was forced to make sexual relations with him. As time passes by, Phoolan gradually grows into a beautiful woman. Since Phoolan was born into a lower caste named Mallah, she often became the subject of sexual abuse by people belonging to higher castes like Thakurs. One day, when Phoolan had gone on a home ordeal, she was approached by Ashok (a Thakur's son). Being mesmerised by her beauty, Ashok tried to make sexual relations with her to which she objected. In response to it, Ashok resorted to forceful

means. Phoolan somehow manages to escape. A Panchayat was held to discuss the incident. The Panchayat however, consisted of people belonging to higher castes including Thakurs, which absurdly declared that Phoolan deliberately lured Ashok to make sexual relations with her and exiled her from the village.

Having been exiled from the village, Phoolan took shelter in the home of her cousin Puttilal. But as "*a daughter is always considered a burden*" Phoolan is forced to leave Puttilal's home. Having no other place to go, Phoolan went to the Police station to lift her ban from entering the village but was instead arrested on false charges as she was complaining against higher caste people. After locking up her in prison, the police officials raped her. Later, Thakurs got her out on bail. Then they went to her house for collecting the price of letting her out of jail via having sexual intercourse with her.

A few years later Phoolan got abducted by Babu Gujjar, a ruthless, predatory dacoit. Soon after her abduction Phoolan became a tool for satisfying the sexual urges of Gujjar and was often raped and molested by him. One day, Gujjar's lieutenant Vikram who held a deep respect for Phoolan killed Gujjar when the latter was trying to rape her again. Eventually, Vikram became the leader of the gang, and his empathy for Phoolan grew into a mutually respectful mature adult relationship. The former also helped the latter in getting revenge on her husband for all the sexual and physical abuse he had inflicted on Phoolan.

All goes well until Thakur Shri Ram is released from prison. Thakur Shri Ram is the real gang leader (boss of the erstwhile Gujjar). Shri Ram returns to his gang and while Vikram receives him with respect, Shri Ram was not happy with Vikram's leadership style as the latter had hard feelings for Thakurs. As a result, Vikram was assassinated by Shri Ram. After Vikram's assassination, Phoolan was repeatedly raped and beaten by Shri Ram and by the rest of the gang members, as punishment for her "disrespect" for his previous advances, and for her audacity at being equal. Shri Ram also ridiculed Phoolan saying "This is what people born in lower caste deserve". All the limits of humanity were crossed when Phoolan was stripped naked, paraded around Behmai, beaten, and sent to fetch water from the well (in full view of the village) without any clothes on her body. The whole village gazed at her naked body without raising any objections to this barbarous act. This broke Phoolan completely and she decided to take revenge on Shri Ram. Gaining the support of Man Singh (a close friend of Vikram), she went to Baba Mustakim, the leader of a huge gang and asked for his help. Baba Mustakim agreed and gave her a gang of dacoits.

Phoolan leads her new gang with courage, generosity, humility, and shrewdness. Her stockpile and her legend grew astonishingly and she became notorious as Phoolan Devi, the bandit queen. In February 1981, Baba Mustakim informs her of a large wedding in Behmai, with Thakur Shri Ram in attendance. Phoolan saw it as a perfect opportunity of getting revenge and attacked the wedding party. Her gang dragged all the Thakurs out of their home, and beat and killed them. This act of vengeance brought her to the attention of the national law enforcement authorities (in New Delhi). The top police officials then began a massive manhunt for Phoolan. Thakur Shri Ram relishes the opportunity and decided to help them. The manhunt wiped off almost all the gang members of Phoolan. In the end, Phoolan decided to surrender in February, 1983. Her terms are to have her remaining mates protected and provided for (the women and children in particular). The film ends with Phoolan's surrender in February 1983. The end credits indicate that all the charges against her

were withdrawn (including the charges of murder at Behmai) and that she was released in 1994. The end credits show that all the charges against her were withdrawn and that she was released in 1994.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Bandit Queen efficiently tackled the issues of gender oppression in an unconventional format. The two quotes mentioned in the Film rightly manifested the mindset of Indians in respect of women. The first is a quote shown on screen at the film's start: "*Animals, drums, illiterates, low castes and women are worthy of being beaten*". The second is a statement by Phoolan Devi's father: "*A daughter is always a burden...*" The film rightly depicted the life of a woman from her birth to death. Their whole life they are considered mere "*tools for satisfying man's lust*". Though child marriage is prohibited by Child Marriage Restraint Act, numerous women are married off at a very young age to satisfy men's sexual urges. Despite big talks about gender equality, they are always humiliated, beaten and molested in society and are never granted equal rights and opportunities as men. Society wants only one thing from her i.e. sexual copulation. The recent "*ME TOO*" movement is a pragmatic illustration of the same. Further, the film shows the reality of caste-based discrimination that is still widespread in many parts of Indian society. "*An upper caste male could not have defiled himself by raping a lower caste woman*". These types of statements are not uncommon. People of lower castes are often mistreated by those of upper castes. The film exquisitely manifested the brutal reality of all such issues.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

Though Bandit Queen depicted the brutal realism of Indian society, some of the scenes shown in the Film are questionable and too much for the audience to bear like the frontal nudity scene relating to the incident of fetching water from the well; scene showing the naked posterior of the rapist, and use of expletives.

Further, a specific community namely the Thakurs had been depicted in a most depraved way especially in the scene of rape by one belonging to the Thakur community, which suggests the moral depravity of the Thakurs. The movie seems to manifest that all Thakurs are rapists and molesters of lower-caste women which itself is wrong. The movie further seems to promote the idea of killing perpetrators to get revenge. Phoolan Devi in order of avenging the humiliation inflicted by Shri Ram killed 20 Thakurs. Taking the law in one's hand is itself wrong and shatters the very idea on which our criminal justice system is built.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

This film has had a lasting impact on the audience due to its hard-hitting socio-legal themes and its examination of the impact of injustice on vulnerable individuals. It accuses the audience to be part of an exploitative tradition and levels an accusing finger on the members of society who had tormented the victim and driven her to become a dreaded dacoit filled with the desire to revenge and raised awareness in society regarding the protection of women's rights and intimated to them how their silence can ruin the whole life of a person. In addition to it, the movie turned out to be an eye-opener for the government making it aware of various loopholes in the implementation of laws enacted for the protection of women. The movie further informed parents how the solemnization of the marriage of their daughter at a young age can serve as a disaster to their daughter's life and bring a change in their mindset regarding the early marriage of their daughters. The movie further highlighter the problem of caste-based discrimination which has been ingrained in our society since aeon and forced

the government to ensure that every person is treated equally irrespective of his caste. It brought a new waive against caste discrimination and many new provisions were incorporated in various laws for protecting people of lower caste.

CONCLUSION

In the 21st century, India is rising as a global power, but half of the population, i.e. women are still facing issues and struggling for life and dignity. Women in every sphere of life have to deal with various hurdles and cope with immediate problems. The most common of them is Child marriage. As per National Population Policy, over 50% of girl child in India marries below the age of 18 years which slows their emotional and psychological development. In addition to it, women are subjected to repeated domestic aggression. When they go out looking for a job, they are always asked sexual favours in return for jobs. It's the hard reality of Indian society at present but we refuse to accept it. Also, when we see some wrong happening with women we simply ignore it thinking it's none of our concern. But *"Ignorance Today Brings Darkness Tomorrow"*. The film Bandit Queen tried to highlight all such issues comprehensively and forces one to introspect. It asks us one question- "Is this the type of world we want to create for our mothers, daughters or sisters?" And if the answer is "NO" then it's high time to bring the change starting from our home itself as said by Mahatma Gandhi *"You must be the change you wish to see in the world"*.



PARIYERUM PERUMAL: ENDURANCE AND THE WILL TO FIGHT

Swaroop Nair

Amity University, Maharashtra

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, Tamil cinema has become stronger and more vehement in taking a strong political stance. Fans of Tamil cinema usually would want mass action films, where the hero jumps and flies and kicks the villains who also go flying in the air and fall defeated. While still retaining much of it, the rise of directors such as PA Ranjith, Vetrimaran and Mari Selvaraj is bringing a different, conscious political awakening in Tamil cinema to the realities of caste which are still prevalent in the modern democratic society. No, this is not to say that Tamil cinema was a largely apolitical phenomenon earlier. With Tamil Nadu, like much of the rest of the country, being a politically volatile State, politics and cinema have always been closely interlinked. In recent times, this political consciousness has grown to carry more weight and responsibility than earlier. And it is in such context that filmmakers like PA Ranjith, Vetrimaran and Mari Selvaraj have gained prominence.

ABOUT THE FILM

Pariyerum Perumal is not really a legal drama, it is not a movie about an advocate or a judge presiding over a court of law. It actually is a movie about a boy named Pariyerum Perumal, B.A. B.L. with a line on the top. He is a student of law who aspires to become a doctor one day. No, not the kind of doctor who puts injections. Dr. BR Ambedkar, he means.

So, *Pariyerum Perumal* is the story of this boy from a village who has joined a government law college in Tirunelveli and it is the story of how he tries to fit in there. Fitting in, obviously, is not easy. Caste and class differences become more visible. The fellow students in the college do not even seem to know the name of the village he comes from. The college professors teach the course in the English language, a language so unfamiliar to him. This is a boy who barely managed to pass the English language papers in school through cheating. He would have been completely lost in that college if not for Jothi Mahalakshmi. Jothi Mahalakshmi, or, as she prefers to be called, Jo, comes as an angel to teach him the English language. This arrangement of teaching English soon turns into a friendship, a pure and pleasant relationship. However, it is this friendship that eventually would lead this boy to have violent confrontations with the harsh realities of the society.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Mari Selvaraj is a visionary, he has this ability to create strikingly impactful visions to tell his story. Much of the cinematography is raw and rough to give a more natural feeling to the intense conflicts that are being built up. Selvaraj knows better than compromising on the artistic elements in making a message film, so he also serves us with some stunning artistic visuals. The *Naan Yaar* song sequence, for instance, is a creative, expressive and powerful sequence. There's anguish, there's pain and there's an impending sense of a violent redemption. Santosh Narayan's music gives goosebumps and Selvaraj compliments it with powerful imagery and symbolism and it elicits revolutionary passion.

Now, Pariyerum Perumal is the hero of the story, but it is also through the other characters in the story that we understand better the different elements that constitute the Indian society stratified by caste-based distinctions.

Anandhi plays the role of Jo. Jo is an upper-caste girl. She comes from an extremely wealthy and respected family in the society. Jo does not seem to be aware of the fact that her friendship with Perumal is not appreciated by her family members and what dire consequences it brings for him. Jo is the representation of the modern, privileged youth in an urban setup to whom the realities of caste are invisible. What we as an audience must realize here is that that being blind to something does not imply the absence of it.

Yogi Babu plays Anand and he brings some light-heartedness and comic relief in this otherwise intense story. His character is also an upper-caste, wealthy fellow – he is the son of a powerful man. Like Perumal, even he does not speak English. It can well be assumed that probably did not need to bother himself with learning the language because his privileged background did not necessitate it. He is a good friend and he wishes to stand with Perumal, and he in fact does help him in more ways than one. However, some things are beyond this friendship, where even his help can extend only to a certain extent. In Pariyerum Perumal's ultimate fight against caste, his allyship may not be powerful enough to do much to contribute meaningfully in the annihilation of caste.

Marimuthu plays the role of Jo's father. He represents the father who is concerned more with the society's views than his own daughter's interests. He himself may not be a violent person at heart, however, he is easily manipulated by what the society imposes on him. What must be understood here is that being so malleable too is a dangerous tendency. Complying and letting the bad men do bad things leads to just about as much damage as doing the bad things yourself.

There are some more characters who play crucial roles in the movie – and in the society. The principal in the college is someone who himself has faced his fair share of discrimination, but still considers a student who idolizes Ambedkar as a potential troublemaker. There is a kind-hearted professor in college who roots for Perumal and is supportive. Perumal's father dresses up as a woman and puts up dance performances. His old age does not protect him from being humiliated by a group of college thugs. And there is a mason who part-times as someone who does honour killings in what he considers to be service to God. Through these different characters, we see a reflection of the kind of persons that constitute the society – there are people who reinforce the caste-system to continue to reap its benefits and stand strong in the society, and there are people who have to fight it every day.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film is strong and conscious with the politics of it. It is unabashed, unapologetic. It does not sugar-coat anything and it is honest in its approach in dealing with caste, the central issue in this story. The anti-caste sentiments are voiced loudly and vehemently through our protagonist, Pariyerum Perumal. Unlike other movies where filmmaking ultimately resorts to hero worshipping, there is not any requirement of a saviour, an external agency in this story. Here, in Selvaraj's story, Pariyerum Perumal himself is the embodiment of the revolution. Indeed, Kathir is not a mass hero. He does not fight the oppressors like Rajnikant or Dhanush. His strength lies not in wielding weapons and landing heavy punches. It is not what generally evokes hollers and whistles from the audience. His strength, instead, lies in enduring. As Pariyerum Perumal, Kathir endures a lot. Men kill his beloved dog, Karippu. Men beat him up and urinate on him. Men humiliate his father in front of other young, impressionable eyes. Hell, men even try to get him killed. And Perumal withstands all of it. The thing is, he does not seek trouble; he does not wish to get entangled into situations that would threaten his peace. He would rather avoid conflicts such as that. Unfortunately for him, though, trouble finds him. Regardless of how much he tries to escape it, it does not sit right with certain people with their superiority complex to see a man belonging to a social stratum below them walk and talk and be like them.

CONCLUSION

Caste-based discrimination is not a thing of the past. If not entirely consciously, there are hints of casteism that subconsciously creep into our daily activities. Dr. BR Ambedkar wrote about annihilation of caste but that goal is still not anywhere near in sight.

Movies have always been a medium of great power to disseminate ideas. And movies like *Pariyerum Perumal* have a great role to play in taking the society as a whole forward. As a movie, it stands strong on technical aspects, does not compromise either on its artistic elements or its political stance and presents a compelling story backed by a terrific leading performance by Kathir. *Pariyerum Perumal* is an important film and by the end of it, it does its job of adding substance to what it says in the beginning – “Caste and religion are against humanity”.



MOHAN JOSHI HAZIR HO!

Ramashankar

Bharatratna Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Law College, Mumbai

INTRODUCTION

The film, a part of the Indian New Wave or the Indian ressemblant Cinema Movement, is everything a great lampoon should be. It's perceptive, facetious, heart- warming, eye- opening, study- provoking, ironic (the song in praise of Bombay but actually showing its squalor and underbelly works wonderfully, wonderfully well!) and eventually yes, extremely poignant as well. The film creates brawn and blood characters whose lives we follow and deeply watch about and therefore, Mohan Joshi's death at the end of the film comes as a rude jolt and packs a solid emotional wallop. In fact, the film beautifully highlights the ineffectuality of the ordinary man faced with an abuse of his veritably introductory rights and stripped of his desire to live his life with integrity & nobility. Special citation has to be made to Bisham Sahni and Dina Pathak, who play the harried, senior couple to perfection. Naseeruddin Shah, of course, is as brilliant as ever as the muddy counsel. His 'vanity' toupee is an absolute laugh! Amjad Khan as the couldn't-care-less landlord makes you respect that there's a completely different side to him as an actor from Gabbar Singh and other villains that he has played in marketable cinema. Perfect support comes from Deepti Naval, Mohan Gokhale, Arvind Deshpande, Rohini Hattangadi, Pankaj Kapur and Satish Shah. On the technical side, one must punctuate Virendra Saini's forfeiture on- position photography and Renu Saluja's deft editing. The use of factual locales is most effective and accordingly, Bombay is as much a character in the story as are the artists. But also Saeed, who has been born and brought up in the outside world, has always set all his flicks in the megacity he understands stylish, exploring the day- to- day problems of its citizens. This is what gives his flicks that redundant humane and humane edge as well. All by each, **Mohan Joshi Hazir Ho!** is a gem of a little film made by one of our most married filmmakers and remains as material as ever indeed.

ABOUT THE FILM

Mohan Joshi is a naïve old man. He doesn't appreciate the fact that he's one of the privileged many who actually have a home to live in. So what if the sewage pipes leak on his head throughout the time, and the cataplasm peels off the ceiling without notice? It all begins when old Joshi is standing in the line at the milk cell one day, when the man in front of him boasts how he sued the landlord of his uncle, giving the man commodity to worry about for times! What a grand idea! Why cannot Mohan Joshi demand that his landlord provides the minimal handling repairs for a flat where the Joshi family has lived for three generations, and paid the rent too? Joshi and his woman decide to meet the landlord first and give him a chance to redeem himself. Still, the greedy Kapadia, bloated with his

formerly overflowing wealth, is girdled by an army of real estate harpies. He'll get further plutocrat when the diggings collapse and high-rise structures are constructed in their place. Disrespected and lowered, Joshi marches off in righteous outrage in the hunt for counsel. His neighbors sport him, his family refuses to help him. Only his woman stands by the stubborn old man. Clientless attorneys hurdle upon the two old people like a pack of empty wolves. Out of the fray, Malkani and Gokhale crop the victors, and Joshi becomes their first customer. The courtroom battle begins. The case starts and stretches on as all court cases do. The old couple part with their stingy savings and the old woman's last bits of jewelry. The slippery attorneys promise great results. Still, days turn to months and months to times, without the day of reckoning ever coming within sight. The landlord hires Desai and Rani, whose claim to fame lies in the fact that they can kill the opponent into submission with their unconscionable tactics. That's exactly what they set out to do. The Joshi's are slighted with an assault case and an eviction suit to complicate the original case. The neighbors watch Joshi's demotion with gaiety, some of them bait him mercilessly and indeed fill their pockets by helping the landlord against Joshi. Threatened by the hired mugs of the landlord, indeed his elder son, and son-in-law join the battle. In the meanwhile, Malkani and Gokhale progress from an office in the corridor to a gaudy office. Rani marries Desai but continues a covert affair with Malkani. Between the four of them, the case drags on while the promoters stay for their chance to make an ocean of structures from Bombay to Dubai. Judges come and go, and sections and sub-sections discord in the skyline in the courtroom. The Joshi's family is tossed between desirousness and total despair. Their apartment home creaks and groans under times of neglect. Indeed old Joshi begins to see through the farce. Eventually, when the whole family starts bearing down on the attorneys, Malkani decides to make a suddenly passionate appeal in the court, demanding that the judge sees for himself the state of affairs. The judge agrees and the world changes color for Mohan Joshi. He becomes an idol overnight. This won't only fix his problems but will be a means of redressal for the whole community. Mohan Joshi gets a standing acclamation from his new musketeers. The shop of justice may grind sluggishly, but now there's no still, what the tenants haven't regarded is the artfulness of Kapadia and his slick attorneys. An army of workmen descends on the worsening structure, sweeping the dirt down, giving a new fleece of makeup to cover the cracks, propping the falling roof with painted poles. At the end of it, the structure wears an incontrovertible gleeful look when the judge eventually arrives. The two sets of attorneys stand on either side of the judge and carry on a slanging match. The apartment residents watch helplessly as the whole spectacle becomes another legal battle that would remain undetermined. In despair, they try to intermeditate to have the last hail. But the judge isn't interested presently. It seems like a lost cause now. There's only one way left to Mohan Joshi. Putting all his frail strength together, he decides to end the disagreement formally and for all. He bangs his head against the bamboo scaffolding holding the roof together. The rickety ceiling comes down crashing, vindicating Mohan Joshi, and buries him under the debris.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

A republic, theoretically, gives every citizen a right to seek redressal for a wrong done to them by approaching the court of law, similar to their indigenous rights. Mohan Joshi Hazir Ho! Acquires its endlessness from the failure of the judicial system of the country to reform itself. It's as applicable in 2023, as it was in 1984. The real estate cabal still reigns supreme, abetted by the veritable system that was made to cover ordinary citizens. The film captures the aging and the loneliness of the protagonists as the narrative progresses, in a perceptive and facetious manner that's both ironic and disturbing. The life of lower-middle-class families in the Bombay of the 1980s is directly represented, by the

diurnal struggle for introductory musts, long ranges, overcrowded trains, and thoroughfares and worsening roads that give no respite from the chump holes that go for homes.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie explores problems typical of but not exclusive to Mumbai – affordable housing and the rights of tenants. Also the approach of the movie was limited to one side of the problem. **Mohan Joshi Hazir Ho!** Talks about the problems faced by tenants from landlords or builders but there are many cases where judicial bodies have come across of tenants misusing legal remedies against landlords with the idea of holding possession on the property irrespective of the mode and purpose for which the house was obtained, which was for shelter of the tenant & his/her family that to on rent. Today, the idea of having a home by a middle class family at the prime location or all over in Mumbai or anywhere is like a dream and making this dream come true is really a big challenge. When we talk about a problem faced by one side (tenants) then we shall also consider the problem faced by another side (landlord) which is an equal and important issue in today's society.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Justice is the foundation and the focus of every civilized society. The quest for justice was an ideal that the human race aspired to down the line for decades. The first and most common approach is to resolve disputes through courts. With the uprising development of the nation the burden falls over the judiciary. Our judicial system has some drawbacks, such as an overburdened court, time-consuming, requiring a costly technical process with a low number of judges, and unfilled vacancies with long procedural and pendency of cases. The conventional system of justice delivery is deeply flawed; as a result of which there is a backlog of pending cases in the Indian Courts. The judicial infrastructure is inadequate and is on the verge of a collapse.

CONCLUSION

The movie lays bare the agonies caused by a judicial system in which cases take years to be heard and resolved. An old couple, Mohan Joshi and his wife, decide to sue their landlord, for not maintaining their collapsing chawl. The landlord is least bothered as he wants to drive the tenants out and tear down the chawl. The court case drags on for years and the lawyers in cahoots with the opposition lawyer milk the old couple dry. Meanwhile in the housing society, the old couple is ridiculed for fighting the landlord, but they fight on nevertheless. In the end when the judge comes to check the condition of the chawl, Kapadia's men prop up the place thus convincing the judge that all is well with the chawl. Finally, Joshi gathers all his strength and pulls down the temporary supports put up by the men causing the building to collapse on.

Mohan Joshi Hazir Ho! is one of the best satires ever made on the Indian screen and one of Saeed Akhtar Mirza's best films. The film is a brilliant take off on the housing problems faced by lower middle-class chawl living tenants in Bombay, while at the same time making a dig at the archaic Indian judicial system where judges get changed and cases drag on and on and on and on... This movie actually highlights the quote by **Mark Twain** – “Going to law is losing a cow for the sake of a cat.”



GARGI- “DECEIVED BY DISGUISE.”

Niharika Bendreddy
Pendekanti Law College, Telangana

INTRODUCTION

One of the prominent American Filmmakers in the 1930s, Mr. Frank Capra once said, “No Saint, no Pope, no General, no Sultan, has ever had the power that a Filmmaker has; the power to talk to hundreds of millions of people for two hours in the dark.” Indeed, it is true that this unparalleled power immerses the beholder into a fictitious world only to relieve him with an intricate web of thoughts. By the time he comes to terms with reality, the filmmaker himself turns a muse to the beholder’s musings on life, death and everything in-between them. Film is a universal language that shifts one’s view, stirs one’s faith, melts one’s bias and tilts one’s judgement. It’s a medium through which imagination flows and entertainment breathes, creativity sells and perception raises. Film takes one to places while one’s still and break one’s heart while it still beats. One such moving movie is “Gargi”.

ABOUT THE FILM

Gargi, the protagonist, comes from a working-class family. Her father, Brahmanandam, works as a Security Guard in a Residential Apartment. Her mother is a homemaker who also sells homemade rice batter. *Gargi* is a teacher while her sister goes to middle school. As *Gargi* anticipates marriage with her boyfriend, she begins to await the happiest days of her life. However, her bubble of joy bursts in no time.

One evening, *Gargi* goes in search of her father who does not return home after work. She soon learns that he is arrested in a gang-rape case of a nine-year-old girl who lives in the same apartment where he works. The *witness statement report* states that the victim, in the *Test Identification Parade (TIP)* has identified Brahmanandam as one of the rapists. *Gargi*, on knowing this, is unable to come to terms with the slightest possibility of her father committing such a heinous crime. To her, he is a guardian who came to her rescue when a predatory tuition teacher tried to sexually abuse her as a child and gave her all the strength to stand up against such abusers.

Thus, she is hell-bent to prove her father’s innocence and approaches a famous advocate who is also their so called “well-wisher” but he refuses to take up the case. To her relief, his junior comes forward to defend Brahmanandam. He proves in court that the victim, who was on a barbiturate medication, was under the influence of an adult dosage of the drug during the *TIP* which could have led to confusion, memory loss and misjudgment when she identified Brahmanandam. The court, upon

hearing the expert testimony, holds the *witness statement report* to be inadmissible as evidence and orders to conduct the *TIP* again. However, during the following *TIP*, the victim fails to look at the accused in fear of reliving the trauma.

Meanwhile, the court grants conditional bail to Brahmanandam till the victim is ready to face him again. When Gargi meets the victim privately, she identifies Brahmanandam from his photo, as the perpetrator. Gargi's world shatters in a second, but soon she decides to do what she deems as the right deed. When she arranges a spontaneous *TIP* before the judge, the victim identifies Brahmanandam as the rapist. As a result, the Court orders the police to take him into custody and later punishes him. In the end, both the families of accused and victim, reconcile and move on with their respective lives.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

At the onset, the film clearly details the everyday life of a middle-class family living in an urban city. Although the family struggles to make ends meet, Gargi, who is the elder daughter, remains a ray of sunshine, ever so accepting of life and its seasons of challenge. Although her boyfriend jokingly demands dowry, Gargi, being a strong-willed woman, is quick to dismiss the notion as she knows that she cannot burden her father financially. The film portrays *Gargi* as a responsible daughter and a protective sister.

Secondly, the film spreads awareness about the Indian Government's free legal aid service that is available to people belonging to weaker sections of the society to ensure that they secure the means to seek justice and are not denied the same by reason of poverty or other hardships.

Thirdly, the film endorses the role of transgender judge in the gang-rape case. Such representation of the LGBTQIA+ community not only encourages its members to showcase their talent in the entertainment industry, but also reassures that the doors of legal profession are open to all those who aspire to become the officers of court.

Finally, the film ends on a high note where the daughter, who discovers her father's truth, is seen not in two minds but clear about handing him over in the hands of the justice system. After all, he once was her protector who spurred her on to stand firm against any perpetrator.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

To begin with, the film depicts the broadcast and print media that boldly reveals the identity of Brahmanandam after his arrest in the gang-rape case. The media sensationalizes the news of gang rape and inadvertently outrages public intolerance. As a result, Gargi loses her job, her mother shuts down her home business and an uncontrollable mob physically attacks the accused inside the premises of court.

Next, the Bar Association issues notice to all its members not to represent the accused owing to the gruesome nature of the crime. The hypocritical lawyer who is also the so-called "well-wisher" realizes that his name, fame and reputation can be at stake if he disobeys the notice and subsequently, when his junior defends the accused, the Bar Association wrongly condemns his decision.

Furthermore, the police botch up the investigation, deny the imprisoned Brahmanandam's legal right to meet his family or lawyer and ultimately, encourage the victim's father to reclaim his chance to kill Brahmanandam when the court releases him from prison on conditional bail. In other words, the police become puppet in the hands of public sensitivity.

Last but not the least, the movie focusses more on the guilt of the accused and does not explore endeavors such as the convict's psychological assessment and the victim's rehabilitation. These are essential as they take care of both, precaution and cure that can bring down the occurrences of such inhuman acts in future.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

"Gargi" has a broad socio-legal impact on individuals and the society as a whole. It depicts the plight of the free legal aid centers which also reflects the underwhelming quality of services and the lack of awareness of such offices which are established by the Legal Service Authorities across India.

The portrayal of transgender judge in the film promotes inclusivity which is crucial especially in 2023 when the Supreme Court Collegium's recommendation for the elevation of gay lawyer- Mr. Saurabh Kripal as a High Court judge is being objected by the Indian Government.


"Gargi" reflects on the existence of media trial of active cases in India. The Supreme Court of India frequently condemns media's interference with fair trial, which is an essential step in the administration of criminal justice. Due to media's publications that obstruct this essential step, the apex court ensures that their fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression is subject to reasonable restrictions by any law in relation to "Contempt of Court".

Unlike what construes in *"Gargi"*, Courts often convey that it is against the Constitutional values and professional ethics for Bar Associations to pass resolutions that none of its members will represent an accused and reiterate that all such resolutions are illegal as it is the duty of a lawyer to defend an accused, however repulsive, he may be regarded by the society.

"Gargi" exposes the insufficiency of police personnel. The accountability of police in high-profile criminal cases is a matter of growing concern especially where the courts repeatedly state the need to balance the rights of the accused while it safeguards the legitimate prayers of the victim. Therefore, awareness about the duties of authorities and the lapses in the judiciary must spread in order to raise voice against the pitiful state of affairs in the justice system.

CONCLUSION

"Gargi" as an Indian legal drama, depicts a brutal and prevalent crime: "Gang Rape". In most cases, perpetrators are no stranger to victims. Sooner or later, the most unexpected person removes the disguise to let the truth out. In this case, an old man, who is a father of two girls and a Security Guard by profession, reveals the beast in him and a minor girl falls prey to the trap. As a result, the child loses her spark as she is led to a state of betrayed trust and lost innocence. *"Gargi"* is one film that makes us contemplate on which step we as a society are standing at, on the ladder of human conscience and we realize that indeed, there is a long way to go.



BADLA: VICTORY OF TRUTH OR POWER OVER JUSTICE ?

Preet Dulhani
NUALS , Kochi

INTRODUCTION

Law and Film, is an interdisciplinary field-in-the-making. Movies are the reflection of society, it's disputes, controversies and perceptions. In recent years, the justice system has become the point of convergence in the field of entertainment. The characters, arguments and the conspiracy revolves around the result of the judgement whether it got rightly served or not. The elevation of theatrical and exaggerated actions taking a different path aside from law have impacted the viewers in such a way it shouldn't as it strings up the society to lose faith in the justice system, broadening their horizons and making them focus on it's slackness. This has led to widespread vigilante justice. One such movie is 'Badla' directed by Sujoy Ghosh, that depicts a lesson in mind games where it presents how an adversarial legal system impacts testimony and strategy if the person involved in it is powerful. This article will inspect the social and legal aspects of the movie and will layout all the insights and critics.

ABOUT THE FILM

'Badla' is a story about a top defence lawyer with the reputation of having a hundred percent success rate with his cases, Badal Gupta (Amitabh Bachchan) who is brought on board to save a successful businesswoman, Naina Sethi (Tapsee Pannu) by her lawyer Jimmy (Manav Kaul) to save her from the charge of murdering her lover, Arjun (Tony Luke). Badal gives Naina exactly three hours to speak out every truth she knows, else there's a high chance she could get arrested owing to a new witness coming to light. Naina explains that she and Arjun were blackmailed by someone for their extramarital affair. They were called to a hotel where Naina was attacked; only to wake and find Arjun dead with the money meant for the blackmailer. She was arrested but is out on bail. The police find no trace of anyone else being present in the room or breaking in.

Badal tells Naina that she is not being honest with him and questions her about the disappearance of a young man near the hotel. Naina reveals that she and Arjun went to a cabin in the woods few months ago. On the way back, she accidentally crashed into an oncoming car and killed its driver, a young boy named Sunny. They put Sunny's body in the trunk of his car, which Naina dumped in a swamp. While Arjun was waiting for her, Rani and Nirmal, a local couple, met and invited him to their home, where Arjun discovered that they are Sunny's parents. When Rani called Sunny, his phone rang in Arjun's

pocket as he had forgotten to dispose of it, making Rani suspicious. Arjun and Naina get away but become worried that they will be discovered soon.

Naina watched the news showing that Sunny had embezzled money from the bank where he was working before disappearing. She learned that Arjun had taken Sunny's wallet as they disposed of the body and used his girlfriend's employee credentials to hack into the bank to frame Sunny as a criminal. Rani identifies Naina's car at the scene of her son's disappearance, making her a suspect, but Naina has her lawyer falsify an alibi. The police buy it, but Rani is unconvinced. Rani later confronts Naina at a press event and reveals that she knows the truth. She pleads Naina to tell her Sunny's location but Naina keeps up her act of innocence. A few months later, Arjun and Naina are contacted by the blackmailer, leading to the present events.

Badal decides that Rani must have killed Arjun and could have easily done so since Sunny's father, Nirmal, works at the hotel. Naina reveals that she saw Rani in the room but lied to check whether Badal was a good lawyer or not, to which Badal reveals there was no witness and he was lying to get the truth from Naina. However, As time passes by, Naina unfolds the layers of truth to Badal, reveals a secret: Sunny was still alive in the trunk before she disposed of the car. However, she let him drown, deciding not to save him to protect herself from potential incrimination. Surprised by her murderous and selfish actions, Badal proposes an alternate sequence of events in which Naina was the one who actually pressured Arjun into hiding the crime and framed Sunny. And every situation in reverse order. Naina confesses to Arjun's murder, revealing where Sunny's body is. Badal agrees to continue defending her and excuses himself for a moment, going out to get some fresh air while Naina receives a call from Jimmy. She realises that Badal's pen is interfering with the call. Naina then discovers that the person who came to her as Badal Gupta was an imposter when she finds the real Badal Gupta at the doorstep. Naina, shocked, takes apart Badal's pen to reveal a voice recorder inside that recorded every word of their meeting, including her confessions of both murders. As she glances outside her window, Naina makes eye contact with the imposter and Rani in the apartment building across from hers. "Badal" takes off his disguise, revealing himself to be Nirmal. Rani calls the police for Naina's arrest. Rani (Amrita Singh) effortlessly steal's everybody's thunder and turns out to be Badla's big takeaway.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

Legal system geared to favour the rich, powerful people who can cover up the truth but Victory will always be of truth, the more they tried to untangle the truth, the more convoluted it became. At the heart of it it's all about perception. Whenever you try to find an answer, you tend to complicate things but the answer is always right in front of you. You were too busy looking for a 6 while a 9 was always right in front of you. What you see may not be for real and what's actually transpiring may not quite be visible. Don't get your fear & guilt to take over you, if u get this happen, your life's on stake. One mistake can ruin your life. Nobody lies without a cause. Fear is for those who have a lot to loose.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The big reveal gets painfully crummy because it is so centralised that it gets improbable to believe the entire series of event. There are some slight flaws which need to be considered. The first flaw of this movie is the ethics of evidence that was breached by Naina's lawyer who knowingly produces fake and false witnesses drawn to the position that anything that might increase their chances of winning


instead of possessing a certain set of traits-truthfulness and reliability, and a professional commitment to the judicial process and the administration of justice. Ethics are not simply rules to be interpreted in the light most favorable to the clients, but moral principles that are supposed to guide behavior as a member of an honorable profession. Second flaw is that this movie has not shown the legal concepts of seeking divorce because of Naina Sethi (a married woman who admits to adultery) having extra-marital affair in detail, and if there it be her husband then the law would have treated him as the sole master. Showing legal concepts in simple terms would have been helpful to create awareness about it. One another flaw is they haven't focused more on the stories of the supporting characters and it's just owing to the cat and mouse game between Mr.Gupta and Naina Sethi, mind games they play with each other and, in turn, with the audience.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

Whether we accept it or not, cinema has the power to seep into our brains and hearts, causing a roller coaster of emotions giving us a completely new direction and perspective. We unconsciously take part in the movie with us and cherish the impact of making a change. This movie has made a mark with the framework of portraying the legal system or the lawyers in a bad light. Damaging the aspects of law brings a loss of faith in the judicial and advocacy world of functioning which harms the society at large. They portrayed the idea of taking justice into one's own hands with disregarding the faith in the system.

CONCLUSION

Your power can't defend you; Power is the worst kind of addiction because those addicted to power fail to foresee their downfall. This movie portrays that the revenge isn't always the answer but forgiving isn't the right choice either. What we think is the truth, might not be the same for everyone else. Everyone sees truth differently, justice is blind. It only considers the truth that can be proven, something factual. And facts are built on details. Details that can make or break the evidence after all prosecution has its way. Thus, I can conclude that this movie definitely showcased a part where power is superior to justice but nevertheless truth has to be the win!



CHANDIGARH KARE AASHIQUI : STEPS TOWARDS TRANSFORMING THE STATUS OF TRANSGENDERS FROM THE EYES OF LAW TO THE HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE.

Bhoomija Pandey
IMS Unison University, Dehradun

INTRODUCTION

National legal services authority v. Union of India, a watershed in the history of transgender rights in India for the decision granted a third gender status to the transgenders. The decision of 2014 actualized the ideals in Articles 14, 15, 16, 19[1][a] and 21 of our Constitution to the benefit of transgenders. Although all these articles and the judgement provided justice to the transgenders in papers and in the eyes of the law, but, the social stigmas and the mindset of the people still remain intact. Transgenders are looked down upon as coarse grained and are often called by names such as “hijra”, “chakka”, etc in a demeaning tone. They are even associated with prostitution and other sexual crimes. It becomes a matter of shame for the parents to reveal that their child is a transgender. Thus, to provide a holistic justice to the transgender community, it is required that they should be welcomed in the society with open arms as dignified individuals having their own individual identity which is not to be determined merely by their sex but by their orientations, calibre and capabilities.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film, Chandigarh Kare Aashiqui, may seem a love story from its very title but there is a twist which is revealed later on in the movie. The movie casts actor Ayushman Khurana as Manvinder Munjal alias Manu, and actress Vani Kapoor as Maanvi in the movie. Manu is introduced as a bodybuilder who is buffing up to win some weight lifting competition which would eventually promote the gym which he runs with his close friends. Meanwhile, enters beautiful and smart Maanvi who starts working as a Zumba instructor in the Gym, she through her charm and style not only attracts the students of Zumba but also the attention of Manu. After having few conversations, they both fall in love with each other and eventually got intimate with each other, in the heat of passion, Manu didn't pay heed to what Maanvi wanted to converse with Manu regarding her sexuality and they both continued to be in active sexual relationship with each other for considerable time.

One day when Manu proposed Maanvi for Marriage, she told her that she is a transwoman and has undergone therapy to become a complete woman, this invoked an outrageous reaction from the side of Manu as he felt cheated and disgusted from the fact that he established relation with a Male and not with a Female, he even hurled abuses upon Maanvi. The scene explicitly portrays the predicament and agony of the transgenders in the society. The way Maanvi tried to explain to Manu about her feminine feelings and that how only her body was masculine but the heart and soul were feminine and she has only transformed her body to bring it in line with her inner feelings shows that how transgenders are required to explain their sexual orientation to all in order to seek acceptance, they are understood by none but are easily misunderstood and ridiculed, even Manu did the same, he turned a deaf ear to the feelings and explanation of Maanvi and started cursing and ridiculing her by calling her by names.

Even the family members of the Manu who were once happy to see Maanvi together with Manu got agitated just to know that she was a transgender. The situation became worse when the sisters of Manu humiliated Maanvi before the entire Zumba class students and even sacked her out by posting her video in social media. All such things are mirror of reality for the transgenders in our society finds no solace, wherever they go they are targeted based on their sexual orientations.

Eventually, the movie ends on a positive note, Manu empathises with Maanvi and tries to understand the entire anatomy of transgender and the therapy Maanvi has undergone. He finally after much struggle is able to change his mindset and accept Maanvi as she is and also wins the competition for which he was practicing diligently. The same struggle is going on in our society which needs to be ended only then we would be able to win the hearts of each other to make this society a paradise for all.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The film aptly showcased the agony and anguish of the transgenders, it showed how they are deprived of love and acceptance just because of their sexual orientation. Even the family members and the near relatives of Maanvi were diffident towards her just because she wanted to be "she" and not "he". It also showed how barbaric society becomes once it gets to know that the person is a transgender.

Moreover, the way Manu tried to scientifically analyse the concept of transgender changed the tone of the movie and educated the audience about the scientific and technological aspects involved in undergoing surgery. Thus, such discussions conveyed the feelings and aspiration of the transgenders to the masses. Moreover, the Psychiatrist and one local transgender to whom Manu visits to satiate his curiosity further helped not only him to clarify his misconceptions from scientific and humanitarian perspective but also entitled the masses by bringing reform in their perspective and mindsets.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie though beautifully plotted lacks at few points. First of all, the movie ignores the concept of 'consent' in establishing sexual relationship, this is because in the movie, Manu entirely blames Maanvi for using him and cheating him, however, it could be seen that it was Manu who seduced Maanvi and even didn't paid any heed to her words when she was about to utter her secret to him, in such case Maanvi was nowhere responsible for cheating or using.

Secondly, it can be seen in the movie that Maanvi's close friend is also shown as a transgender who is bodily a female but her sexual orientations are masculine, it can be seen that while Maanvi was in hospitable with her family and father, her friend also came there who was also looked disgusted by Maanvi's family members. However, not much is told about her and her background. Had more was told about her, the movie would be able to communicate its message more fruitfully.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACT OF THE FILM

There is no doubt that the movie had a strong socio- legal impact in the society. Since 2014, after the transgenders were granted a third gender status, society has been accepting transgenders more welcomingly but not as heartfully as it should as still the social stigmas are intact in the minds of the people. The movies like such are helping in breaking the ice and are trying to make our society more inclusive. The movie is directly impacting the minds of the people as it not only showcase the humanitarian perspective of the transgender but also the scientific aspect of their anatomy which is laudable.

Today we are so open that we are talking about marriage between homosexuals, even section 377 of the Indian Penal code criminalising homosexuality has been decriminalised in the Navtej Singh Johar case in 2018, hence the time is changing and both the law and the society are walking hands in hands.

CONCLUSION

It is herein concluded that the movie is not only entertaining but also educating and is a good instrument of social change. It is hoped that the society becomes more inclusive and the LGBTQ+ community gets the love and acceptance for which they have coveted and now the time has come to not just reform our laws but also our mindsets so that the term "Aashiqui" could be made more inclusive to eventually attain the "heaven of freedom" as envisaged by our Nobel Laureate, Rabindranath Tagore.



377 AB NORMAL: A KERNEL OF NEW ERA

Raja Kumar

Central University of South Bihar, Gaya

INTRODUCTION

“Equality means more than passing laws. The struggle is really won in the hearts and minds of the community, where it really counts.”

~ Barbara Gittings.

Although we call our society a free society, however, in reality, it is not truly a free society because people are still living in the bondage of dogmatic social norms, prejudiced ideas, stereotypes, narrow-minded mindsets, etc. And this film depicts these anti-social things. Gender identity is one of the most fundamental aspects of life which refers to a person 's intrinsic sense of being a male, female or transgender, or transsexual person and a person cannot be prejudiced on the same. As in our Vedas, it is said that *विकृतिः एवम् प्रकृति* meaning what seems unnatural is also natural. Therefore, there should not be any discrimination on the ground of Sex that includes not only males and females but includes people who consider themselves to be neither male nor female.

ABOUT THE FILM

The film is made on the outcome of the very famous case *Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India*¹⁵ in which Section 377 of the IPC was de-criminalized and partially struck down that marked the beginning of a new era of equality. The film is directed by Faruk Kabir which portrays the story of the journey of petitioners who challenged Section 377 and gives a glimpse of the struggles of the LGBT community. This depicts the stories of Keshav (Sid Makkar) who was living in Paris and having fun, and suddenly he got to know about an attack on Gay bar in Orlando what makes him stressed. His friend encouraged him to do something for the LGBTQ Community in India. After then he met with his friend who let him know that the law which criminalises the LGBTQ Sex under the name of unnatural offences, can be amended or repealed. After knowing this Keshav decided to come India and fight against this in accordance with law. Further, it took this story of a Lucknow man, Arif Jafar (Zeeshan Ayub), who was arrested from his Bharosa Trust office, a community-based NGO that provided information and counselling for AIDS awareness. Jafar gets targeted by a prejudiced establishment for being a homosexual himself. He gets imprisonment for propagating ideas around “unnatural sex.” Another thread revolves around Pallav (Shashank Arora), who got bullied in his childhood by some boys upon this incident his mother explains to him that he should not be afraid of anyone. Later on, he becomes a good cricket player in his college and have in love with his friend but due to the fear of the family

¹⁵ *Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India* AIR 2018 SC 4321.

and society, his friend leaves him. On his 18th Birthday, his father came to know about his identity and thought that Pallav got mad. along with that he is dealing with heartbreak and struggling to make peace with his family who think that Pallav needs a psychiatrist and want to get him treated for his disease. Next, Shalmili (Maanvi Gagroo) is in romance with her friend Nisha, blossoms while watching Ismat Chughtai's most celebrated yet controversial "Lihaaf". One day she comes to her mother (Tanvi Azmi) and tells that she is a lesbian. Although, her mother got stunned to hear this but stands by her, supports her and filed a petition against section 377 of IPC.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

The movie within its 1 hour and 33 minutes runtime, was truly able to capture the real struggles that the LGBTQ community has faced for years. The symbolism in the film hits hard in the very first shot of the movie where there was a pink flower surrounded by a bunch of yellow flowers, showing that a human different from society is still a human.

In this movie, we not only get to see the arguments that were put in the Supreme Court but also get to experience the struggles that were faced by these petitioners, who challenged the IPC Section 377. The film, in very starting frame, rightly shows the economic angle of the country that the country GDP is falling due to the act against the LGBTQ community. Moreover, it shows the feelings of the LGBTQ with a statement that 'don't know what people gain by harassing them. Next, it portrays the gay bar shootout in Orlando that shows the hatred of people over gay people. It also uses the very suitable song of Urvashi- Urvashi by A.R. Rahman that gives a lesson to be okay and don't worry if a situation gets abnormal. The stand taken by

Shalmili's mother is also important where she understands her daughter and goes to the court to file a petition to abolish IPC Section 377 and decriminalize homosexuality. In order to keep the movie as real as they can, newspaper clippings and television broadcasts are shown from time to time.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

The movie suffers from the phenomena of a lack of sense of direction and the story gets lost from time to time. Sometimes it gets into homosexual feelings, sometimes struggles of activism, but couldn't attach all of the lives together in the story. While the movie was made with a lot of hard work, it narrowly shows the actual route to the significant victory of the LGBT community in India, the actual battle was the one that was fought in the court, which the movie showed in a very brief and vague manner. In the movie, the concept of the "Pink Economy" was mentioned by Keshav and his lawyer, which was also the main point of argument in the petitioner's repertoire. But the writers of the movie did not care to explain in the movie what the Pink Economy is all about. In the movie, the chief petitioner i.e. Navtej Singh Johar, along with other petitioners was highly ignored, it also did not demonstrate the scene when Keshav was going to meet someone who will become the gooly of the case.

The only thing that left an impact in the entire runtime of the movie was the acting skills of Zeeshan Ayyub who played the role of Arif Jafar but the backstories of other characters suffer from a lack of proper characterization and seem to be written in hurry¹⁶.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

377 AB Normal is a landmark movie in India. This movie gives an impact of “right to sexuality”, “right to sexual autonomy” and “right to choose of a sexual partner”. the film makes a great impact on its viewers by breaking their belief that homosexuality is odious, a meanspirited act and they should stay out of society and hidden from everyone.

According to the Bentham’s Utilitarian Theory, ‘all punishments are in itself is evil’. His views that punishments should only be laid down so that it removes a bigger evil. Bentham advocated for reforms in sodomy laws since early and held homosexuality as if viewed outside the realms of morality and religion, is neutral behaviour which gives the participants pleasure and does not cause pain to anyone else¹⁷. And this view has been shown in the movie that leaves a great impact in the society that in our society, culture, neighbourhood, workplace homosexuality just spread love but not hatred and it not any kind of evil. Therefore, this movie encourages all the LGBTQ community to face the situation courageously without taking society too seriously and look forward for their happiness.

CONCLUSION

377 Ab Normal is a movie that beautifully demonstrates the struggle of LGBTQ from road to justice and it displays the words of the great German thinker, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, I am what I am, so take me as I am. It gives a smack to all those stereotypes and the old thinking person who believed that LGBTQ persons are curse on society. This movie rightly produced an expansive view of the judgment of Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India that is a milestone judgment in itself. It is well made however a slow style of movie but it is what that connects it with the moot problem. This movie clearly fit on the song 'Na Moonh Chhupa Ke Jiyo aur na Sar Jhuka Ke Jiyo' from the movie Hamraaz (1967) that inspires the people to walk with their heads high in the society. Moreover, this film is definitely heart touching film and a film that is crucial for the society. This movie is an orderly voice or say amidst the noise.

¹⁶ [377 Ab Normal review: Well-meaning saga about LGBTQ rights in India goes astray, Available at: <https://www.cinestaan.com/reviews/377-ab-normal-40119> (last visited on Feb. 08, 2023).

¹⁷ [MANISHA KUMARI GUPTA,) *Navtej Singh Johar & Ors. v. Union of India*: Interpreting Section 377 of IPC 1860, 4 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities, 211 (2014).



ARTICLE 15

Kumar Satyam

Central University of South Bihar, Gaya

“Films are an important form of cultural expression and play a crucial role in shaping public discourse and reflecting the values and issues of the society in which they are created.”

INTRODUCTION

Films can be considered as a mirror of society, reflecting its values, beliefs, and attitudes. Through their stories, characters, and themes, films often provide a reflection of the social, political, and cultural issues that are prevalent in society at a given time. They can highlight social problems and injustices, spark public discourse, and challenge the status quo.

Films play a crucial role in our society and have a profound impact on the way we think, feel, and view the world. Films serve as a reflection of the culture and values of a society. They showcase the experiences, struggles, and triumphs of different groups of people and provide a platform for underrepresented communities to have their stories told. Through films, audiences can gain a deeper understanding of different cultures, traditions, and perspectives, promoting empathy and cultural awareness. Films can also serve as a means of education, conveying important historical events, scientific concepts, and moral values. They can make complex ideas accessible and entertaining, helping people to better understand and engage with the world.

ABOUT THE FILM

“Article 15” is a 2019 Indian Hindi-language film directed by Anubhav Sinha. The film stars Ayushmann Khurrana, Isha Talwar, Sayani Gupta, Kumud Mishra, Manoj Pahwa, and Nassar in leading roles. The movie is a crime drama that draws its inspiration from real-life incidents of caste-based discrimination and violence in rural India. The film follows the story of a young and idealistic police officer, played by Ayushmann Khurrana, who is posted in a remote village and is confronted with the harsh realities of the caste system and systemic corruption. As he investigates a brutal crime, he uncovers a web of corruption and abuse of power that threatens to destroy the fabric of society.

“Article 15” received critical acclaim for its powerful storytelling and the performances of its cast. The film was a commercial success and was widely praised for its handling of sensitive and relevant social issues. It has been credited with starting a national conversation on caste-based discrimination and the need for systemic change.

Overall, “Article 15” is considered to be one of the most impactful and socially relevant films in recent Indian cinema and has been widely praised for its handling of important and timely themes.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

“Article 15” that tackle themes of discrimination, oppression, and inequality can bring these issues to the forefront of public consciousness and prompt discussions and debates about ways to address them. In the movie the plot was created one in the vicinity of Uttar Pradesh, a state where discrimination on the basis of caste is predominant.

“Article 15” is a thought-provoking film that challenges the audience to confront the realities of Indian society and to consider their own role in creating a more just and equitable world. The film encourages viewers to reflect on their own beliefs and attitudes and to engage with important social issues. The film deals with important and relevant social issues such as caste-based discrimination, corruption, and abuse of power, which are still prevalent in India today. By shining a light on these issues, the film raises important questions and prompts a public discourse on the need for systemic change.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

As with any film, “Article 15” has both strengths and weaknesses. While the film received praise for its engaging storyline, powerful performances, and thought-provoking themes, but the movies have lots of lacuna. The film for its depiction of Dalits, or members of India’s lowest caste, as passive victims who are unable to take action to resist oppression. Some argue that this depiction reinforces negative stereotypes and does not accurately reflect the agency and resilience of Dalit communities. The film also portrayal of police officers, who are often depicted as corrupt and complicit in the systemic injustices faced by Dalits. Some argue that this depiction reinforces negative stereotypes of the police and does not accurately reflect the complex reality of the police force in India.

Film oversimplifies complex social and political issues, such as caste-based discrimination and corruption, by reducing them to straightforward villains and heroes. They argue that this oversimplification can detract from the nuanced realities of these issues and may not provide a fully accurate picture of the situation. Finally, the film for being heavy-handed in its message, with many elements of the film feeling forced or preachy.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film “Article 15” has had significant socio-legal impacts in India. Here are a few key ways in which the film has influenced Indian society and the legal system:

Raising awareness of caste-based discrimination: The film has helped to raise awareness of the issue of caste-based discrimination, which remains a serious problem in India today. By bringing the issue to the forefront, the film has contributed to a national conversation on the need for change and has put pressure on the government to take action to address this issue.

Encouraging public discourse: The film has encouraged public discourse on a range of social and legal issues, including corruption, abuse of power, and police brutality. By providing a platform for discussion, the film has helped to engage the public in important debates and to promote change.

Challenging the legal system: The film has challenged the Indian legal system to take a more proactive role in addressing the systemic injustices faced by Dalits. It has prompted calls for reforms to the legal system and has brought attention to the need for stronger protections for marginalized communities.

Inspiring activism: The film has inspired activism and social movements, particularly among young people who are passionate about creating a more just and equitable society. The film has encouraged these activists to become more engaged in important social and legal issues and to work towards creating change.


Changing attitudes: By raising awareness of important social issues and encouraging public discourse, the film has helped to change attitudes and to shift public opinion on a range of issues. This has contributed to a more informed and engaged public and has helped to create a more supportive environment for change.

Overall, the film “Article 15” has had a significant impact on Indian society and the legal system. Through its powerful storytelling and thought-provoking themes, the film has helped to raise awareness of important issues, to challenge the status quo, and to inspire change.

CONCLUSION

Films can be considered as a mirror of society, reflecting its values, beliefs, and attitudes. Through their stories, characters, and themes, films often provide a reflection of the social, political, and cultural issues that are prevalent in society at a given time. They can highlight social problems and injustices, spark public discourse, and challenge the status quo.

In conclusion, the film “Article 15” is a powerful and thought-provoking film that has had significant impacts on Indian society and the legal system. Through its engaging storyline, powerful performances, and important themes, the film has raised awareness of caste-based discrimination, encouraged public discourse, challenged the legal system, inspired activism, and changed attitudes. Despite some criticisms, the film remains an important contribution to the ongoing conversation about social justice and equality in India. By shining a light on these important issues, the film has helped to raise awareness, spur action, and create a more just and equitable society.



GARGI (2022)

S. Suriyakala

Tamil Nadu National Law University, Trichy

INTRODUCTION

Gargi is a 2022 Tamil film centred around the theme of child sexual abuse. It is directed by Gautham Ramachandran. Crimes involving sexual abuse, more specifically child sexual abuse, have been on the rise all over the world in the past few decades. There have been positive, collective efforts to ensure greater awareness of protecting children from abusers, though they are marred sometimes by victim blamers and moral policers. Despite not being made as a preachy awareness film, the impact of Gargi is certainly hard-hitting due to its close relevance to real-life events that one might encounter in their neighbourhood or the news. The movie assumes legal significance as the law is ultimately the daughter's only resort to ensure that her father, whom she believes to be innocent, gets justice. It also follows the development arc of a stuttering lawyer, who has not argued for even a single case due to his stuttering problem, as he goes on to gain confidence due to the trust Gargi places in him as well as the fact that he has nothing to lose. "Will she win in her lone fight against those who are seemingly trying to frame her 'innocent' father?" is what the movie is all about.

ABOUT THE FILM

A young woman from a middle-class family who works as a schoolteacher finds her life turned upside down overnight, with her father, the watchman of an apartment, being held as an accused in the case of a gang sexual assault of a minor. She loses her job, is not supported by her fiancé and breaks up with him, and her family becomes the target of social contempt and stigma with cow dung being smeared on the walls of their house and stones being pelted at their windows. All through this, she does not lose hope in her father's innocence and believes that the police must have surely been mistaken or misguided. Thus, she undertakes the uphill task of proving his innocence before the court of law, when a parallel media trial has already convicted him before the court could deem him to be so. This is where Indrans, a lawyer with zero experience comes forward to help her, saying that he has nothing to lose as he is a nobody in society. With him by her side, she goes from pillar to post, trying to visit her imprisoned father and getting the court to hear their side of the story. The film shatters several misconceptions about child sexual abuse, like the fallacy that those who have daughters will not commit sexual offences on another woman or girl child. It also shatters the heroic image of her father in her mind, as Gargi has to come to terms with the fact that the same man who saved her from sexual abuse as a kid could have now become a sexual abuser himself.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

When the public prosecutor murmurs in court, loud enough for the judge to hear, that the case would have gotten over much earlier if only the judge had been 'normal', the transgender judge aptly rebukes him by boldly asserting that they knew the arrogance of a man and pain of a woman and are therefore the best person to decide the case. The film also got right the state of media houses or news agencies

in India, that conduct media trials and witch-hunts without caring about respecting the privacy of others, just for the sake of gaining an edge over other channels in terms of Television Rating Points and being the first to break the news. The protagonist Gargi is initially shown to be a conservative woman who chides her younger sister, who is a prepubescent schoolgirl, for her way of dressing and staying out later than the time of sunset, playing with her friends. Her evolved attitude towards her sister and life, in general, is revealed during the post-credits scene, where her younger sister says that Gargi is no longer like how she used to be in the past and that she lectures her less now. This shows that Gargi has matured as a person, by the turbulent times in her life, and has understood that clothing is not responsible for the occurrence of sexual abuse. Another major fact that the film got right is that those who are accused of a sexual offence cannot be absolved just by the fact that he has daughters or was born with sisters.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG


Gargi and her lawyer Indrans go to the house of the abuse survivor and try to coerce her father to meet the daughter 'only once', seemingly to reaffirm if it was indeed Gargi's father she meant to recognise and point in the identification parade. This pressurising on the young survivor who was facing great difficulty in even returning to her normal life, to recount the details of that traumatic incident, outside of legal or police procedures, felt like a serious breach of ethics and law. There was no reason to allow her to be subject to such burdening in her state of confusion about what happened to her. The defence counsel Indrans also secretly records the admission of the abuse survivor's father that he coached his daughter to pick out the accused men during the identification parade. He further adduces this in court, not caring that it is a breach of the recorded person's privacy and cannot be admissible in court as per several landmark judgments.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The movie has made welcome the idea of having a transgender judge and has led to the starting of more conversation in society about child sexual abuse. The judge takes care and adheres to legal provisions concerning minors, especially during her court appearance and the identification parade, safeguarding the interests and privacy of the survivor in the wake of unwanted media attention in the case. The child's legal rights have been exercised in accessing legal remedies, instead of giving in to social pressures and being silenced, which are culturally believed to be the better option that would not affect the girl's future. In the end, it was the due process of law and truth that won, bringing justice to the survivor. I believe that this movie would therefore lead to greater encouragement in society to report the crime instead of being hesitant about the consequences that it might have on the family's reputation and the survivor's future prospects. The lawyer with no experience has gained confidence and at least some experience by getting a chance to argue this case before the court. As a law student, it was heartening to see the judge being cognizant of his stammering and patiently hearing him out without compromising on her objective seriousness as a judge.

CONCLUSION

This movie is a must-watch not only for law students and legal professionals but also for everyone else, as the movie stays with you long after you've watched it, making you question and critically analyse the state of society. For the evil of sexual abuse to be abolished from society, there needs to be an increase in the conversations surrounding it, until the voices of abuse survivors can no longer be silenced, and the noise gets deafening to the extent that it can no longer be ignored.



JOLLY LLB (2013): A POWERFUL COMMENTARY ON THE REALITIES OF THE INDIAN JUSTICE SYSTEM

Shivam Bhattacharya

Gujarat National Law University, Gandhinagar

Cinema is not only about making people dream. It's about changing things and making people think.

Nadine Labaki (Actress, director and activist).

INTRODUCTION

'Jolly LLB' is a Hindi courtroom drama film that revolves around the Indian legal system and follows the journey of a struggling lawyer who takes on a high-profile case to prove his worth. Released in 2013, it starred the impressive *Jolly* (Arshad Warshi) and *Rajpal* (Boman Irani) in the lead roles. The movie based on the famous hit-and-run case of *Sanjeev Nanda* in 1999, has a good mixture of drama, suspense, twists and a fitting climax. From a legal perspective, the movie highlights several aspects and provides insights into how the system actually works at the ground level. The storyline involves the journey of Jolly, who navigates the complexities of the Indian legal system and emerges victorious at the end. The role played by *Saurabh Shukla* as the Judge was one of the major highlights of the film. The movie received a positive response from the audience post its release.

ABOUT THE FILM

The movie in its essence is humorous, intense, poignant and offers a reality check on the functioning of the Courts in India. The story revolves around Jolly, a small-time lawyer who decides to move to Delhi to earn money and fame in the legal circuit. He comes across a highly-publicised case of a rich boy from an extremely well-to-do family, who in his drunken state allegedly ran over and killed six innocent pavement-dwellers at night. The accused is represented by the best lawyer in the country, *Rajpal*, who through his sheer legal acumen manages to prove that there is no evidence against his client. The Court acquits him initially, however, Jolly files a *PIL before the District and Sessions Court* in Delhi.

Along his journey towards delivering justice, Jolly faces a lot of obstacles starting from being bribed to being physically assaulted by alleged henchmen of the opposite party. Being new to the strenuous field of litigation, the Judge reprimands Jolly in the first hearing for his basic mistakes in filing a PIL and taking press reports as evidence.

His conscience rises when his wife, played by *Amrita Rao*, encourages him to fight for the truth instead of accepting a bribe from the opposite party. Subsequently, he becomes even more determined to win the case. With the help of his friends, he manages to retrieve the video footage of the car that night. As the case progresses, Jolly soon learns that there is still a survivor of the accident and manages to present him before the Judge. The survivor narrates his ordeal on that fateful night, and identifies the accused as the person who was driving the car. The Judge takes note of the lapses in the police investigation and suspends the police officer and the accused Rahul is sentenced to *7 years of imprisonment* under Section 304 of the IPC.

Even though the film becomes predictable at some points, the overall production and direction of the film is commendable. From a legal perspective, the film provides a stark illustration of the challenges faced by common people in navigating the complexities and highlights the importance of a competent lawyer who can fight for justice and represent the interests of their clients.

It thus provides a thought-provoking commentary on the Indian legal system, highlighting its strengths and weaknesses, and offering a glimpse into the lives of those who work within it.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

‘Jolly LLB’ is a promising, entertaining and engaging film. The film's script is well-written, with plenty of humour and drama. It is the story of an underdog who fights against the whole judicial system.. It accurately depicts some of the common challenges faced by individuals navigating the Indian legal system, such as corruption, bureaucratic delays, and the influence of money and power on the outcome of cases. The most defining feature of the main protagonist is that he refuses to be intimidated and deterred even as he comes up against one of the best lawyers in the country.

The movie benefits from some fiery courtroom exchanges between the two lawyers and the Judge. The scene wherein Jolly sees the plight and anguish of the pavement dwellers is extremely moving. It shows the simmering frustration within the minds of a common man to get justice.

Significantly, the film highlights the crucial role of the judiciary in upholding the ‘Rule of Law’ and ensuring justice is served. The film accurately portrays the slow pace of the legal system and the numerous hurdles that individuals must overcome in order to seek justice. The depiction of corruption and the influence of money and power on the outcome of cases is also reflected in the movie. The portrayal of the legal profession as an important aspect of society is an important element of the film along with the significance of having lawyers who are honest committed to fighting for their clients.

WHAT THE FILM GOT WRONG

‘Jolly LLB’, like most Bollywood films, is a work of fiction and therefore, certain liberties have been taken with the depiction of legal procedures and events in the movie. From a legal perspective, here are a few areas where the movie could have been better:

Depiction of legal proceedings: The movie takes some liberties with the portrayal of legal proceedings and the way cases are conducted in court. In some instances, the film simplifies complex legal procedures and presents them in a manner that is not entirely accurate.

Portrayal of judges: The movie portrays judges in a stereotypical manner and exaggerates the extent to which personal biases can influence judicial decision-making. The generalisation of the Judges in the film could have been presented in a better manner.

Representation of evidence: The movie does not always accurately represent the way evidence is presented and used in a court of law. For example, there are instances in the movie where witnesses are brought before the Court without giving prior notice to the Judge or the opposing counsel, which in a real case would not be admissible.

Nevertheless, this film should definitely be watched by those who are interested in the legal field and want to know how the system actually works. It is important to take note of that films are often simplified for the purpose of entertainment, and it is not always possible to represent accurately every aspect of a complex system such as the legal system in a single film.

SOCIO-LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE FILM

The film “Jolly LLB” has had a significant socio-legal impact in India, serving as a commentary on the Indian legal system and highlighting some of its key challenges and shortcomings.

Firstly, the film has contributed to a wider public discourse on the Indian legal system, bringing attention to issues such as corruption and the influence of money and power on the outcome of cases. The film has sparked a conversation about the need for reforms and improvements in the system.

Secondly, it has contributed to a wider public awareness and highlighted the crucial role that lawyers play in ensuring that the rights of their clients are protected and that justice is served, and has encouraged people to seek out competent and honest legal representation.

The film manifested the significance of upholding the rule of law, and ensuring that justice is served to everyone. It has helped in encouraging the citizens to be more mindful of the critical role played by the Judiciary in ensuring a fair and just legal system. That is, the film has served as a catalyst for a wider appreciation of the importance of the legal profession amongst the general public in India.

CONCLUSION

The film evokes introspective thoughts on the Indian legal system and its challenges. It has an engaging storyline and highlights some of the common issues faced by individuals navigating the Indian legal system and the influence of money and power on the outcome of cases. The film also emphasizes the importance of competent and honest legal representation, as well as the crucial role of the judiciary in upholding the rule of law and ensuring justice is served.

The film eloquently presents the journey of a small-time litigator who faces all challenges thrown at him with resilience and conviction. Importantly, the film through its presentation highlights the

loopholes in the judicial system and how the rich and the powerful take advantage of it. Two interesting points in the film emerge. Once, when the Judge tells Jolly that, "*The law may be blind. The Judge is not*". Also, at one point the opposing counsel, tells Jolly that, "*Yeh court hai, yahan jaldi kuch nahi hota*". Both these statements underscores the need for the stakeholders involved to take crucial steps towards ensuring that the cases are disposed of as effectively as possible, and at the same time ensuring that justice is served.

'Jolly LLB' scores on most of the grounds including its acting, direction, storyline and production. Overall, it presents a stinging indictment of our judicial system while also providing the viewers with hope that if truth is fought for in all its honesty and conviction, then justice would be served no matter what.

“Cinema is not only about making people dream. It’s about changing things and making people think.”

— Nadine Labaki



chitrapat.co.in



probono-india.in



krjoshi.com