

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES [IJLSSS]

ISSN: 2584-1513 (Online)

Volume 3 | Issue 1 [2025] | Page 83 - 97

© 2025 International Journal of Legal Studies and Social Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlss.com/>

In case of any queries or suggestions, kindly contact editor@ijlss.com

FROM SECTION 124A TO SECTION 152: EVOLUTION, CONTROVERSIES, AND IMPLICATIONS OF INDIA'S SEDITION LAWS

-Kushagra Singh

ABSTRACT

The paper is intended to study the evolution of sedition laws in India, with a particular focus on the change from Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), to Section 152 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) 2023. While much of that criticism against Section 124A has decried its "suppressing dissent" and "limiting free speech in India," Section 152 turns the state's attention toward "acts endangering the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India." However, it omits the explicit term "sedition"; this omission does not eliminate the potential for misuse. Although it retains ambiguous provisions, including phrases such as "subversive activities" and the inclusion of "financial means and electronic communication," these elements could broaden state power. As a result, there exists a risk of mislabelling legitimate dissent as a threat, which is a serious concern for democratic principles.

The BNS introduces a more structured framework and coherent definitions, with the intention of modernizing the legal landscape. Section 152 imposes significant penalties for inciting secession or armed revolt; however, it permits open criticism of government actions—this is a marked shift from the expansive prohibitions outlined in Section 124A. Although the terms employed in Section 152 are abstract, they raise apprehensions regarding possible misuse and infringement on constitutional rights. This paper posits that, while the BNS seeks to enhance national security, it complicates the distinction between legitimate dissent and perceived threats, potentially leading to an overreach that endangers democratic liberties. The findings emphasize the urgent need for more precise definitions and strong judicial safeguards to preserve individual rights in this changing legal landscape.

INTRODUCTION

In India, the idea of sedition has changed drastically, starting as a tool of colonial oppression and now incorporating measures to address national security issues. Under the British colonial government instated in 1870, Section 124A¹ (Sedition) of the Indian Penal Code was enacted with the intention of choking out any dissenting voices and safeguarding the imperial rule. Its vague wording and stringent penalties became the embodiment of an oppressive regime that drew flak for curtailing free speech and democratic participation. Even after pardonable transgressions by the courts in India post-independence, including the celebrated case of *Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar*² in 1962 that offered limitations on the provision's scope to acts that only incite violence or public disorder, it remained a hotbed of controversy due to its liability to abuse in its benign form.

In the year 2023, the legal framework underwent a significant change saw the introduction of section 152 in the *Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita*³. It is this clause in this section which replaces the word “sedition” with offences against the sovereignty, unity and integrity of the nation. Such a reframing seems to be consistent with concerns raised in dictions in contemporary India in that it attempts to separate what is legitimate dissent from activities that endanger national security. Section 152 also solves one of the shortcomings of the former law, there being no allowance for lawful discrediting of the government, which provided for extreme measures in protection of state interests. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the phrase ‘subversive activities and expansion to cover internet and financial transactions is concerning as it suggests abuse and violation of individual rights provided in the constitution.

This change demonstrates the attempts being made by India to update its justice institution within the confines of upholding the integration of the country and individual freedom. However, it also points to the long way that still exists to the brute force of the state against the will of the people, and thus the necessity of definitions and the protection against their abuse. Lastly, as the constitution is amended, the issue still remains whether or not the modifications addressed the

¹ (Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 124A)

² (*Kedarnath Singh v. State of Bihar*, 1962)

³ (*Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita Bill*, 2023, § 152)

need of maintaining law and order without compromising the democratic principles of the state as provided by the Constitution.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF SEDITION LAWS IN INDIA

Sedition laws in India have evolved in a unique contextual framework comprising of colonial histories, interpretations by courts and the current political conditions. Sedition laws were first introduced in Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code with the purpose of suppressing the voice of the Indians fighting against colonialism. In present day India, this has been argued quite differently especially considering the change to section 152 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) 2023. This section explores the history of sedition law, and the most prominent cases and events, that reinterpret it in modern times.

COLONIAL ORIGINS: INTRODUCTION OF SECTION 124A IPC

The British introduced Section 124A in 1870 as a colonial measure to curb any form of opposition to colonial rule. It was mainly meant to curb nationalist sentiments and criminalize any utterance that to any degree could spur hatred or scorn against the monarchy. Sundry Indian leaders experienced the effects of this law almost immediately. The law was first invoked against Bal Gangadhar Tilak in 1897 after his articles were published by Kesari Journal⁴. The trial of Tilak made patent the imperial design of equating any dissent with disloyalty, dubbing all opposition as endangering public order and safety.

The second trial of Tilak in 1917 further highlighted the law's oppressive potential. Even though the judiciary maintained a position that was somewhat less severe, the wide and ambiguous definitions of “disaffection” gave ample scope for abuse hence even peaceful disapprobation of government was made an offense.

SEDITION POST-INDEPENDENCE: JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

In the years following independence, Section 124A became overtly contentious, as it did not seem to align with the spirit of free speech enshrined in Article 19(1)(a)⁵ of the Constitution. The critical and memorable turning point in this respect arose in the case of *Tara Singh Gopi Chand v. The*

⁴Bal Gangadhar Tilak, *The Role of Kesari in India's Freedom Struggle*, *Kesari* (Mar. 25, 2024).

⁵ (Constitution of India, 1950, art. 19(1)(a))

State (1951)⁶ when the Punjab High Court struck down the section as unconstitutional for violating the principles of free speech. However, the First Constitutional Amendment (1951) added “public order” as a justifiable restriction to the freedom of speech clause, therefore giving sedition laws a new lease of life within the ambit of the Constitution.

The ambit of the term ‘sedition’ was succinctly elucidated by the Supreme Court in the landmark judgment of *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar* (1962)⁷. The court upheld the provision of Section 124A of the IPC as constitutional but narrowed its scope down to actions with an evident inclination towards violence or public disorder. The court was of the view that even the strongest comments about the government, however vitriolic, would not amount to sedition unless they called for violence or an uprising. This also struck a nano coating protected the primary interest of the state and the fundamental rights of the citizens.

LANDMARK CASES SHAPING SEDITION LAWS

1. **Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar (1962):** The court also made a distinction between permissible critique and acts of sedition, claiming that sedition could only be invoked in cases where there was intention coupled with the probability of violence towards inducing feelings of resentment. This ruling continues to be the foundation for understanding the scope of section 124A.
2. **Balwant Singh v. State of Punjab (1995)**⁸: The Supreme Court exonerated people who were charged with shouting slogans against the Government, asserting that a few random remarks with no intention of promoting violence do not amount to sedition.
3. **Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015)**⁹: While not directly linked to sedition, this case established a strong precedent about safeguarding free speech, nullifying unreasonable provisions of the IT Act. It emphasized more on the fact that laws which impinge on fundamental rights have to be drafted with greater precision.
4. **Recent Developments:** Recent cases, including accusations levelled against members of the press and those involved in activism, have once again raised discussions on the application of sedition laws.

⁶ (*Tara Singh Gopi Chand v. The State*, 1951)

⁷ (*Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar*, 1962)⁷

⁸ (*Balwant Singh & Anr. v. State of Punjab*, 1995)

⁹ (*Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, 2015)

Cases like **Arun Jaitley v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2015)**¹⁰ and recent petitions challenging Section 124A highlight its controversial application.

TRANSITION TO SECTION 152 OF THE BNS

The Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 substitutes Section 124A with Section 152 with a difference in focus from the specific word “sedition” and now looks at actions that “threaten the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India.” This change illustrates a strategy to contemporary update the provisions of law on sedition and tackle the challenge of abusing them in legal practice. Nevertheless, the new provision includes vague concepts, such as “subversive activities,” which is problematic in relation to risks of abuse. Detractors believe that the ambiguity will allow the laws ever used to abuse since Section 124A to suppress dissimilarities, to remain in effect and be misused.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS

For as long as sedition laws have existed, there has always existed a conflict between the powers of the state and those of the individual. Sociologically, interpretations of law aimed at narrowing the limits of sedition are prone to abuse. As was Section 152, its introduction must achieve two equally important objectives: preservation of territorial integrity and democracy. This entails strong judicial protection with regard to the legislative framing of the provisions, to avoid the provisions being misused against bonafide opposition.

FREE SPEECH AND THEORIES ON THE FREE SPEECH

The concept of free speech vis-a-vis enacting sedition laws in India represents the uneasy compromise between fundamental freedoms and the security of the state. The Constitution of India, under Article 19(1)(a), guarantees every citizen the right to free speech, which is an essential element of any democracy as it empowers citizens to question the government, and stimulate discussion on important issues. However, Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), has over the years, restricted this right as it prescribed punishment for any word or gesture publishing hatred or contempt towards the government. This dilemma was resolved in *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar* [1962] where the Constitutionality of the sedition law was of course upheld but also limited the application of the law to acts that involved or were likely incite violence or disorder. However, the specter of anti-dissenting use of sedition laws persists and stifles the very essence of freedom of expression, or rather, its practice.

¹⁰ (Arun Jaitley v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2015)

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 presents an entirely new Section 152 in place of Section 124A which relates to actions threatening 'sovereignty, unity and integrity' as opposed to merely speaking against the government. While this shift in aim attempts to limit the applicability of the law, its critics maintain that it has the potential to inhibit free expression as it is prone to loose interpretation and abuse. Proponents of the amendment to the clause assert that it seeks to mitigate threats to national security more clearly. Hence, sedition laws in their application have undergone considerable transition starting from the colonial BNA statutes to the present BNS. Competing and contending interests of freedom in a democracy and nationalistic exigencies designed for purpose of oppression. Nevertheless, the perfect scenario will always be that such laws will be enacted, great restraint will be observed in the application of such statutes by the government and the interpretation will always be wholesome and in favor of upholding free speech in any functional democracy.

EVOLUTION AND DIFFERENCE OF SEDITION LAW AS PER IPC AND BHARATIYA NYAYA SANHITA

K.M. Munshi, a member of the Constituent Assembly, and Sikh leader Bhupinder Singh Mann opposed the inclusion of such restrictive provisions, arguing that criticism of the government is essential to democracy. However, judicial interpretations in the early years struck down several laws as unconstitutional due to their infringement on free speech.

To address these challenges, the First Constitutional Amendment Act of 1951 was introduced by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's government. It reimposed restrictions on free speech by amending Article 19(2) to include grounds like "public order" and "incitement to an offense" for restricting the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression. These amendments not only revived the sedition law but also broadened the scope for its application.

In contemporary India, the sedition law has faced significant criticism for being weaponized against political opponents, journalists, activists, and dissenters. Data reveals a sharp rise in sedition cases post-2014, with over 800 cases pending and around 13,000 individuals imprisoned. Most charges have targeted individuals for criticizing government actions or expressing dissent, raising concerns about its misuse and the chilling effect on free speech.

This historical and political context underscores the need to re-evaluate the sedition law's relevance and its potential to undermine democratic freedoms while maintaining a balance between national security and civil liberties

SEDITION AS PER IPC

Sedition is a crime under Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

Section 124A. Sedition

Whoever, by words, either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation, or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite disaffection towards, the Government established by law in India, shall be punished with imprisonment for life, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with fine.

Explanation 1.- The expression "disaffection" includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity.

Explanation 2.- Comments expressing disapprobation of the measures of the Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence under this section.

Explanation 3.- Comments expressing disapprobation of the administrative or other action of the Government without excitement or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence under this section.

A person charged under this law is Barred from a government job.

They have to live without their passport and must appear in court at all times as and when required.

THE NEED FOR SEDITION LAW IN INDEPENDENT INDIA

It provides further clarity that right to free speech under the Indian Constitution article 19(1)(a) is not absolute and carries reasonable restrictions as provided under article 19(2) of the constitution. Abrogation of the sedition law would severely undermine the government's ability to hold its unity, integrity and sovereignty. Moreover, it consists in preserving the functioning of the government by the rule of law and preventing any violent change-based government extinguishment. The existing government which is enacted according to the law is vital for the preservation of stability in the state.

PROBLEMS WITH THE SEDITION LAW

Sedition laws seem to be a vestige of the Colonial Age as evident in their application. The colonialists used sedition legislation against every critic of their oppressive rule. Many of the prominent figures of the Indian Independence struggle such as Gandhi, Tilak, Nehru, Bhagat Singh and many others were charged and imprisoned for their seditious speeches and writings, and freedom of speech was not tolerated during the British Empire. Therefore, there was a lot of enforcement of the sedition law during colonization.

Afterward, in the case of Independence, The Constituent Assembly did not support the idea. The members were against the proposition to incorporate sedition in the Constitution as they were of the opinion that it would infringe upon the right to free speech. They also suggested that the sedition law was unconstitutional in as much that it could be misused in the oppression of the right to assembly as a form of protest.

The main problem associated with the Sedition Law, or its discontents, is that it does not define be seditious but broadly refers to actions which 'bring into hatred or contempt' or 'attempt to excite disaffection'. These phrases could mean many things, and any government or police force is permitted to persecute anyone who fits its agenda, including people who are innocent.

The reason police can charge individuals for sedition, even when such individuals have committed no seditious acts, is not only the impeding of the right to free speech but rather the very broad definition of seditious acts. The language of seditious conspiracy in its present form has been disastrous for the Indian democracy as it is increasingly getting described as an elected dictatorship.

The examples are increasing that this law has been used more like a political tool for targeting the political opponents rather than maintaining the peace and civility. For instance, the cases registered under section 124A increased by 160% between 2016 and 2019 while the cases that resulted in conviction stood at 3%.

SUPREME COURT JUDGEMENTS REGARDING SEDITION LAWS

KEDARNATH V. STATE OF BIHAR, AIR 1962 SC 955

In this landmark case, the constitutional validity Section 124A of the IPC was challenged by the petitioner. The sedition law was contended to restrict the freedom of speech which is not in the interest of the public having contrary opinions with government.

FACTS

Kedarnath, the political leader, openly condemned the Congress Government. In a speech when he was addressing the critics and talking about the government, he expressed support for the Forward Communist Party. Based on the choice of words that he used in the speech, a case was filed against him on the grounds of Section 124A, Sedition and Section 505, Public Mischief, with additional firearms specifications. In line with the judgement, the respondent was thereby sentenced to one year of rigorous imprisonment.

The High Court of Patna dismissed the appeal made by Patel. He sought further appeal to the Supreme Court of India where he stated that his fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression (article 19(1)) was being violated. Additionally, he argued that the provisions of sedition in IPC Section 124A were and is not contained in the Constitution of India.

Issues Involved in the case was essentially Whether sections 124A and 505 of the IPC are ultra vires in the light of Article 19 (1) (a) and (2) of the Constitution of India.

JUDGEMENT

The Court observed first that the provision of sedition (section 124A), clearly restricts freedom of speech under Article 19(1) of the Constitution of India, 1950. However, the Supreme Court of India upheld the constitutional validity of the provisions of the Indian Penal Code that penalized sedition. The Court said that the protection of freedom of speech should be safeguarded to its full extent, but reasonable restrictions are necessary for the safety and integrity of the State. Kedar Nath had given a speech in which he criticized the congress government and advocated for the Forward Communist Party.

THE COURT GAVE THE REASONINGS

The sedition laws cannot be used to penalize expression unless it involves so violent language that it is intended to disturb public peace. Threats directed towards a government which has been established in accordance to the Constitution of India under section 124A, cannot be equated to attacks directed towards one of its political actors or towards his or her fighting political parties. Seditious utterances are detrimental to peace, order, and even stability, which, among other roles,

is the core role of the sovereign state. The Court further observed that Section 124A is not intended to suppress freedom of expression, or political dissent but only those expressions, which lead to public disorder. The Court stated that whenever certain words are spoken with the tendency or the intention of which is to promote public disorder, then such words would amount to sedition. In this sense, it is a constitutionally justified limitation on the freedom of expression because the State can impose limitations on speech in defense of public order. The protection of freedom of expression on the other hand was stated by the Court to be to its fullest extent, but it was also recognized that some limitations on that freedom of expression are necessary for the safety and preservation of the State. In this regard, it is a constitutionally permissible restriction on the right to freedom of expression. For the same reason, the Court held that Section 505 of the Penal Code is also constitutional; it implicates an acceptable limitation on the right to freedom of expression in order to preserve public order.

The Supreme Court of India delivered a significant verdict in the month of May 2022, wherein the Court restrained the application of statute ‘Section 124A of Indian Penal Code’ which dealt with the colonial era sedition. This was the first time after 162 years that the operation of the law was suspended. The Court observed that sedition should be charged in the first instance only when there is an attempt to overthrow the state and not in prosecution aimed at violence which has the potential of national insecurity and sovereignty threatened.

After the judgment, the government was asked to review the provision, as well as introduced a prohibition on further sedition cases, and stood cases already in progress as suspending them and allowing the persons charged to apply for bail. Sedition law has been heavily criticized by many commentators over the years who insist that it is weaponized in order to stifle any form of dissent and is often leveled against journalists, activists and other political foes.

The Court conceded its justification in dealing with threats of secession and terrorism but stressed the necessity of dissent and criticism of the government for democracy to thrive. It therefore called for the criteria for the applicability of the sedition law to be limited to matters concerning disruption of territorial integrity and the sovereignty of the state.

In 2023, however, the 22nd Law Commission took a different view and upheld the retention of Section 124A but with modifications. It argued that the provision must be read in conjunction with the Supreme Court’s order in the matter of Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar so as to provide clearer guidance on its operationalization. Though it also advised that the other punishment should be raised from three years to seven for instances which merit the offence to

varying degrees. These changes indicate considerable progress being made in the protection of freedom of expression against the abuse of statutory limitations even as there are worries related to national security.

SEDITION AS PER BNS

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita Bill's Section 152 goes ahead to make provisions for punishing activities that are likely to undermine the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India. Such acts also include purposeful or knowing spoken or written words, visible representations, electronic communications or financial means, which prompt or seek to prompt tension, war, rebellion, insurgency or separatism. The suggested penalties for these crimes are imprisonment for a term of seven years and up to, including life, along with a fine.

On the one hand, "Secession" denotes the breaking away of one or more states from the Republic of India while on the other "armed rebellion", coining of this phrase as part of the 44th Amendment Act was on practical ground that the situation called for imposition of national state of emergency. The phrase "subversive activities" has been explained in the 43rd report ¹¹with respect to the crimes against national security and further includes acts punishable through the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA)¹² as well as others. The provision further seeks to punish any militant insurrection or cry for militant acts of secession.

Moreover, this section tends to expand the purview of crimes relating to national security through the use of cyber and financial means. While it strengthens the power of the state to combat threats to the territory of the country, it also raises fears of abuse in relation to opposition and freedom of speech.

ACTS ENDANGERING SOVEREIGNTY, UNITY, AND INTEGRITY OF INDIA

1. Section 152 of the new Bill criminalizes "acts endangering sovereignty unity and integrity of India".
2. In section 124A IPC, a person convicted of sedition could get away with a fine. Section 152 of the bill prescribes imprisonment for life or imprisonment which may extend to seven years, in addition to the fine, as punishment. Thus, punishment has been made more severe.

¹¹ (Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967)

¹²

3. The name sedition law will be replaced by "Acts endangering sovereignty unity and integrity of India".
4. Words "disaffection towards the Government established by law in India" have been removed from Section 124A of IPC.
5. It directly targets secessionism, separatism, subversive activities and a call for armed rebellion – words like "contempt" or "hatred" against the Government of India has been removed.
6. It also includes "electronic communication" and "use of financial means" as tools for perpetuating an act "endangering sovereignty unity and integrity of India."
7. Section 124A IPC required very harsh words and some action (for example uprising against the country) to be qualified as sedition. Under Section 152, merely words by themselves will attract the charge of having participated in anti-national activities.
8. Terrorism offences, organized crimes and criminal activities were added to the new Act. Loopholes in New Act.

Section 152 of BNS redefines secession or sedition as ‘acts endangering sovereignty, unity and integrity of India.’ in this new definition however, the issues of vagueness and worry about misuse remain. Contrary to the Kedarnath Singh judgment which confined itself to seditious speech as “incitement to violence” or taking the law and public order,” Section 152 makes a wide net that prohibits all acts that incite or that seek to incite the people with intentions to separate the country without necessarily linking to any form of violence.

The section goes on to list provisions against such individuals thereby allowing law enforcement a very wide power on how to define the offence. Such a scope can be interpreted to also include regardless of the excited or attempted excitement political activity and organization speeches, writings, plays, movies, books among other forms. However, the term ‘subversive activity’ is specified, it is unspecified and clear, thus creating a vagueness on what can be termed as seditious or harmful to the nation.

The punishment has been enhanced with life, imprisonment of not more than 7 years and a fine included, raising the minimum punishment from 3 years. The provision in question does not use the word “sedition,” however, it still retains the essence of Section 124A of the IPC, but the scope of actions covered is much wider. In this regard, critics note that this facilitates encroachments on free speech and raises problems of constitutionality in relation to its enforcement.

CASE LAW

Disha Ravi¹³, whose activism revolves around climate change and is also one of the co-founders of Fridays for Future India, became a global sensation post arrest on February 13, 2021. She faced allegations of sedition due to her reported assistance with an internet toolkit that linked Greta Thunberg and playing a part in the Indian Farmers Protests 2020- 21. The Indian authorities charged Ravi with seditious conspiracy arguing that she had employed the toolkit which had material designed to wheel support behind agitating farmers.

The toolkit in question was mainly intended to be a digital informational handout concerning the protest and how individuals could actively join in. It is like how campaign materials are used in traditional forms of activism, for example, how flyers and posters help create awareness. In the present social media transformation, the World Wide Web has become the core of the cause' and the conquering of the 'people.'

The arrest of Ravi provoked widespread condemnation in India and beyond, and many considered it as abuse of power and an infringement of their right to free speech.

FACTS OF THE CASE

On February 4, 2021, climate activist Greta Thunberg showed her support for the farmers' protest in India through a tweet where she shared a toolkit termed "by people on the ground in India," which was a typical document for social justice activists to sensitize the public and rally support towards issues. On February 13, Disha Ravi, a climate activist who is also a co-founder of Fridays for Future India, was detained by the Delhi police who accused her of disseminating the said farmers protest toolkit. The police charged the toolkit with links to pro-Khalistan sites and pointed out that the actions of Ravi were similar to the violence committed at the Red fort on January 26, 2021, with an aim of creating discord and violence.

Disha dismissed the allegations, stating that they were baseless because all she did was to make a few changes to a pre-existing toolkit and that there was no conspiracy. She also maintained that her detention was in breach of her statutory rights, in particular absence of "transit remand" and denial of access to her advocate. On February 23, 2021, the sessions court admitted her on bail, determining that the prosecution had not provided sufficient evidence in support of the

¹³ (Disha Ravi Bail Order, 2021)

allegations. The court underlined the value of dissent in a democratic state and stated that the right to free articulation including outreach to the world is guaranteed in the constitution of India. The arrest was viewed as unjustified in terms of due process and considering the 1962 Kedar Nath case and its rulings on sedition laws.

CONCLUSION

From the evolution of sedition laws in India which, for the time period we are discussing, can be primarily traced through Section 124A of the IPC and now conversely perforates into Section 152 of BNS 2023, one can see the persistent efforts to achieve the ever-elusive perfect equilibrium between national security and civil liberties. As for the first corruption of content in the BNS, for this sub-section, it is aimed against public disorder or detestation of the government as defined therein, which by its very nature, has been subject to reproach for embodying an aggressive and violent silencing of political dissenters.

In response, the BNS's New Enemy law widens the definition of crimes and criminalization beyond mere betrayal to matters that undermine, promote activities, block meddling secrets, incite after breaking up of the country or even promotes breaking up of the country.

Challenging language in legal implementation and its application; Steps are being taken to fill in the gaps but so laws such as terrorism laws begin to similarly include content on appropriate behavior and introduce vague phrases such as subversive activities. There's also the risk of this resulting in a curtailment on the freedom of speech, as the law might then be aimed at punishing those who dissent or protest for justice in a manner that the law in principle does not allow. The approach seeks to evolve from a restricted understanding of sedition to a sizable body of laws, and this evolution calls for strong judicial protection mechanisms against any infringement against people's rights in the name of protection of the state. The foregoing evolution therefore illustrates the importance of the need to find an equilibrium between the imperatives of national protection and the ideals of democracy.

REFERENCES

- K.I. Vibhute, PSA Pillai's Criminal Law (15th ed. 2024)
- C.K. Thakker & M.C. Thakker, Ratanlal & Dhirajlal's The Indian Penal Code (36th ed. 2023).
- K.D. Gaur, The Indian Penal Code (7th ed., Universal Law Publishing 2023).
- S.R. Myneni, Law of Crimes (3d ed., Asian Law House 2023).

- Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 § 152 (Government of India, 2023)
- <https://www.lawweb.in/2024/09/how-concept-of-sedition-as-mentioned-in.html>
- <https://www.juscorpus.com/sedition-indian-penal-code-vs-bharatiya-nyaya-sanhita>
- Manupatra
- SCC Online
- IPLeaders<https://devgan.in/ipc/section/124A>
- <https://theamikusqriac.com/comparative-analysis-of-sedition-under-indian-penal-code-and-bhartiya-nyaya-sanhita/>
- <https://www.lexology.com/library/>
- <https://www.civildaily.com/news/sedition-law/>
- <https://pure.jgu.edu.in/>
- <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/supreme-court-refers-challenge-to-the-validity-of-sedition-law-to-constitution-bench/>
- <https://www.thestatesman.com/india/old-sedition-law-vs-new-bharatiya-nyaya-sanhita-bill-2023-whats-the-difference>
- <https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/The-origins-and-validity-of-Sedition-Law-in-India>
- <https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2022/07/05/settled-principles-unsettled-sedition-law-sent-into-abeyance/>
- <https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2023/06/02/law-commission-recommends-to-retain-section124a-in-ipc-legal-news/>
- <https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2022/05/11/sedition-law-review-section-124a-pending-trials-fresh-cases-stay-supreme-court-india-judgment-law-legal-research-updates-news/>
- <https://internetfreedom.in/sc-sedition-update-larger-bench/>