
Durgaprasad Prasannakumar Vs The State

Criminal Appeal No"s. 798 and 803 of 1955

Court: Bombay High Court

Date of Decision: Oct. 7, 1955

Acts Referred:

Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931 & Section 3#Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951 & Section 10, 22, 3, 4, 4(1)

Citation: AIR 1956 Bom 357 : (1956) 58 BOMLR 75 : (1956) CriLJ 704 : (1956) ILR (Bom) 305

Hon'ble Judges: Vyas, J; Dixit, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: N.B. Dange and L.G. Khare, for the Appellant; Govt. Pleader, for the Respondent

Judgement

Dixit, J.

These two appeals raise a question u/s 3(v) Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951. The facts of the two cases which give rise to the appeals are simple and they may be shortly stated.

2. The appellant is the keeper of a press known as Nirbhaya Mudranalaya situate at Vithal Wadi, Ranade Road, Dadar, Bombay 22. He is a

publisher of a weekly called ""Hindu"" published in Marathi language, which is printed at the said press. On 5-5-1954 he made a declaration to that

effect before the Chief Presidency Magistrate Bombay.

3. In its issue of 19-7-1954, there appeared an article headed ""Statement of repentant Kamal Vijayalaxmi became Hindu again"" under pen, name

""Veerketu"". The Commissioner of Police Greater Bombay, having taken the view that the said article was objectionable within the meaning of

Section 3 (v) of the Act, filed before the Sessions Judge, Greater Bombay, a complaint against the appellant, firstly, as the keeper of the press and,

secondly as the publisher of the weekly.

Upon the two complaints, a notice was issued to the appellant and upon the evidence adduced before him, the learned Sessions Judge made two

orders, by one of which he called upon the appellant to furnish security of Rs. 1500/- and by another he issued a warning to the appellant, holding

that the issue of the said weekly ""Hindu"" dated 19-7-1954 contained objectionable matter within Section 3 (b). Feeling aggrieved by the two

orders, the original respondent i. e. the keeper and publisher has filed two separate appeals.

4. As these two appeals involve a common question, it will be convenient to dispose of them by a common judgment.

5. The only question for decision in both the appeals is whether, as the State contends, the article referred to above falls within the language of

Section 3(v) or whether, as the appellant contends, it falls within Expln. I to Section 3. It will, I think, be convenient first to set out the relevant

provisions. Section 3 defines "objectionable matter" and provides that:

In this Act the expression ""objectionable matter"" means any words, signs or visible representations which are likely to (v) promote feelings of

enmity or hatred between different sections of the people of India"".

There are three explanations added to this section, two of which need be mentioned in this place. Explanation I is as follows;

Comments expressing disapprobation or criticism of any law or of any policy or administrative action of the Government with a view to obtain its

alteration or redress by lawful means, and words pointing out, with a view to their removal, matters which are producing, or have a tendency to

produce feelings of enmity or hatred between different sections of the people of India, shall not be deemed to be objectionable matter within the

meaning of this section"".

Explanation II runs as follows:

In judging whether any matter is objectionable matter under this Act, the effect of the words, signs or visible representations, and not the! intention

of the keeper of the press or the publisher of the newspaper or news-sheet, as the case may be, shall be taken into account"".

6. In ascertaining the scope of Section 3, two considerations arise. The first is the freedom of the press and the other is the limits within which the

freedom of the press may be allowed to be enjoyed. These two considerations are set out in the section and the explanations attached to the

section.

On the one hand, there is the freedom of the press and on the other, there are limits within which the freedom of the press may be allowed to be

enjoyed and it is for the nice balancing of these two considerations that Section 3 together with the explanations has been exacted. While the

freedom of the press is a very important freedom, it has to be recognised that there are limits to the exercise of that freedom and the limits within

which that freedom is to be enjoyed are indicated in the section.

7. Now, before I refer to the article which is alleged to be objectionable matter within Section 3 (v), it will, I think, be convenient to set out the

story of certain experiences of a film actress by name Kamal Varma as was recited by her in July 1954 number of ""Film India"". The article is based

upon The account given by her and I propose to state that account as briefly as possible.

On 4-1-1954, Kamal Varma was married to one Ata Mahomed, after embracing Islam. She lived with her mother for about two months after the

marriage but thereafter Ata Mahomed & Kamal Varma who, by marriage, became Anjuman Ara, lived in the Taj Mahal Hotel for about two

months until 20-5-1954 when Ata Mahomed left for Palaripur. In the evening of May 29, Kamal Varma alias Anjuman Ara went to the Bombay

Central Station to see her husband off who promised that he would return within four or five days.

On 30-5-1954, i. e. on the next day, one Akhatar Hussein, a common friend of Ata Mahomed and Kamal Varma, saw Kamal Varma and gave

her a writing which was a talaknama which is a deed of divorce bearing date 14-5-1954. The writing stated that Anjuman Ara had been divorced

by Ata Mahomed as from 14-5-1954 and an amount of emoluments was deposited with the Chief Kazi Murghay. According to Kamal Varma,

she was stunned, as she says, and to put it in her own words:

For several hours I Just could not realise what had happened; only the previous evening, till the moment of the train's departure he was

whispering; in my ears all the love talk the sort of which a bride likes to hear from the mouth of her husband. I could not understand how the man

who had already divorced me on the 14th May could live with me, love me and beguile me for 15 days more without feeling the least uneasiness of

mind or conscience. Being in love I was of course, behaving with blind trust like all Indian Women".

She then goes on to say:

I had now realised that I had made a mistake in giving up everything for a man who did not deserve the love and faith of a woman".

She says that she was returning to her old religion, suggesting that she wanted to be converted back to Hinduism and the account concludes in her

own words:

Fortunately in that religion there are no restrictions which can dissolve a marriage in half a second and that is why a marriage tie has attained more

sanctity and security in it. I hope that owing to my unfortunate experience other women would be on the alert and avoid trusting the undeserving

(persons)".

It is this story as given by Kamal Varma which became the subject-matter of the article called "the Clarification by Vijayalaxmi" in the issue of the

paper dated 19-7-1954.

8. Now, before I refer to the article which is fairly lengthy one and runs into something like nine pages of the record, it may be as well to state the

principles in approaching the consideration of the question which arises for decision.

In the first place, one has to read the writing quietly and attentively. The writing is to be read as a whole and not merely isolated passages here and

there. It is not right to pick up a strong expression here and a strong expression there. The general tenor and the drift of the writing is to be

considered.

Further, the Court is not concerned with the correctness or otherwise of the views expressed by the writer. The Court has to consider the general

drift of the writing, its tenor and its effect. These principles are laid down in several cases and it would be enough to quote the remarks of Shah J.

in the case reported in -- "Bal Gangadhar Tilak v. Emperor", AIR 1916 Bom 9 at page 48 (A). Shah J. was dealing with the speeches delivered

by Bal Gangadhar Tilak and this is what he said:

The speeches must be read as a whole in a fair, free and liberal spirit. In dealing with them one should not pause upon an objectionable sentence

here or a strong word there. They should be dealt with in a spirit of freedom and "not viewed with an eye of narrow criticism". The case should be

viewed "in a free, bold, manly, and generous spirit" towards the petitioners. See --"Reg. v. Burns" (1886) 16 Cox CC 355 (B)".

Now, in order to appreciate the dispute it is as well to point out the nature of the appellant's defence. In the Court below the appellant filed a

written statement, in paragraph 5 of which it is stated as follows:

The matter appeared to be very serious, considering the interest of the citizens of India (Bharat) and the subject of conversion. The policy of the

Government was thought to be, not what it ought to be. With a view, therefore, to obtain alteration or redress by lawful means, comments

expressing disapprobation or criticism in respect of existing circumstances, were thought necessary in the matter".

In paragraph 7 of the written statement it was stated:

It is submitted that the said article written by Veerketu in the issue of "Hindu" dated 12-7-54 is continued in the next issue of the Hindu dated 19-

7-54 which article is the subject-matter of the present case, so that both the articles must be read together as counterpart of each other or at least

the two extracts (Annexures C and D herewith) from the article dated 12-7-54 and the article dated 19-7-54 must be read together and as one

article".

Finally, paragraph 8 of the written statement is as follows:

It is further submitted that the article in question dated 12-7-54 is protected by Explan. I to Section 3, Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 56 of

1951".

In substance, therefore, the position is that, according to the State, the Hindu of 19-7-1954 contains matter which is likely to promote feelings of

enmity or hatred between different sections of the people of India i. e. between Hindus and Mahomedans. But the defence of the appellant is that

the article is protected by Explan. I to Section 3 and Mr. Dange's contention is that the article is justified on that ground.

9. Now, turning to the article, the article, in the first place, refers to the sanctity of Hindu marriage institution. What happened was that Kamal

Varma, a film actress, felt attracted towards Ata Mahomed. She embraced Islam & lived with him only to find that after a few months of an

apparently happy married life Ata Mahomed suddenly left for Palanpur, giving his wife Anjuman Ara a deed of divorce, thus ending the marriage

tie. The occasion, therefore was an occasion of indignation felt by Kamal Varma towards her husband.

Now, Kamal Varma was free to marry Ata Mahomed or not to marry him, but she chose to marry him. He was a Mahomedan and under

Mahomedan law a divorce can take place by a method known as talaknama. If Ata Mahomed chose to divorce Kamal Varma, it was entirely a

matter of his choice. If Kamal Varma found that the marriage tie was suddenly put an end to, it was an affair entirely between Ata Mahomed and

Kamal Varma. Nobody compelled Kamal Varma to marry Ata Mahomed and one must assume that she chose freely to marry him.

One must also assume that she knew that Ata Mahomed, being a Mahomedan, was in a position to end the marriage by the method of talaknama.

This was, therefore, an individual affair between the two but the writer Veerketu takes this as a theme for his subject and begins by saying:

The Alamgiri tradition itself which puts the father in jail, assassinates the brothers and keeps an evil eye on sisters-in-law had made the Palanpur

son proficient in this mean art of breach of trust. Betrayal, rape, lust and deceitfulness constituted his ancestral tradition.

When Kamal Varma overwhelmed with love became Anjuman Ara, she fell victim to this beastly tradition with open eyes. Had not Ata Mahomed

rumpled and thrown her away like a used garment, the heirs to this same mean tradition would have been born from Vijayalaxmi's womb".

This passage shows that Ata Mahomed is a representative of a tradition known as "the Alamgiri tradition". According to that tradition, there is

nothing wrong in putting a father in jail. Equally, there is nothing wrong in assassinating a brother and further, there is nothing wrong in keeping an

evil eye upon a sister-in-law.

It is evident that this is nothing but an attack upon the Muslim community. What is noteworthy is the fact that the writer says that it is a tradition and

it is an ancestral tradition, suggesting that this tradition is peculiar to Mahomedans. But this is not all. The next passage which may be referred to in

this connection runs as follows:

Then Kamal Varma had not the slightest consciousness that Muslim marriage meant betrayal of woman, Muslim marriage meant betrayal of

nation, Muslim marriage meant betrayal of one's self and that Muslim marriage meant betrayal of humanity".

This again is an attack upon what the writer describes the sort of Muslim marriage and the Consequent betrayal following it. The suggestion implied

is that Kamal Varma embraced Islam and married Ata Mahomed and the result of the Muslim marriage was nothing more than the betrayal of

womanhood, betrayal of the nation, betrayal of one's individuality & betrayal of the entire humanity. This is again a tirade against the Muslims as a

community. There is a further passage which is equally striking:

Kamal Varma had expected "quiet domestic life" from a person born in a Muslim family who (whose community) detain women in purdah, regard

them merely a thing of enjoyment, deny to them all rights of humanity and who ultimately become only one-fourth husband of any woman"".

This passage suggests that, according to the writer women in the Muslim community are nothing but objects of enjoyment and they are not even

human beings because even ordinary rights according to human beings are denied to them. This is again a generalisation and would constitute a

tirade upon the Muslim community. There is then a reference made to Pakistan which is described as Papas tan which, I apprehend means a land

or place of sins. The writer laments the Country's vivisection, laments the partition of India into Bharat and Pakistan and goes on to condemn what

he calls secularism in the country. He described the secularism as selfish, suicidal, self-deceptive, impudent and licentious.

Then at page 43 of the record the writer says that Kamal Varma, had she loved as a muslim, would have shared bed with a cow-eater throughout

her life and she would have become the mother of the unborn generations of idol breakers. This is again an attack upon the Muslim community.

Finally, persons residing in Pakistan are described as ""fanatic neighbours lying in wait for our life and our existence"". The writer says:. ""We and our

Papastani friends are today standing facing each other in almost a belligerent State"". Then he says:

This strife is not merely a communal one. This is an ancient conflict between truth and falsehood, good and bad, God and devil, sin and merit. The

side of the Hindus is the same as that of God. The side of the Hindus is the same as that of morality. The Hindus in this country have to gird up their

loins in the name of all these divine values in order that tolerance may survive, mercy may not be rooted out, independence may be unaffected,

humanity may bear fruits and flowers"".

This is the language of hyperbole. One may say this is merely picturesque language. But it is clear that the effect of the writing was to show the

Muslims as a community in the blackest possible light and evidently if this was the effect, then the writing would come within section 3 (v).

I must observe that I am not concerned with the opinions expressed by the writer. He may be right or he may be wrong. The Court is not

concerned with the correctness of these views. What I have to consider is whether the effect produced upon the mind of an average reader is the

effect which is described within Section 3 (v) and I am clear that upon a fair, free and. liberal reading of the writing the effect is to promote feelings

of enmity between Hindus and Mahomedans. Reference to Pakistan as Papastan is but one illustration. The lament over partition is another. The

country's vivisection is another illustration of that mentality and on the whole, I think, the learned Judge of the Court below was right in taking the

view that the article fell within Section 3 (v).

10. But Mr. Dange for the appellant contends that the writing fell within Expln. I to Section 3. As I read the article, there is no question of any

comment expressing disapprobation or criticism of any law; nor is there any comment expressing disapprobation or criticism of any policy of

Government.

Equally, There is no question of any comment expressing disapprobation or criticism of any administrative action of Government, & if the writing is

read in a spirit in which it should be read, there is no concrete suggestion as to what should be done. But Mr. Dange says that in reading the article

of 19-7-1954, we should read the article of 12-7-1954 and he says that this course is permissible, having regard to Section 22 of the Act which

provides:

In any inquiry before a Sessions Judge with reference to any newspaper or news-sheet, any previous or subsequent issue of such newspaper or

news-sheet may be given in evidence in aid of the proof of the nature and effect of the words, signs or visible representations in respect of which

the complaint is made".

Now, this section evidently means that in order to appreciate the true nature and effect of the article impugned, it is open to the Court to look at

any previous or subsequent issue of the newspaper and even if one reads the issue of 12-7-1954, no other conclusion than the one at which I have

arrived is possible.

This issue of 12-7-1954 contains an article under the title "'Vijayalaxmi proselytised by Mahomed: Crescent over Indian Screen world. Dreadful

aggression of Muslim communalism on Bharatiya National Religion". With regard to the Muslims, the article says "'Our Islamic brothers too are

fleeing us.? -- Our relations with Pakistan are not friendly and crores of creators of Pakistan are stealthily entrenched in this very land". It is

difficult to say that even if one gives the most liberal meaning to this article, one would reach the conclusion that this article falls within Explan. I.

11. As I said at the commencement of this judgment, while the freedom of the press is undoubtedly a valuable right, there are limits within which

the freedom is to be enjoyed and it is for the nice balancing of these two considerations that Section 3 together with Explan. I is enacted in the Act.

In our view, the article, read as a whole, in a free, fair and liberal spirit falls within Section 3 (v) and does not fall within Explan. I to Section 3.

12. That being so, the only remaining question is one of the amount of the security. In the complaint filed by the Commissioner of Police, Greater

Bombay, the amount mentioned was a sum of Rs. 3000/-. The learned Judge of the Sessions Court considered that a sum of Rs. 1500/- would

suffice and the Question of decision is whether, having regard to the circumstances of the case, this is an adequate amount of security. In

determining the amount of security regard is to be had to Section 10 which provides:

The amount of security, required to be deposited by the keeper of a press or the publisher of any newspaper or news-sheet u/s 4 or Section 5 or

Section 7 or Section 8, shall be fixed with due regard to the circumstances or the case and shall not be excessive, and shall, in no case, be larger

than the amount specified in the complaint u/s 16"".

It is clear that Section 10 does not lay down any particular amount as the amount of security and this would be natural because the amount of

security must depend upon the facts of each case. But there are three important considerations and they are: (1) the Court must have regard to the

circumstances of the case; (2) the amount of security should not be excessive and (3) the amount shall, in no case, exceed the amount mentioned in

the complaint.

The question is whether this amount is excessive or is commensurate with the circumstances of the case.. Now, the circulation of this newspaper is

about 3000 copies per week. Mr. Dange has suggested that this is not a newspaper in the sense in which one understands the expression

newspaper"" , but the paper is devoted to the cause of the Hindus and the Hindu religion in general.

There is no evidence in the case except the extent of its circulation. But the circulation is a fair indication of its popularity. It cannot be suggested

that a circulation of 3000 copies is, in any sense, a wide circulation, and on the whole, we are (disposed to think that the amount of Rs. 1500/- is

excessive and we propose to reduce the amount and the amount of security should be Rs. 750/- and not Rs. 1500/-.

13. The result of the aforesaid discussion is that Criminal Appeal No. 803 of 1955 fails and the same will be dismissed and for the same-reasons,

Criminal Appeal No. 798 of 1955 will be dismissed subject to the variation that the amount of security will be Rs. 750/- instead of Rs. 1500/-.

Vyas, J.

14. I agree with my learned brother. A short question arising for determination in these appeals is as to the construction of Section 3, Clause (v),

Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951. The circumstances under which this Question has arisen have been stated by my learned brother in his

judgment. Consequent upon the publication, in the Film India of July 1954, by Vijayalaxmi alias Kamal Varma, a Hindu film actress, of her

sorrowful romance of having married a Muslim -- Ata Mahomed of Palanpur -- in January 1954 and having been divorced by him in May 1954,

there appeared two articles in the Weekly paper ""Hindu"".

One of the articles appeared in the issue dated 12-7-1954 and the other was published in the issue dated 19-7-1954. The appellant before us is

the Publisher of these articles. He is also the keeper of the Press ""Nirbhaya Mudranalaya"" , Dadar, where the weekly ""Hindu"" is published. The

impugned article is the one which was published on 19-7-1954 and the question before us is whether it falls within the mischief of Clause (v) of

Section 3, Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951.

Upon a consideration of the several statements contained in this article and upon a careful reading of the whole article in ""a fair, free and liberal

spirit"" and not merely ""pausing upon an objectionable sentence here or a strong word there"", it is clear to us that the spirit of the entire article from

the beginning to the end is to create hatred and feelings of enmity towards the Muslim community by referring contemptuously to Muslim thought

and traditions. Below mentioned are some extracts from the article and they constitute quite a collection:

(1) ""The Alamgiri tradition itself which puts the father to jail, assassinates the brothers and keeps an evil eye on sisters-in-law had made the

Palanpur son proficient in this mean art of breach of trust"".

(2) ""Betrayal, rape, lust and deceitfulness constituted his (Ata Mahomed"s) ancestral tradition. When Kamal Varma overwhelmed with love

became Anjuman Ara, she fell victim to this beastly tradition with open eyes"".

(3) ""Had not Ata Mahomed rumped and. thrown her away like a used garment, the heirs to this same mean tradition (the reference obviously is to

the Alamgiri tradition) would have been born from Vijayalaxmi"s womb

..... The anti-human motherhood rearing the sinful tradition of Ata Mahomed with the nature and water of her blood and flesh would have come to

her lot"".

(4) ""Kamal Varma had not the slightest consciousness that Muslim marriage meant betrayal of woman Muslim marriage meant betrayal of the

nation, Muslim marriage meant betrayal of one"s self and that Muslim marriage meant betrayal of humanity"".

(5) ""Kamal Varma had expected "quiet domestic life" from a person born in a Muslim family who (whose community) detain women in purdah,

regard them merely as a thing of enjoyment, deny to them all rights of humanity and, who ultimately become only one-fourth husband of any

woman"".

(6) ""The sooner every Hindu woman and man and every secularist realise that in such a situation, forming relation by any individual among us with a

Papastani for any personal gain, sentiment or (any other) reason is not only a treachery to religion but also a treachery to the country, the better.

This strife is not merely a communal one.

This is an ancient conflict between truth and falsehood, good and bad, God and Devil, sin and merit. This conflict is of perpetual nature like that of

tolerance versus intolerance, humanity versus inhumanity, religiousness versus fanaticism"".

(7) ""The side of the Hindus is the same as that of God. The side of the Hindus is the same as that of freedom. The side of the Hindus is the same as

that of morality"".

(8) ""When Vijayalaxmi got the burning water of Islam sprinkled on her Hindu body

(9) ""But this woman who was entirely incapable and unauthorised to cope with the lofty idea of the freedom of action burnt that freedom itself on

the intolerant flame of Islam"".

(10) ""Create a fanatic nation like Papastan"".

(11) ""She (the reference obviously is to Vijayalaxmi) has bought the dreadful experience of Islam by paying a price which ought not to have been

paid"".

(12) ""Had not Ata Mahomed thrown her into the rubbish of forgetfulness like a chappal made old by using, she would not have come back to the

Hindu religion. She would have remained only Muslim; she would have shared bed with cow-eater throughout her life. She would have become the

mother of the unborn generation of iconoclasts"".

(13) ""Vijayalaxmi walked the infernal way to the Muslim haram with her legs and came out merely by an accident"".

(14) ""A Muslim harem has got only an entrance and no exit"".

15. To say that the Muslims as a community are inheritors to the tradition (Alamgiri tradition) of imprisoning fathers, assassinating brothers and

having immoral intentions towards sisters-in-law and of betrayals, rapes and lust; to say that if Ata Mahomed had not discarded Vijayalaxmi, heirs

to the abovementioned tradition would have been born of her womb; to say that it would have been a anti human motherhood, in that Vijayalaxmi

would have nursed and reared the Alamgiri traditions of rapes and betrayals of women with her blood and flesh; and to say that for a Hindu

woman to marry a Muslim was a betrayal of womanhood, a betrayal of nation, a betrayal of one's self and a betrayal of communal hatred. To

accuse the Muslim as a community that they detain women in purdah regard them merely as a thing of enjoyment and deny to them all the rights of

humanity and to characterise the marriage of a Hindu with a Muslim as being a marriage which raises a question of communal strife and represents

a conflict between truth and falsehood, good and bad, God and Devil, sin and merit are statements calculated to arouse the passions of the

Muslims generally and exasperate the Muslim community.

To suggest that Hindus are Godly and the Muslims are devilish, that the Hindus are meritorious and the Muslims are sinful, that the Hindus

represent truth and morality and the Muslims falsehood and immorality is to engender feelings of bitter enmity between the two communities and

substitute disharmony, discord and hatred in place of peaceful relations between the communities.

It is futile to contend that statements such as these saying that the ways of the Muslim harem are infernal that Pakistan is Papastan (the literal

meaning being "the abode of sin") that ""Vijayalaxmi had got the dreadful experience of Islam and would have become the mother of the unborn

generations of iconoclasts (idol-breakers), that the Muslims are a fanatic nation of Papas-tan that the flame of Islam was intolerant and that the

burning water of Islam had been sprinkled upon the Hindu body of Vijayalaxmi can lead to any other result, but the communal tension, hatred and

bitterness.

I do not think that I need say anything more to point out that the article dated 19-7-1954 from which the extracts have been quoted above falls

clearly within the mischief of Section 3, Clause (v) Tress (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951.

16. The defence of the appellant is that the impugned writing is protected by Explanation I to Section 3. Explanation I to Section 3 says:

Comments expressing disapprobation or criticism of any law or of any policy or administrative action of the Govt. with a view to obtain its

alteration or redress by lawful means, and words pointing out, with a view to their removal, matters which are producing or have a tendency to

produce, feelings of enmity or hatred between different sections of the people of India, shall not be deemed to be objectionable matter within the

meaning of this section"".

17. Mr. Dange for the appellant says that the statements contained in the impugned article dated 19-7-1954 were comments on the policy of the

State as a secular State and on the administrative acts of the State done in pursuance of that policy. It is impossible to accept this contention. It is

nowhere laid down that the policy of Government is that Hindu girls should marry Muslims and it is nowhere suggested -- and indeed it would be

idle to suggest -- that there is any administrative action taken by the State that the Hindu girls should marry Muslims.

India is a secular State recognising no distinction between religions, castes, creeds and sects, and therefore, the Government would of course not

prevent such marriage. But that is not to say that the Policy of the State is that the Hindus should marry Muslims. In a secular State, everybody is

free to marry whomsoever he or she likes. The State imposes no restrictions upon the liberty and right of a person to marry anybody of his or her

choice.

In the exercise of that right, if a Hindu girl chooses to marry a Muslim, it is a matter entirely of her individual choice, and not a matter of any policy

of the State or an administrative or executive act of the State. When it is said that a particular thing is a policy of the State, it means that the State

expects that the said thing should be done.

Now, it could not be said by any stretch of imagination that the State wishes that the Hindu girls should marry Muslims. It is entirely a matter for the

girls & boys to decide whom they will marry. The State has nothing to do with it either by way of policy or administratively.

18. Mr. Dange has next contended that the impugned article would be protected because it was written with a view to point out the undesirability

of such a marriage as the one into which Vijayalaxmi had entered. Mr. Dange says that the idea was that Government should look into the matter

and remove the grievances like the one from which Vijayalaxmi had suffered in this particular case. It is not possible to accept this contention of

Mr. Dange either.

There is nothing in the whole of the article dated 19-7-1954 to suggest that the writer had requested the State of Bombay or any other authority to

look into the matter and see that the grievances like the one from which Vijayalaxmi suffered should be removed. Mr. Dange says that, having

regard to the provisions of Section 22 of the Act we should read the article dated 12-7-1954, in conjunction with the article dated July 19, 1954-

As a matter of fact, we do not agree with Mr. Dange's submission that the two articles should be read together. The article dated 12-7-1954 is

not an impugned article and the article, with which we are concerned is only one article namely the article dated 19-7-1954. But, even if we were

to read the two articles together, there is nothing even in the article dated 12-7-1954 to suggest that the writer had requested the Government to

look into the matter and see that such grievances were removed in future. For this purpose, it would be relevant to turn only to the last paragraph

of the article dated 12-7-1954 and the pertinent recitals therein are:

Let the time of getting up in this matter for our secular Government come when it may. Our Society however should remain extremely alert in the

matter. It would be just to declare illegal such invasions made by Christian and Muslim religions on our national religion. But if it is not going to

happen, our society should see to it that such degradation becomes impossible"".

There is nothing in these statements to show that the writer was making a request to Government that they should look into the matter of such

grievances. On the contrary, the writer wrote slightlying for the State in this connection when he said:

Let the time of getting up in this matter for our secular Government come when it may"".

He was merely expressing his own view and not making a request to Government when he observed, ""It would be just to declare illegal such

invasions made by Christian and Muslim religions on our national religion"". The point, therefore, is that there is nothing either in the article dated 12-

7-1954 or in the article dated 19-7-1954 to show that, by writing those articles, the writer was making a request to Government that the

grievances such as the one from which Vijayalaxmi had suffered should be removed.

19. Then Mr. Dange has contended that all that the writer did by writing the impugned article was to protest against a fraudulent conversion of

Vijayalaxmi from Hinduism to Islam. It is not possible for us to subscribe to Mr. Dange's submission that this was a case of a fraudulent

conversion. Vijayalaxmi had walked into this marriage with open eyes. She had known Ata Mahomed before agreeing to marry him.

It would not be wrong to presume that she must have been attracted by his personality. It would also not be incorrect to assume that she must have

been drawn by his wealth, position and status. If attracted by these circumstances she walked into the marriage with him, it could hardly be said

that this was a case of fraudulent conversion, if, for the purposes of getting Ata Mahomed to agree to the marriage, she had to convert herself from

Hinduism to Islam.

There is nothing to show that even at the date when Ata Mahomed married this girl, he had an idea to divorce her later. But, even apart from all

this, there is not one little syllable in the whole of the article dated 19-7-1954 that the writer was protesting against fraudulent conversion. The only

object which the writer had in mind was to hold in ridicule and contempt the Muslim religion, the Muslim culture and the Muslim traditions.

20. Now, it is evident that in a democratic State, the Press must have the freedom of expression. Free expression of views and comments upon the

acts of individuals and the State is one of the valuable rights of the Press, through the healthy exercise of which the press can make an effective

contribution to the welfare of the Society. Unless this right is recognised and respected, democratic institutions cannot have a healthy growth.

It is natural and human for individuals and even the State to make mistakes with the best of intentions and unless those mistakes are criticised and

commented upon by the Press, which must of course be done in a healthy and restrained manner, a democracy cannot function efficiently. An

enlightened and fully-informed public opinion upon vital questions affecting the well-being of the society cannot be formed if the press is under a

disability to express its views freely.

In a democratic State, it is of fundamental importance that people's political consciousness should be awakened and they should be made to

understand "the pros and cons of every political system and every political ideology". Free expression of views, even if strong and emphatic words

are used, would not necessarily fall within the mischief of Clause (v) of Section 3 of the Act unless of course it is illegal to propagate those views or

the propagation is likely to lead to an outburst of violence.

But it is to be noticed that this is not a case of using words which are merely strong words. This is a case where the Muslim religion, the Muslim

morality, the Muslim thought, the Muslim culture, the Muslim traditions, Muslim social institutions such as marriages of the Muslims and the entire

mental make-up of the Muslims were brought into ridicule and contempt by words which were intemperate & inflammatory and by language which

was violent and vicious.

Any Hindu reader in whose hands the article is likely to fall is likely to have the feeling of hatred aroused in his mind towards the Muslims and the

Muslims are likely to react violently towards the Hindus by the reading of an article such as this.

21. Mr. Dange for the appellant invited our attention to a decision of this Court in -- Manohar Damodar Patil and Another Vs. The Government of

Bombay, . It was a case u/s 3, Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931. It was held in that case that the Press was entirely free to propagate

any views, provided that those views were not prohibited or were not likely to lead to any breach of the peace. It was observed that it was not

wrong or contrary to law for any editor of a paper or any propagandist to draw the attention of his readers to the existence in this country of a bad

or evil influence and to ask the readers to eliminate that influence.

Whether the writer was right or wrong was another matter altogether, but in advocating a particular cause and by using a strong language in

support of that cause, the writer did not necessarily come within the mischief of that Act. Dange had contended on the authority of this decision

that, Just as in that case a writing containing a propaganda in favour of the Communist Party was held protected, so in the present case also the

writing containing the propaganda in favour of the Hindu religion and culture should be held protected.

Now, it is important to remember that the clauses which came up for construction in AIR 1950 210 (C), were Clauses (d) and (f) of Section 3, of

the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, and not Clause. (h) the terminology whereof is similar to that of Clause (v) of Section 3, Press

(Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951. In other words, the question whether the article was calculated to promote feelings of enmity and hatred

between different sections of the people of India did not arise for consideration at all in that case.

Besides, the article in that case was intended for Communist propaganda, and the Communist party had not been declared unlawful association in

India. The Court pointed out that there was nothing in law to prevent the Communists from carrying on propaganda with regard to their own

philosophy and to extol their own ideology as against the Socialist or Congress ideologies.

Now, what really distinguishes the present case from -- "Manohar Damodar Patil's Case (C)" is that the Constitution of this country prohibits the

carrying on of a propaganda against any religion. The Constitution of India recognises no distinction whether between religions, nationalities,

cultures, castes, creeds, sects, etc.

Under the Constitution, it would not be legal for a Hindu or a Muslim or a Christian to carry on a propaganda against another's religion. The

Constitution is based upon the recognition of absolute equality between all religions, and mutual respect for all religious, all cultures, all creeds and

sects is required of every citizen of India. Accordingly, it would be illegal for anybody to carry on any propaganda, against another's religion and

this would distinguish this case from "Manohar Damodar Patil's case (C).

22. The next case to which Mr. Dange drew our attention is the case of -- Dravida Nadu, a Tamil Weekly Vs. The Government of the Province of

Madras, . It was held in that case that when a writer set out to ventilate the grievances of a class or community, there was a likelihood of criticising

adversely the action of the class or community which was alleged to have taken an unfair advantage.

In all such cases it would be wrong to say that a writing which ventilated the grievances of a particular class or community would fall within the

mischief of the enactment. It was observed that "enmity" and "hatred" in Section 4(1)(h) of the Press Act were strong words. It was also pointed

out that in a world of conflicting claims, it would be manifestly unfair to characterise every expression of dissatisfaction and every ventilation of

grievances as tending to the promotion of enmity and hatred.

Now to "Annadurai"s case (D)", the impugned writing consisted of two articles. The first article started with a praise of the good qualities of

Ramswami Reddiar and then posed the question ""Why was there any opposition to such a man?"" A part of the article was devoted to an analysis

of events and circumstances with a view to demonstrate that the opposition was due to the intrigue and the "communal frenzy" of a selfish group of

the Congress Legislative Party consisting of Brahmins.

A major portion of the second article was in no way offensive. The writer referred to the fact that in Hindu society in that Province the vast

majority were non-Brahmins and a minority were Brahmins, But that the majority were treating the minority as members of a superior caste. He

pointed out that the majority did not get equal rights and facilities in educational, industrial, economical, political, religious and other fields, whereas

the minority community, namely, the Brahmins, had made great advance in all the fields.

The writer pleaded for destroying the system which had for the last several thousands of years! spread and struck root and had rendered the

majority community "born slaves" and "walking corpses". It is pertinent to see that the writer hastened to assure that he and those who held

opinions similar to his had no hatred against the Brahmins and they were opposing only the system, namely, Brahminism, because it was on account

of this that several troubles had arisen in the body politic.

The Court was satisfied in that case on a reading of the entire article that the writer was denouncing the system, whether it was called a caste

system of Brahminism, which had led to the superior position in society of the Brahmins. According to the learned Judges who decided the case,

nowhere in the article did the writer say that the Brahmins of the present day had actually done everything.

The complaint in the article was that the system ""had in the last several thousands of years"" spread and struck root and expressly said that he had

no hatred against the Brahmins as individuals and stated in the clearest of terms in places more than one that it was the system which should be

destroyed.

According to the learned Judges, upon the language of the writing there was no incitement anywhere of the non-Brahmins to act in any inimical way

or to inspire them with hatred against the Brahmins. The case with the present writing is entirely different. As I have pointed out, the impugned

article dated 19-7-1954 contains condemnation in violent and inflammatory language of practically everything which belongs to the Muslim

community i.e. the Muslim thought, the Muslim way of thinking, the Muslim religion and the Muslim social institutions.

23. That being so, I have no hesitation in agreeing with judgment just delivered by my learned brother that the article would not be protected by

Explanation I to Section 3. In my view, the learned Sessions Judge of Greater Bombay has rightly passed an order requiring security from the

appellant.

24. Appeals dismissed.