International Journal of Integrated Academic Research
ISSN: 3139-5287 | Volume-1 Issue-2 | April-June 2026 | IAR12-006
doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22326002

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSIONS OF PREVENTIVE DETENTION IN INDIA

N. Raj Kumar, *LLB Student,*
Kims College of Law, Karimnagar.

ABSTRACT: This paper examines the challenging equilibrium between the State's need to maintain public order and national security and the individual's right to personal liberty concerning preventative detention in India. The examination focuses on Articles 21 and 22 of the Indian Constitution, which provide procedural safeguards against arbitrary imprisonment, as well as the evolution of preventive detention legislation. This article examines the Supreme Court of India's interpretation of constitutional provisions on preventative detention, focusing on fairness, proportionality, and due process. This essay examines the constitutional legality of preventative detention through judicial scrutiny, highlighting the tension between individual rights and collective security. To uphold preventative detention as a distinctive measure within India's democracy and constitution, there is a pressing need for enhanced constitutional accountability and safeguards.

Keywords: *Preventive Detention, Constitution of India, Fundamental Rights, Personal Liberty, Article 21, Article 22, Due Process, Judicial Review, National Security, Public Order, Constitutional Safeguards, Supreme Court of India.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indian constitution permits preventative detention without trial to maintain national security, public order, or important services. Preventive detention predicts behavior, whereas punitive incarceration transpires post-offense. The Constitution, although limiting human liberty, prohibits arbitrary enforcement and recognizes its necessity in certain circumstances.

Articles 21 and 22 of the Indian Constitution stipulate provisions for preventative detention. Article 21 ensures the right to life and personal liberty, whilst Article 22 provides the right to be informed of the grounds for imprisonment and to challenge the detention order. The Constitution seeks to reconcile individual rights with state rights in several domains.

The constitutionality of preventive detention was influenced by legislation and judicial decisions. Preventive detention mandated by the court must be infrequent and comply with constitutional protocols. The Indian constitution balances fundamental rights with state security on preventive detention.

2. PRE–INDEPENDENCE BACKGROUND

Bengal Regulation Act, 1818 (Regulation III of 1818)

Preventative detention was implemented in colonial India by the Bengal Regulation Act of 1818. The Act, which was initially implemented in Bengal, Bombay, and Madras, gave the British government the authority to imprison individuals without conviction in order to maintain public

ISSN: 3139-5287 | Volume-1 Issue-2 | April-June 2026 | IAR12-006
doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22326002

order and advance colonial interests. Ultimately, the measure expanded the use of preventative detention.

Defence of India Act, 1915

The Defence of India Act, 1915 (Act IV of 1915) was enacted in response to the peril posed by World War I to British India. The Act empowered the colonial government to apprehend and penalize any individual suspected of endangering the nation in the absence of criminal law. Civil liberties were significantly diminished during the wartime period due to incarceration and adjudication.

Rowlatt Act, 1919

The emergency powers of the Defence of India Act of 1915 were reaffirmed by the Rowlatt Act of 1919 in the aftermath of World War I. The government is permitted to detain any individual without charge for a period of two years under this provision. India's freedom war commenced with demonstrations due to the Act's violation of civil liberties and justice.

Government of India Act, 1935

Preventative detention was required for independent India under the 1935 Government of India Act. Under the Act, the Governor-General and Provincial Governments have the authority to enact public safety preventative detention measures. Preventative detention was implemented by colonial authorities to ensure security and control.

Defence of India Act, 1939

The British government was granted extensive emergency powers during World War II by the Defence of India Act of 1939. Similar to the Defence of India Act, 1915, it permitted preventative detention, travel restrictions, censorship, and other coercive measures to safeguard State security. During national emergencies, the Act permitted colonial authorities to detain individuals without trial.

3. POST–INDEPENDENCE DEVELOPMENTS

Constitutional Provisions

Preventive arrest is legal under Indian Constitution Articles 22(3)–22(7). It allows Parliament and state legislatures to regulate preventative detention. After Advisory Board assessment, these statutes enable three-month detention.

Early Legislations

The first preventative imprisonment statute following independence was the 1950 Preventative Imprisonment Act. The 1962 Defense of India Act replaced it amid a national emergency.

Major Preventive Detention Laws

Important laws enacted include:

- AFSPA, 1958
- MISA, 1971
- COFEPOSA, 1974
- NSA, 1980
- TADA, 1985
- POTA, 2002
- UAPA, 1967

Present Status

The key preventive detention legislation in India are COFEPOSA, NSA, and UAPA. Others like MISA, TADA, and POTA have been repealed or expired.

4. INTERNATIONAL STANCE ON PREVENTIVE DETENTION

Position in Democratic Countries

US, UK, Australia, and Canada laws allow preventive detention. The UK Anti-Terrorism, Crime, and Security Act of 2001 and the U.S. PATRIOT Act of 2001 provide more court monitoring and

ISSN: 3139-5287 | Volume-1 Issue-2 | April-June 2026 | IAR12-006
doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22326002

openness than other preventative detention systems.

International Human Rights Framework

Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) allows interim suspension of certain rights during public emergencies, subject to non-discrimination and international law. The lack of implementation requirements in preventative detention rules has drawn criticism.

European Convention on Human Rights

Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) allows preventive custody under certain conditions and requires strict judicial review to prevent arbitrary detention.

International Criticism of India

Amnesty International (2022) and the UN Human Rights Council (2021) have highlighted concerns about India's preventative detention laws and advocated for legislative amendments to protect fundamental rights.

5. NEGATIVE RESULTS OF CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION

Conflict with Fundamental Rights

Despite justifications for public order, national security, and necessary services, preventive detention typically violates Article 21's right to life and personal liberty.

Judicial Evolution

In Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, the Supreme Court expanded its interpretation from A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras to hold that fundamental rights are interrelated and that any procedure limiting personal liberty must be fair, just, and reasonable.

Need for Reforms

Despite judicial protections, concerns about preventative detention misuse, poor procedural safeguards, and minimal public understanding persist. Achieving balance between personal freedom and national security requires optimal international standards and legal safeguards.

6. FADING AWAY OF INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION

Limited Constitutional Safeguards

Prevention detention in Articles 22(3)–22(7) has fewer safeguards than regular arrests in Articles 22(1) and 22(2). Preventive detainees may not have legal representation or appear before a magistrate within 24 hours.

Reduced Judicial Protection

Limited procedural protections limit court involvement and detainees' capacity to contest their imprisonment, undermining personal liberty.

Delay in Habeas Corpus Remedies

Habeas corpus allows detainees to seek relief, but judicial delays might hinder it. After the three-month detention term, petitions often linger, reducing the usefulness of this constitutional remedy.

7. DELAYED EXECUTION OF REASONABLENESS

Delay in Implementing Constitutional Reform

Section 3 of the 44th Constitutional Amendment Act, 1978, which advocated decreasing preventive detention without Advisory Board review from three months to two months, was not implemented, which is concerning.

Scope for Misuse

The delay raises worries about

ISSN: 3139-5287 | Volume-1 Issue-2 | April-June 2026 | IAR12-006
doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22326002

preventative detention abuse.

Apprehension of political opponents under MISA during the Emergency (1975–1977) and preventative detentions in Jammu and Kashmir after Article 370 was repealed are notable examples.

Prolonged Detention and Fair Trial Concerns

Umar Khalid's case and others under the UAPA have highlighted issues with protracted detention and trial delays. These examples show how difficult it is to balance national security and individual liberty.

Empirical Observation of Misuse

Weak Judicial Oversight

Research shows that inadequate court oversight in preventative detention enforcement undermines safeguards against arbitrary imprisonment.

Prolonged Detention

The National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) reports that 60% of preventative detainees had been kept for over six months, raising worries about protracted detention.

Limited Judicial Relief

Advisory Boards uphold 90% of detention orders with little investigation, and many detainees are denied legal recourse. These trends have questioned the efficacy of protections and the misuse of preventative detention regulations.

8. CONCLUSION

The constitutional aspects of preventative detention in India demonstrate the delicate balance between public order, national security, and individual liberty. Article 22 of the Constitution enables preventative detention in rare cases and protects personal liberty. According to legal interpretation, preventive detention is a unique weapon that must be used diligently under constitutional and statutory protections. Due to abuse, protracted incarceration, and procedural violations, the constitutional commitment to the rule of law and fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 21 remains disputed. Preventive detention should be a last choice, executed with accountability, openness, and rigorous court scrutiny to protect the State's interests and respect India's democratic values and constitutional norms.

REFERENCES

[1] Austin, Granville. The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation. Oxford University Press, 1966.

[2] Austin, Granville. Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience. Oxford University Press, 1999.

[3] Basu, D. D. Commentary on the Constitution of India. LexisNexis Butterworths, Latest Edition.

[4] Basu, D. D. Introduction to the Constitution of India. LexisNexis, Latest Edition.

[5] Chaturvedi, A. N. Constitutional Law of India. Central Law Agency, Latest Edition.

[6] Durga Das Basu. Human Rights in Constitutional Law. Prentice Hall of India.

[7] Hidayatullah, M. Constitutional and Parliamentary Practice. Universal Law Publishing.

[8] Jain, M. P. Indian Constitutional Law. LexisNexis, Latest Edition.

ISSN: 3139-5287 | Volume-1 Issue-2 | April-June 2026 | IAR12-006
doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22326002

[9] Jain, M. P. Outlines of Indian Legal and Constitutional History. LexisNexis.
[10] Kumar, B. V. Preventive Detention Laws of India. Konark Publishers, 1991.
[11] Nariman, Fali S. Before Memory Fades. Hay House India.
[12] Noorani, A. G. Constitutional Questions in India: The President, Parliament and the States. Oxford University Press.
[13] Noorani, A. G. Challenges to Civil Rights Guarantees in India. Oxford University Press.
[14] Seervai, H. M. Constitutional Law of India: A Critical Commentary. Universal Law Publishing, Latest Edition.
[15] Shukla, V. N. Constitution of India. Eastern Book Company, Latest Edition.
[16] Takwani, C. K. Lectures on Administrative Law. Eastern Book Company.
[17] Wade, H. W. R. & Forsyth, C. F. Administrative Law. Oxford University Press.
[18] De Smith, Stanley. Judicial Review of Administrative Action. Sweet & Maxwell.
[19] Dicey, A. V. Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution. Macmillan.
[20] Jennings, Ivor. The Law and the Constitution. University of London Press.