LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE BEHIND THE ENACTMENT OF THE SCHEDULED CASTES AND THE SCHEDULED TRIBES (PREVENTION OF ATROCITIES) ACT, 1989 IN INDIA: A LEGAL STUDY

by

Dr. Mukesh Kumar Malviya[1]

Associate Professor,

Faculty of Law, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi

ABSTRACT

The Indian constitutional order promises equality, dignity, and social justice, yet the lived reality of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has long reflected persistent discrimination, humiliation, exclusion, and violence. The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 was enacted as a special legislative response to this structural injustice. Its long title expressly states that it is "[a]n Act to prevent the commission of offences of atrocities against the members of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, to provide for Special Courts and the Exclusive Special Courts for the trial of such offences and for the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of such offences and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto."[2] *This formulation reveals a legislative purpose that is preventive, punitive, remedial, and restorative.*

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

[1] E-Mail : mukesh9424@bhu.ac.in
Google Scholar : https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=hi&user=tMONW_AAAAAJ&view_op=list_works
ORCID Id: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5851-8672

[2] The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, No. 33 of 1989, long title, India Code, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/1920?view_type=.

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research | Licensed under CC BY 4.0 — https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/ | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22902089 | Title: Legislative Purpose Behind The Enactment Of The Scheduled Castes And The Scheduled Tribes (Prevention Of Atrocities) Act

This paper examines the legislative purpose behind the enactment of the Act through doctrinal and analytical methods. It argues that Parliament did not merely seek to create additional offenses or harsher punishments. Rather, it aimed to recognize caste-based atrocity as a distinct social harm requiring a distinct legal response. Ordinary criminal law was seen as inadequate because atrocities against Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are often embedded in power relations, social dominance, and collective intimidation. The Supreme Court has repeatedly treated the Act as a beneficial and protective legislation whose interpretation must preserve its social justice mission.

The paper further analyzes the constitutional background, the inadequacy of ordinary law, landmark case law on anticipatory bail, legislative intent, and practical enforcement challenges. It concludes that the Act embodies the constitutional commitment to substantive equality and dignity, and that its success depends on faithful implementation by the police, prosecution, courts, and state authorities.

Keywords: Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Atrocities Act, legislative intent, social justice.

Introduction

India's caste order historically produced a system in which certain communities were denied equal social standing, access to resources, and dignity. Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes were among the most vulnerable groups within this structure, facing discrimination not only in private life but also in public institutions, markets, villages, and state mechanisms. The Constitution outlawed untouchability and mandated equality, yet legal equality did not automatically dissolve structural inequality.[3]

It was against this backdrop that Parliament enacted the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. The statute was not simply a criminal law amendment; it was a legislative acknowledgment that caste-based violence and humiliation

[3] India Const. arts. 14, 15, 17, 21.

required a special legal framework. The Act was designed to address an entrenched pattern of oppression through prevention, punishment, special courts, victim relief, and rehabilitation.

The central question of this paper is straightforward: what exactly was Parliament trying to achieve by enacting the Act? Was the goal only to punish offenders, or was it also to transform the state's response to caste oppression? A close reading of the statutory text, legislative framing, and case law shows that the answer is broader and deeper than mere punishment. The Act was intended to be a tool of substantive justice.[4]

Research Method

This study follows a doctrinal and analytical method. Primary sources include the Act itself, especially its long title and statutory framework, along with relevant Supreme Court decisions. Secondary sources include legal commentaries, case compilations, and reports that explain the social context of the statute. The paper uses interpretive analysis to connect legislative language with constitutional principles and judicial reasoning. It is therefore not only descriptive but also normative: it asks whether the law fulfills the purpose for which it was enacted and what that purpose means in contemporary legal practice.

Constitutional Background

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

The constitutional foundation of the Act lies in Articles 14, 15, 17, and 21. Article 14 requires equality before law; Article 15 prohibits discrimination; Article 17 abolishes untouchability; and Article 21 protects life and personal liberty, which the Court has long read to include dignity.

The Act is best understood as a legislative response to the failure of formal equality to eliminate caste violence and exclusion. When a social order produces repeated humiliation and structural domination, a special statute becomes necessary to operationalize constitutional promises. Parliament's choice to enact a targeted anti-atrocity law reflects this logic of substantive equality.

[4] Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, India Code entry, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/17492.

The statute therefore sits within the constitutional project of affirmative state action. It does not create privilege; it seeks to correct entrenched disadvantage and ensure that historically oppressed communities are able to live with dignity and security.[5]

Legislative Context

Before 1989, India had general criminal laws and the Protection of Civil Rights Act, 1955, but these frameworks did not adequately address the specific character of caste atrocities. Caste violence often involved public humiliation, collective intimidation, denial of access, and abuse rooted in local hierarchies of power. Such harm could not always be captured fully through ordinary penal provisions.[6]

Parliament therefore concluded that a separate statute was needed. The Act was drafted to identify certain conduct as "atrocities" and to provide a stronger legal and institutional response. It combined penal provisions with procedural safeguards, special courts, and victim-relief mechanisms.

This legislative move is significant because it shows a shift from general criminality to social justice criminal law. The law does not treat caste atrocities as just another offense; it treats them as a constitutional wrong with deep social roots.

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

Legislative Purpose

The long title of the Act is highly revealing. It states that the law was enacted "to prevent the commission of offences of atrocities" against members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled

[5] Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989: 20 Years Report Card, NCDHR/IDSN, https://idsn.org/wp-content/uploads/user_folder/pdf/New_files/India/SCST_PoA_Act_20_years_report_card_-_NCDHR.pdf

[6] CLPR, Cases Materials on SC-ST Prevention of Atrocities, 1989, https://clpr.org.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Cases-Materials-on-SC-ST-Prevention-of-Atrocities-1989.pdf.

Tribes, "to provide for Special Courts and the Exclusive Special Courts" for trial, and "for the relief and rehabilitation of the victims" of such offenses.

This wording establishes four distinct legislative purposes. First, prevention: Parliament wanted to stop atrocities before they occurred. Second, punishment: it sought to criminalize and penalize specific caste-based harms. Third, adjudication: it created special forums for speedy trial. Fourth, restoration: it aimed at relief and rehabilitation for victims.

Accordingly, the statute must be read as a composite welfare-protective law, not as a narrow penal enactment. Its objective is not only to punish offenders but also to alter the conditions that allow caste oppression to continue.

Why Ordinary Law Was Not Enough

General criminal law is built around ordinary offenses such as assault, intimidation, insult, or mischief. Caste atrocities, however, often carry a distinct social meaning. They are frequently committed to reinforce social hierarchy, enforce obedience, and remind marginalized communities of their "place" in society.

That is why ordinary law was considered insufficient. It could punish the act, but not necessarily capture the caste-based purpose or the structural nature of the harm. Parliament recognized this gap and created a special law that could address both the symbolic and practical dimensions of atrocity.

This is also why the Act is often described as a beneficial statute. It responds to a social context in which victims may be reluctant to report, witnesses may fear retaliation, and local institutions may be biased or indifferent.

Beneficial and Protective Character

The Supreme Court has repeatedly treated the Act as a protective statute intended to preserve dignity and self-respect. In State of M.P. v. Ram Krishna Balothia[7], the Court upheld the constitutionality of the bar on anticipatory bail under Section 18, emphasizing that the Act responds to serious social harms and must be given effect in light of its purpose.

Similarly, in Prithvi Raj Chauhan v. Union of India[8], the Court upheld the amended framework while making clear that if a complaint does not disclose a prima facie offense under the Act, the statutory bar on anticipatory bail does not apply. The judgment preserved the statute's protective core while guarding against misuse in cases where no offense is made out at all.

These cases show that the judiciary sees the Act as more than a collection of penal provisions. It is a constitutional instrument for protecting vulnerable communities from humiliation, violence, and exclusion.

Special Courts and Speedy Trial

A major element of the legislative purpose was the creation of special courts and exclusive special courts. The reason was practical as much as symbolic: if atrocity cases are left in ordinary criminal courts, delays can defeat justice and weaken deterrence.

Special courts reflect Parliament's understanding that caste atrocities require urgency. Delay in these cases does not merely inconvenience the prosecution; it deepens the victim's vulnerability and may reinforce local power structures. The statute therefore attempts to ensure that justice is visible, timely, and accessible.

This institutional design is central to the Act's legal identity. The law is not only about what conduct is prohibited; it is also about how the state must respond when prohibited conduct occurs.

[7] (1995) 3 S.C.C. 221.
[8] (2020) 4 S.C.C. 727.

Relief and Rehabilitation

Another crucial legislative purpose was victim relief and rehabilitation. This is often overlooked, but it is one of the strongest indicators that the Act is not purely punitive. Parliament recognized that victims of atrocity may require immediate support, medical assistance, monetary relief, and protection from further harm.

The relief-and-rehabilitation dimension shows a restorative justice logic. The law acknowledges that criminal punishment alone does not restore the damage caused by humiliation, violence, and social exclusion. Victims need state support to regain security and dignity.

This aspect is especially important in rural and semi-rural settings, where victims may face pressure to compromise, withdraw complaints, or remain silent. In such contexts, rehabilitation is not optional; it is part of meaningful justice.

Judicial Interpretation of Public Humiliation

The Court has also interpreted the Act in ways that reflect its legislative purpose. In Swaran Singh v. State[9], the Court explained the significance of "public view" in cases involving caste insults. The ruling helped clarify that caste-based humiliation has a public dimension that the law must capture.

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

In Gorige Pentaiah v. State of A.P.[10], the Court emphasized the need for proper statutory ingredients, including caste-based intent and legally relevant factual allegations. This approach preserves the Act's seriousness while ensuring that the law is applied on the basis of actual ingredients rather than mere labels.

[9] (2008) 8 S.C.C. 435.
[10] (2008) 12 S.C.C. 531.

These decisions are important because they show that legislative purpose is not abstract. It becomes concrete through judicial interpretation of elements such as caste identity, intent, location, and public character of the act.

Arrest, Anticipatory Bail, and State Power

One of the most contested features of the Act has been the restriction on anticipatory bail. In Ram Krishna Balothia, the Court upheld Section 18, holding that the legislature was entitled to create a stricter regime for offenses under the Act.

Later, after the 2018 amendments and the controversy surrounding Subhash Kashinath Mahajan v. State of Maharashtra[11], Parliament intervened to restore stronger protective provisions. The Court in Prithvi Raj Chauhan upheld the amended framework but clarified that where no prima facie case exists, the statutory bar cannot be used to deny liberty in a wholly baseless prosecution.

These cases show the balance the legal system seeks to maintain: on the one hand, strong protection for victims; on the other, safeguards against malicious or unsupported complaints. But the general rule remains that the Act is meant to operate firmly in favor of marginalized victims.

Legislative Purpose and Social Justice

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

The deepest purpose of the Act lies in social justice. Parliament did not merely want to create a criminal offense; it wanted to challenge the social conditions that normalize caste violence. The statute is therefore part of India's broader constitutional commitment to dignity, fraternity, and equality.

[11] (2018) 6 S.C.C. 454.

The law communicates a moral and legal message: caste humiliation is not a private insult, and caste violence is not a local inconvenience. They are assaults on the constitutional order itself. The legislative purpose thus includes symbolic recognition, not merely legal enforcement.

This symbolic dimension matters because law shapes social meaning. When the state names a harm as "atrocity," it acknowledges the historic and structural gravity of that harm. That acknowledgment is itself part of justice.

Enforcement Challenges

Despite its strong legislative purpose, the Act faces serious implementation problems. Delays in registration, poor investigation, pressure on witnesses, under-reporting, weak prosecution, and social retaliation remain major obstacles.

These problems do not necessarily undermine the law's purpose, but they do reveal the gap between legislative intent and ground-level enforcement. A law can be normatively powerful and operationally weak at the same time. The real challenge is not the absence of purpose but the incomplete realization of that purpose.

Therefore, any serious legal analysis must distinguish between the meaning of the statute and the quality of its administration. The former is clear; the latter requires constant institutional reform.

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

Critical Evaluation

From a doctrinal perspective, the Act is one of India's most significant anti-discrimination statutes. It combines prevention, punishment, special procedure, and victim support in one framework. This is an unusually comprehensive legislative design.

Yet the statute's critical success depends on whether public authorities treat it as a social-justice mandate or as a mere criminal code. If police officers hesitate, prosecutors are inattentive, or courts interpret the provisions too narrowly, the Act's transformative promise is weakened.

Still, the existence of such a law is constitutionally important. It reflects the idea that the state must do more than maintain order; it must actively dismantle structures of humiliation and exclusion. That is the core legislative purpose behind the 1989 enactment.

Conclusion

The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 was enacted to address a specific constitutional and social problem: the persistence of caste-based atrocities against historically marginalized communities. Parliament's purpose was not merely to increase punishment, but to prevent atrocity, provide special forums, ensure victim relief, and enable rehabilitation.[1]

Judicial decisions such as Ram Krishna Balothia, Swaran Singh, Gorige Pentaiah, and Prithvi Raj Chauhan confirm that the Act is a protective and beneficial statute whose interpretation must preserve its social-justice mission.

In short, the Act is a legal expression of constitutional morality. Its legislative purpose is preventive, punitive, remedial, and restorative. Its enduring relevance lies in the fact that substantive equality in India still requires vigilant and specialized legal protection.

Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research

Bibliography

1.The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, No. 33 of 1989.
2.State of M.P. v. Ram Krishna Balothia, (1995) 3 S.C.C. 221.
3.Swaran Singh v. State, (2008) 8 S.C.C. 435.
4.Gorige Pentaiah v. State of A.P., (2008) 12 S.C.C. 531.
5.Subhash Kashinath Mahajan v. State of Maharashtra, (2018) 6 S.C.C. 454.
6.Prithvi Raj Chauhan v. Union of India, (2020) 4 S.C.C. 727.
7.An Analysis of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, SSRN.

8.CLPR, Cases Materials on SC-ST Prevention of Atrocities, 1989.

9.NCDHR/IDSN, 20 Years Report Card.

