



Daily Current Affairs



To The Point by Dhananjay Gautam

Table Of Content **28 Jan 2025**

1. India and Indonesia
2. Appointment of Retired High Court Judges on an Ad Hoc Basis to Tackle Case Backlog
3. Cabinet Approves 6% Hike in Jute MSP for 2025-26 Marketing Season
4. RG Kar Rape Case
5. Electoral Trusts Surge After Ban on Electoral Bonds
6. Abetment of Suicide in India

Subscribe to our

You Tube *Freedom UPSC with Dhananjay Gautam*



1 India and Indonesia: Strengthening Bilateral Relations

Context: Indonesian President **Prabowo Subianto's visit to India** as the chief guest for India's **76th Republic Day celebrations** marks a significant milestone in the bilateral relationship, reflecting the strong and evolving partnership between the two nations.



Historical and Cultural Bonds:

1. Ancient Connections:

- India and Indonesia share over **2,000 years of cultural and historical ties**, shaped by the spread of **Hinduism, Buddhism**, and later **Islam** from India to Indonesia.
- The **Ramayana** and **Mahabharata** continue to influence Indonesian art, culture, and folklore.

2. Post-Independence Collaboration:

- Both nations emerged as independent states with shared goals of **political sovereignty, economic self-reliance**, and a commitment to the **Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)**.

Strategic and Diplomatic Engagements:

High-Level Visits and Agreements:

1. 2018 Milestone:

- PM **Narendra Modi's visit to Jakarta** resulted in the signing of a **Comprehensive Strategic Partnership** and a shared vision for **Indo-Pacific maritime cooperation**.

2. 2024 Engagements:

- PM Modi and President **Prabowo Subianto** held talks during the **G20 Summit**, focusing on **economic cooperation, regional stability**, and **security frameworks**.

Defense and Security Cooperation:

1. Joint Exercises:

- Garuda Shakti** (Army), **Samudra Shakti** (Navy), and coordinated patrols (**IND-INDO CORPAT**) enhance military collaboration.

2. Defense Industry Collaboration:

- The **India-Indonesia Defense Industry Exhibition (2024)** showcased opportunities in **defense technology** and **manufacturing**, emphasizing regional security in the **Indo-Pacific**.

Economic and Trade Relations:

Bilateral Trade:

1. Trade Volumes:

- In **2023-24**, bilateral trade stood at **\$29.4 billion**, making Indonesia India's **second-largest trading partner in ASEAN**.
- Major Imports:** Coal, crude palm oil, rubber.
- Major Exports:** Refined petroleum, telecommunications equipment, agricultural products.

Investments and Connectivity:

1. Indian Investments:

Download Our Application



Freedom UPSC with **Dhananjay Gautam**

- Over **\$1.56 billion** invested in **mining, textiles, and infrastructure**.

2. Connectivity:

- Direct flights between cities like **Mumbai-Jakarta** and **Delhi-Bali** boost **tourism** and **people-to-people ties**.

Cultural and Educational Collaboration:

Cultural Initiatives:

1. **Indian Cultural Centers:** Operate in **Jakarta** and **Bali**, promoting **yoga, classical dance, and music**.
2. **Shared Celebrations:** Joint events like **International Yoga Day** and heritage conferences strengthen cultural exchanges.

Educational Cooperation:

1. **Scholarships:**
 - Indian programs like **ITEC** and **ICCR** support Indonesian students, fostering **academic partnerships**.
2. **Future Collaboration:** Discussions on **MoUs** in higher education aim to deepen ties in **knowledge sharing**.

Multilateral Cooperation:

India and Indonesia collaborate in platforms like:

- **G20, ASEAN, and IORA**, focusing on:
 - **Maritime Security:** Securing the Indo-Pacific region.
 - **Sustainable Development:** Addressing climate and resource challenges.
 - **Regional Stability:** Tackling shared geopolitical concerns.

Future Prospects:

1. **75 Years of Diplomacy:**
 - Celebrations in **2024** highlighted the nations' shared history and future aspirations.
2. **Strengthened Collaboration:**
 - Enhanced **trade, defense, and cultural partnerships** are crucial for growth and stability in the **Indo-Pacific region**.

Conclusion:

The **India-Indonesia relationship** is a testament to deep historical ties and forward-looking strategic collaboration.

As vibrant democracies and emerging economies, their partnership plays a pivotal role in shaping regional and global dynamics, ensuring peace, prosperity, and sustainable growth.



2

Appointment of Retired High Court Judges on an Ad Hoc Basis to Tackle Case Backlog

Context: To address the growing backlog of cases in High Courts, the **Supreme Court** has recently proposed appointing **retired High Court judges** on an **ad hoc basis**, citing the need to revisit its 2021 decision, which restricted such appointments to specific circumstances.

**Constitutional Provisions and Legal Framework:****Article 224A of the Constitution:****1. Provisions:**

- Enables the **Chief Justice of a High Court** to appoint retired judges to act as ad hoc judges.
- Requires the **President's consent** for such appointments.

2. Key Features:

- Retired judges have **full jurisdiction, powers, and privileges** equivalent to sitting judges.
- They are, however, not considered **permanent judges** of the court.

3. Appointment Process:

- Governed by the **1998 Memorandum of Procedure (MOP)**:
 - The retired judge's consent is obtained.
 - The Chief Justice sends recommendations to the **state's Chief Minister**, who forwards them to the **Union Law Minister**.
 - The **Chief Justice of India (CJI)** is consulted, whose advice is submitted to the **Prime Minister** for Presidential approval.

Supreme Court Guidelines and Criteria for Appointment**2021 Lok Prahari Case:**

1. The Supreme Court clarified the detailed process for invoking **Article 224A**, emphasizing its use in exceptional situations.
2. **Guidelines for Appointments:**
 - The recommendation must go through the **Supreme Court Collegium**, comprising the **CJI** and two senior-most judges.
 - Ad hoc judges are to be appointed when **less than 20% of vacancies** in the High Court have been filled.

Trigger Points for Appointments:

1. Ad hoc appointments may be initiated when:
 - High Court vacancies exceed **20%** of sanctioned strength (excluding pending proposals).
 - More than **10% of pending cases** are over **5 years old**.
 - **Regular appointments** are delayed or insufficient to tackle the backlog.

Panel of Retired Judges:

1. Each High Court Chief Justice should maintain a **panel of retired or soon-to-retire judges** for ad hoc appointments.
2. Appointments are recommended for a term of **2-3 years**, with **2-5 ad hoc judges** per High Court.

Challenges Addressed by Ad Hoc Judges:

1. Case Backlog:

- India's High Courts are burdened by **over 4 million pending cases**.
- Around **40% of judge positions** remain vacant in several High Courts.

2. Efficiency:

- Experienced retired judges can swiftly adjudicate long-pending matters, especially **criminal cases**.

3. Judicial Accessibility:

- Ad hoc appointments can ensure timely justice delivery in under-resourced courts.

Historical Instances of Ad Hoc Appointments:

Despite the provision's existence, Article 224A has been invoked only three times in India's history:

1. **Justice Suraj Bhan (1972)**: Appointed to the **Madhya Pradesh High Court** to hear election petitions.
2. **Justice P. Venugopal (1982-1983)**: Appointed to the **Madras High Court**, with his term renewed.
3. **Justice O.P. Srivastava (2007)**: Appointed to the **Allahabad High Court** to hear the **Ayodhya title suits**.

Since the **2021 Lok Prahari case**, there have been **no recorded ad hoc appointments** under Article 224A.

Way Forward:

Revisiting the 2021 Decision:

The Supreme Court's proposal to re-evaluate the **2021 ruling** may relax the restrictions on ad hoc appointments, making Article 224A more accessible.

Enhancing Regular Appointments:

Ad hoc judges should supplement—not replace—efforts to fill **regular judicial vacancies**.

Periodic Reviews:

1. Regular reviews of pending cases should ensure the judicious use of ad hoc appointments.
2. Transparent reporting mechanisms can track the impact of ad hoc judges on case disposal rates.

Legislative and Policy Support:

1. Streamlining the **MOP process** can ensure timely ad hoc appointments.
2. Additional incentives, such as **honorariums** or extended tenures, can attract experienced retired judges.

Conclusion:

The appointment of ad hoc High Court judges under **Article 224A** offers a pragmatic solution to India's mounting judicial backlog. While the provision has historically been underutilized, revisiting the framework and enabling its efficient application can strengthen the judiciary and ensure timely justice for all.

3 Cabinet Approves 6% Hike in Jute MSP for 2025-26 Marketing Season

Context: The Maharashtra Food & Drugs Administration (FDA) recently allowed **homeopathic practitioners** with a **certificate course in modern pharmacology** to prescribe **allopathic medications**. This directive has sparked debates on the legality, safety, and ethics of crosspathy in India.



Understanding Crosspathy:

Definition:

Crosspathy refers to the practice of medical professionals trained in one system of medicine—like **Ayurveda**, **Homeopathy**, or **Unani**—prescribing medicines or performing treatments from another system, primarily **Allopathy** (modern medicine).

Prevalence in India: Crosspathy is widespread, particularly in **rural areas**, where there is a critical shortage of qualified allopathic doctors.

Legal and Regulatory Framework for Crosspathy:

1. **Permissibility:** Crosspathy is **illegal** unless explicitly allowed by state laws or government directives.
2. **Judicial Rulings:**
 - The **Supreme Court of India** has ruled that practicing outside one's field of expertise amounts to **medical negligence** unless authorized by law.
 - Several crosspathy practitioners have faced penalties under the **Indian Medical Council Act** and state medical regulations.
3. **State-Specific Policies:**
 - Maharashtra's **2014 law** expanded the definition of a "registered medical practitioner" to include homeopaths with pharmacology training.
 - In contrast, states like **Kerala** maintain stricter boundaries between medical systems.

Rationale Behind Crosspathy in India:

1. **Doctor Shortages:**
 - India faces an acute shortage of allopathic doctors, especially in rural areas.
 - As of **2022-23**, there was an **80% shortfall of specialists** in rural Community Health Centres (CHCs).
2. **Rural Accessibility:** AYUSH practitioners are often the only available medical resource for underserved populations.
3. **Cost Factors:** Low-income patients often prefer AYUSH practitioners due to affordability compared to allopathic doctors or urban hospitals.
4. **Policy Adjustments:** To mitigate gaps, some states (e.g., **Goa, Maharashtra**) have permitted **limited crosspathy**, despite opposition from the medical community.

Recent Developments in Maharashtra:

Maharashtra FDA Directive: The **2024 order** allows homeopaths who have completed a **certificate course in modern pharmacology** to prescribe allopathic medicines. This clarifies the 2014 law's provisions and resolves confusion over chemists honoring such prescriptions.

Government's Justification:

- Addressing the **shortfall of doctors** in rural areas.
- Utilizing **5.65 lakh AYUSH practitioners** alongside India's **13 lakh allopathic doctors** to expand healthcare access.



Challenges and Criticisms:

1. Patient Safety Concerns:

- Critics argue that a short pharmacology course cannot substitute for the **extensive training** MBBS doctors receive.
- Risks include **misdiagnosis**, improper prescriptions, and **complications** arising from inadequate medical knowledge.

2. Legal Ambiguity:

- Conflicts with previous **Bombay High Court (2017)** and **Supreme Court** rulings that limit crosspathy practices.
- The directive may face **judicial challenges**, creating regulatory uncertainty.

3. Opposition from Medical Associations:

- The **Indian Medical Association (IMA)** strongly opposes the move, labeling it as a **dilution of healthcare standards**.
- They argue that this undermines the integrity of medical practice.

4. Regulatory Challenges:

Ensuring proper oversight of crosspathy practitioners in rural areas is difficult, leading to potential misuse or **unethical practices**.

Implications of the Move: For Patients

- **Risks:** Increased likelihood of substandard care, particularly in underserved areas.
- **Benefits:** Improved access to basic medical services where allopathic doctors are unavailable.

For the Healthcare System:

- **Pros:** Alleviates immediate doctor shortages in rural regions.
- **Cons:** Weakens healthcare standards and complicates medical regulation.

Way Forward:

1. **Strengthen Oversight:** Establish robust regulatory mechanisms to monitor crosspathy practices and ensure patient safety.
2. **Improve Rural Healthcare:**
 - Increase incentives for MBBS graduates to serve in rural areas.
 - Expand public health facilities to reduce dependence on crosspathy.
3. **Refine Crosspathy Policies:**
 - Define clear guidelines for permissible cross-system practices.
 - Align state laws with national healthcare standards to avoid regulatory conflicts.
4. **Focus on AYUSH Integration:** Utilize AYUSH practitioners in areas where their systems excel, like **preventive care**, rather than substituting modern medicine.

Conclusion:

Maharashtra's decision to allow homeopaths to prescribe allopathic medicine reflects an attempt to address critical gaps in India's healthcare delivery system. While the move may improve accessibility in the short term, it raises significant concerns about patient safety, medical ethics, and healthcare standards. A balanced approach that combines structural reforms, regulatory clarity, and capacity building is essential to ensure sustainable and equitable healthcare for all.

4 RG Kar Rape Case: Not a Rarest of Rare Case

Context: Sanjoy Roy, convicted for **raping and murdering a doctor** at RG Kar Medical College in Kolkata, was sentenced to **life imprisonment** by a **sessions court**.

Despite strong arguments for the **death penalty** from the CBI and public outcry, the court followed the Supreme Court's principle of applying the death penalty only in “**rarest of rare**” cases, as established in the **Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980)** judgment.



Understanding the "Rarest of Rare" Doctrine:

Bachan Singh Case (1980):

- The Supreme Court in **Bachan Singh** upheld the death penalty but restricted its imposition to “**rarest of rare**” cases where the offender is beyond the possibility of reform.
- It did not define an exact standard for **rarest of rare** but listed **aggravating** and **mitigating circumstances** to guide decisions.

Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances in Death Penalty:

1. Aggravating Circumstances (Favoring Death Penalty):

- **Premeditated and Brutal Acts:** Murder that is pre-planned, violent, and shows extreme brutality.
- **Exceptional Depravity:** Crimes that display extraordinary cruelty.
- **Targeting Public Servants:** Killing of law enforcement officers or public servants.

2. Mitigating Circumstances (Discouraging Death Penalty):

- **Mental or Emotional Disturbance:** Offender acted under severe stress or disturbance.
- **Age of the Accused:** Very young or elderly offenders may not be sentenced to death.
- **Possibility of Reform:** Potential for the offender's rehabilitation and reintegration into society.
- **Mental Impairment:** Offender unable to understand the nature of their crime due to mental illness.

Evolution of Aggravating and Mitigating Factors Post-Bachan Singh:

1. Age of the Accused:

- **Young Age as a Mitigating Factor:** In cases like **Ramnaresh v. State of Chhattisgarh (2012)**, young age (under 30) was seen as a factor indicating the possibility of reform.
- **Inconsistent Application:** The Law Commission's 262nd Report (2015) highlighted inconsistencies in considering age as a mitigating factor in death penalty cases.
- In **Sanjoy Roy's case**, he is **35 years old**, which may weigh against age being a mitigating factor.

2. Nature of the Offense:

- The **Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab (1983)** case established that the death penalty can be imposed if the crime is so shocking that it **stirs society's collective conscience**.
- However, this approach primarily considers the nature of the crime and may not fully evaluate the offender's **potential for reform**.

3. Possibility of Reform:

- The **Bachan Singh Principle** stresses that death sentences should only be handed out when the state can prove **irredeemable criminality**.
- The **Santosh Bariyar v. State of Maharashtra (2009)** ruling emphasized that the evidence must be **clear and convincing** to prove that reform is not possible.



Stage of Trial: Impact on Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances:

1. Separate Sentencing Trial:

- In **Bachan Singh**, the SC ruled that a **separate trial** after conviction is necessary to present arguments on whether the death penalty should be imposed.
- The **Dattaraya v. State of Maharashtra (2020)** case showed that if this separate hearing does not provide a **real, effective, and meaningful hearing**, the death penalty can be commuted to life imprisonment.

2. Issues with Same-Day Sentencing:

- The SC highlighted the lack of fairness in **same-day sentencing**, where aggravating and mitigating circumstances are considered together without allowing a proper defense for the convict.
- The **2022 suo motu proceedings** questioned whether **same-day sentencing** meets the required standard for a **meaningful hearing**, suggesting the need for uniform guidelines.

Challenges in Death Penalty Sentencing:

1. Imbalance Between Aggravating and Mitigating Factors:

- Aggravating circumstances are part of the **case record**, making them readily available to judges, whereas **mitigating factors** are usually presented **only after conviction**, creating a potential imbalance.

2. Judicial Concerns:

- The SC raised concerns about the **subjective** application of the “rarest of rare” doctrine and recommended the creation of **uniform guidelines** for evaluating **mitigating circumstances** in death penalty cases.

Key Observations:

- **Evolving Legal Framework:** Over time, courts have refined the factors that influence death penalty decisions, aiming for a more **objective** and **consistent** approach.
- **The Role of Age, Mental Health, and the Nature of the Crime:** Age and mental health are critical considerations in death penalty cases. These factors must be weighed carefully, as they affect the offender’s likelihood of reform.
- **Need for Uniform Guidelines:** The **Supreme Court** is pushing for uniform guidelines to ensure fairness and consistency in death penalty hearings, particularly for assessing mitigating circumstances.

Conclusion:

The **RG Kar rape case** reflects the complexities surrounding the **death penalty** and the “**rarest of rare**” doctrine. Despite public demand for the death penalty, the court adhered to the principle that the death sentence should only apply when there is **no possibility of reform**. This decision highlights the need for a **balanced approach** in sentencing, considering both **aggravating and mitigating factors** to ensure **fairness** and **justice** in capital punishment cases.

5 Electoral Trusts Surge After Ban on Electoral Bonds

Context: Following the Supreme Court's landmark ruling in February 2024, which scrapped the electoral bonds scheme, India has witnessed a significant surge in donations to political parties through electoral trusts. This shift highlights the growing preference for transparent political funding, offering fresh insights into the evolving landscape of electoral donations.



What Exactly Are Electoral Trusts?

Electoral trusts are **non-profit entities** designed to promote **transparency** in the political funding process in India. These trusts collect **voluntary contributions** from **individuals** or **companies** and then distribute the funds to **registered political parties**.

- Eligible Companies to Establish Electoral Trusts:** Any company registered under **Section 25 of the Companies Act, 1956** can apply for approval to establish an electoral trust.
- Creation of Electoral Trusts:**
 - The concept was introduced under **Section 13B of the Income Tax Act, 1961**, offering **tax benefits** to donors.
 - The **Election Commission of India (ECI)** ensures that these trusts follow the guidelines laid out in the **Electoral Trusts Scheme, 2013**.
- Who Can Contribute:** **Indian citizens** and **domestic companies** are allowed to contribute to electoral trusts, with the obligation to disclose both their **identity** and the **amount donated**.
- Who is Excluded?:** **Foreign entities**, including **foreign companies or individuals**, **government companies**, and entities prohibited under the **Representation of the People Act, 1951**, cannot donate.

The Key Benefits of Electoral Trusts Over Electoral Bonds:

1. Transparency in Political Donations:

- Electoral trusts** are legally required to **disclose donor names** and the **amounts donated** to the **Election Commission of India (ECI)**.
- In stark contrast, **electoral bonds** allowed for **anonymous donations**, making it challenging to trace the **source of funds** and raising concerns about the **lack of transparency**.

2. Greater Accountability for Political Parties:

- Electoral trusts ensure that **political parties disclose** the funds they receive, fostering a transparent system where the public is informed about the **contributions received** by each party.
- In contrast, **electoral bonds** do not require such **disclosures**, which significantly limits **accountability**.

3. Robust Regulatory Oversight:

- Electoral trusts** are governed by the **Electoral Trusts Scheme, 2013**, and their activities are **closely monitored** by the **Election Commission of India**.
- Electoral bonds**, however, are **managed by banks**, with minimal **regulatory scrutiny**, making them susceptible to concerns over **oversight and transparency**.



4. Minimizing Foreign Influence:

- **Electoral trusts** explicitly prohibit **foreign donations**, helping to reduce the risk of **foreign interference** in India's political process.
- Meanwhile, **electoral bonds** have **no explicit restrictions** on **foreign-controlled entities** registered in India, raising concerns about **foreign influence** on political funding.

The Surge in Donations via Electoral Trusts:

Since the **scrapping of electoral bonds** by the Supreme Court in **February 2024**, **corporate political donations** have seen a dramatic shift towards **electoral trusts**. The **Electoral Trust**—which has been the largest contributor—has witnessed a sharp increase in donations, highlighting the growing preference for a **more transparent** system of political funding.

Transparency: Electoral Trusts vs. Electoral Bonds:

- **Electoral Trusts** stand out by being **transparent**—they are legally required to disclose **donor names** and the **amounts** distributed to political parties. However, they do not reveal **how much individual corporations contribute** to specific parties.
- On the other hand, **electoral bonds** allow for **anonymous donations**, making it nearly impossible to trace **who is funding whom**, which raised concerns about the integrity of the system.

Conclusion: A Step Towards Cleaner Political Funding

The recent surge in donations through **electoral trusts** marks a significant shift in India's political funding landscape. While **electoral trusts** offer better **transparency** and **accountability**, questions still remain about the **exact allocation** of funds to political parties. However, the **ban on electoral bonds** and the rise of electoral trusts is a positive move towards **cleaner** and **more transparent political financing**, ensuring that corporate donations are **more traceable** and **less prone to undue influence**.

6

Abetment of Suicide in India: Legal Framework, Punishments, and Judicial Guidelines

Context: In recent legal developments, the **Supreme Court of India** has highlighted the importance of **sensitizing investigating agencies** and **courts** when handling cases under **Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)**, which pertains to **abetment of suicide**. The Court emphasized that while the **law** should be applied in genuine cases, it should not be misused in an attempt to appease grieving families, urging careful adherence to the **legal standards** laid out.



Understanding Abetment of Suicide Under Indian Law:

What is Abetment?

According to **Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)** (also equivalent to Section 45 of the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023**), **abetment** involves the following:

- **Instigating** someone to take a particular action.
- **Conspiring** with others to carry out a particular act.
- **Intentionally aiding** an act either through direct action or **inaction**.

To secure a conviction for **abetment of suicide**, it must be proven that the accused **directly instigated** or **aided** the deceased in taking their own life.

Punishment for Abetment of Suicide:

Under **Section 306 of the IPC** (also reflected in **Section 108 of the BNS**), the punishment for abetment of suicide is:

- **Imprisonment:** Up to **10 years**.
- **Fine:** The imposition of a **monetary penalty** in addition to the sentence.

This is a **cognizable, non-bailable, and non-compoundable** offense, meaning the accused can be arrested without a warrant, and the case cannot be settled through a private agreement.

Conviction Rate for Abetment of Suicide:

According to the **National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) 2022**:

- **Conviction rate for Section 306 IPC:** **17.5%**.
- **Conviction rate for all IPC crimes:** **69.8%**.
- **Conviction rate for cognizable offenses** (including abetment of suicide): **54.2%**.

These statistics reveal that the **conviction rate** for **abetment of suicide** is significantly lower than for other criminal offenses, indicating challenges in securing a conviction in such cases.

Key Legal Standards for Abetment of Suicide:

Supreme Court's Judgment on Workplace Suicide Cases

In **October 2024**, the **Supreme Court** quashed an **abetment of suicide** case involving a salesperson who allegedly took their life due to workplace harassment regarding a **voluntary retirement scheme**. The Court's observations include:

- **Higher standard of proof** is required in workplace-related suicide cases, especially in official relationships (e.g., **employer-employee**).

Download Our Application



Freedom UPSC with **Dhananjay Gautam**

Page No

12



- Evidence must clearly demonstrate that the accused **intended** to cause the suicide.
- The prosecution must show that the accused's actions led to **direct and alarming incitement** to suicide.

Important Supreme Court Precedents on Abetment of Suicide:

1. M Mohan v. The State (2011):

- In this case, the Court clarified that **proof of active or direct involvement** by the accused is essential. The accused's actions must have left the deceased with no choice but to **commit suicide**.

2. Ude Singh v. State of Haryana (2019):

- The Court held that **indirect incitement** can be considered as abetment if the continuous actions of the accused **create a situation** where the deceased feels no other option than to take their life.

Key Takeaways: Legal Guidelines for Abetment of Suicide Cases

1. **Need for Evidence:** Proving **direct incitement or encouragement** is crucial in abetment of suicide cases. The prosecution must present **solid evidence** to show that the accused played a direct role in pushing the deceased towards suicide.
2. **Avoiding Misuse of the Law:** The **Supreme Court** has stressed that cases under **Section 306 IPC** should not be used to **appease grieving families**, especially in the absence of clear evidence that the accused directly caused the suicide.
3. **Cautious Approach in Workplace Cases:** In cases of **workplace harassment** or other official relationships, a **higher bar of proof** is required, and courts must be cautious in not allowing **baseless prosecutions**.

Conclusion: A Delicate Balance in Suicide Cases

The legal provisions concerning **abetment of suicide** under **Section 306 IPC** strike a delicate balance between ensuring justice for victims and preventing **misuse of the law**. As **court precedents** highlight, it is imperative to **carefully assess the evidence** and avoid wrongful prosecutions, ensuring that genuine cases are properly adjudicated while protecting individuals from unfounded legal actions.