

SALAFIA MODEL SCHOOL PAMPORE

CLASS 8th

SUBJECT: CIVICS TERM 1ST

LESSON NO:3 (Why do we need a parliament)

LESSON NO:4 (Understanding Laws)

LESSON NO:5 (Judiciary)

LESSON NO:6 (Understanding our Criminal justice system)

lesson no. 3 - why do we need
a parliament.

Qno. 1 - Indian National Congress was established in 1885 and Nationalist leaders demanded that there should be elected members in the legislature with a right to vote the budget and ask questions. The Government of India act 1909 introduced indirect election to the legislative assembly. National leaders were not satisfied with this Act because right to vote was very restricted and limited. Under the act of 1919 and 1935 vote-
-rs numbers increased but adult franchise was not introduced. Indian leaders demanded adult franchise and hence when they got a chance to frame the Constitution for India Adult Franch-
-ise was introduced.

Qno. 2 - Lok Sabha Constituency - Anantnag -
Mehbooba Mufti - PDP (2004).

State - J and K - Lok Sabha seats - of
constituencies coloured green are reserved for
S.T. while constituencies coloured blue are reserved for S.C.

Qno. 3 -

Ans.

state / UT govt. ✓

central govt.

No-party in power	National Democratic Alliance (B.J.P.)
-	Hasnain Masoodi
nil	Congress + other parties.
2014	2019
-	2024
nil	78

L.no. 4 - Understanding Laws -

Qno.1 - Rule of law means that law is supreme, not the arbitrary will of any individual. No body is above the law. Everybody is equal before law. No person is exempted from the jurisdiction of law.

The most common example of a violation of the rule of law can be seen on the roads. Motorists don't adhere nor do they stop behind the line at traffic signals. Pedestrians rarely use zebra crossing and cross the road at will thus causing harm not only to themselves but also to other road users.

Qno.2 - The two reasons why historians refute the claim that the British introduced the Rule of law in India are :-

- 1- Colonial rule was arbitrary e.g, Sedition act 1870.
- 2- Indian nationalists played a prominent role in the development of the legal sphere in British India.

Qno.3 Women's groups worked hard towards passing of the new law on domestic violence in India. They used different forums like public protests, hearings, meetings with other organisations, press conferences and petitions to the government to introduce a new reformed bill

on domestic violence to include demands like monetary relief and protection against being evicted from the shared household. While earlier, domestic violence only entailed "injury or harm or threat of injury or harm" by one adult male against a woman. The protection of women from domestic violence Act 2005 extended to include physical, economic, sexual, verbal and emotional abuse.

Qno 4 - This line refers to the protests of Indian nationalists against the violation of the rule of law by British authorities. Indians were discriminated against in their own country by the British colonists and the sedition Act of 1870 was the most prolific example of the breach of the rule of law. This Act was resented against by Indian freedom fighters in favour of a more just set of rules based on ideals of equality.

Many Indians began to practice the legal profession and used it to demand and gain equal rights for all. Thus, Indians played a major role in the evolution of the rule of law during times of colonial rule.

Unit 5 - Judiciary.

Qno 1 - The Independence of the judiciary allows the Courts to play a central role in upholding the law and enforcing fundamental rights, as it ensures that there is no misuse of power by the legislature and the executive. Anyone can approach the courts if they believe that their rights have been violated and politicians and other socially powerful people can't use their power to change any judgement.

Qno 2 - The right to constitutional remedies allows an Indian citizen to move the court if he feels that any of his or her fundamental rights has been violated by the state. As the final interpreter of the Constitution, the judiciary has the power to review or even strike down any particular law passed by the Parliament if it believes that this law violates the basic structure of the Constitution, which is called judicial review. In this way we find that the right to constitutional remedies given in the fundamental rights is directly connected and supported by the idea of judicial review.

Qno. 3 - Lower Court (Trial Court): Laxman, his mother Shakuntala and his brother Subash Chandra were sentenced to death.

High Court: Laxman, Shakuntala and Subash Chandra were acquitted.

Supreme Court: Laxman and Shakuntala were given life imprisonment while Subash Chandra was acquitted for lack of sufficient evidence.

Qno. 4 - (a) True (b) False - They went to the High Court after the trial Court had given its decision.

(c) False. If they don't like the Supreme Court's verdict, the accused can't go back again to the Trial Court since the Supreme Court is at the highest rung of the judiciary pyramid.

Qno. 5 - The Introduction of PPL in the 1980s is a significant step in ensuring access to justice for all because it also keeps in mind the interests of the illiterate and poor who aren't educated enough or can't afford to access the Indian legal system for justice against exploitation or violation of their basic human and fundamental rights.

Qno. 6 - In Olga Tellis vs. Bombay Municipal Corporation case, the judges said that the right to livelihood was part of the right to life. They stated that life doesn't merely imply an animal existence; it can not be lived without a means of living that is "the means of livelihood". The judges confessed that eviction from a pavement or slum is deprivation of means of livelihood for the poor who can't afford to live anywhere else. They take up small jobs in surrounding areas and to lose their pavement or slum would lead to loss of a job resulting in loss of a means of livelihood. Consequently, leading to "deprivation of life". This is how the judges connected right to livelihood to the right to life.

Qno. 7 - Rahul was a bank officer. After retirement he came back to his grandfather's house. He requested the tenant to vacate the house. But the tenant did not vacate the house. Tenant challenged that if Rahul wanted to have his house vacated, he should move to court for justice. He was compelled to live in a rented house. The owner lodged litigation against the tenant. After fighting the case for five years, the owner won the case in the.

Trial court. But the tenant appealed in the High Court against the lower court's decision. It took again five years for justice. During this time Rahul kept on living in the rented house because unless there was judgement, he had no other option. In such a situation we can definitely say, "justice delayed is justice denied."

Q-1 - 1. **Acquit** - In Sushma murder case, the High Court acquitted Laxman, Shakuntala and Subash Chandra.

2. **To Appeal** - In Sushma murder case, the three accused went to the High Court to appeal against the judgement of Trial Court.

3. **Compensation** - Compensation is given to a person whose property is acquired for public purposes.

4. **Eviction** - The eviction of a person from a slum will inevitably lead to the deprivation of the means of livelihood.

5. **Violation** - In India a citizen can be punished only for the violation of law.

Unit 6

Understanding Our Criminal Justice System.

Qno. 1 - Police - record the statements of witnesses; take photographs of burnt homes; arrest the Fiesta fans; get the assaulted women medically examined.

Public Prosecutor - cross examine the witnesses; examine the witnesses in court; argue the case for the victims.

Defence lawyer - cross examine the witnesses; meet the accused persons; examine the witness in court.

Judge - Hears the witness; writes the judgement; decide for how many years the accused will be put in Jail; pass the judgement.

The victims would not get justice if only one person perform all the functions of the criminal justice system because a separation of powers is necessary within a judicial system too since absolute power can never be fair.

Different persons need to play different roles as part of the criminal justice system because -

1- All aspects of an investigation and trial can't be conducted by one person alone as they entail diverse kinds of work including arrests, recording of witness statements, defence of accused and victims parties, passing of a fair trial and a judicially correct judgement.

2- If all these powers are vested in one person alone, they might be misused and will thereby violate the rule of law based on equal and just decisions.