

Welcome to **KEYSTONE IAS Academy**



Anna Nagar, Chennai - 40.

Current Affairs

For All Competitive Exams



Current Affairs (**NEWS**)



For All Competitive Exams

7305777541 / 641 www.keystoneiasacademy.com

AN ACADEMY RUN BY OFFICERS OF ALL INDIA CIVIL SERVICES & JUDICIAL SERVICES.



தினம் ஒரு குறள்

குறள் எண் 433
குற்றங்கூறாமை

தினைத்துணையாங் குற்றம் வரினும் பனைத்துணையாக்
கொள்வர் பழிநாணு வார்.

To those ashamed of wrong doings, Even millet of fault is as big as a palm-tree.

பழிக்கு நாணுகின்றவர்கள், தினையளவு குற்றத்தையும்
பனையளவாகக் கருதி, அதைச் செய்யாமல், தங்களைக் காத்துக்
கொள்வார்கள்

— மு. கருணாநிதி



TODAY'S ARTICLE

Inter-State rivalry that is fuelling India's growth

Last month, when Google unveiled its plans for its largest Artificial Intelligence (AI) data centre outside of California, U.S., in Andhra Pradesh, Chief Minister N. Chandrababu Naidu gleefully claimed bragging rights – a global tech titan choosing his State for a marquee investment over regional rivals such as Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. The jubilation in Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, could be heard across State borders. In Tamil Nadu, a former All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam Minister chided the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-led Stalin government for failing to woo Google, although it is headed by a true-blue Tamil. Across another border, a Karnataka Minister suggested, with barely concealed envy, that Andhra Pradesh had lured Google with “extravagant subsidies”.

Strip away the politics, though, and what you see is something profoundly healthy – competition among States for investment – a potentially powerful engine for growth. For the first time in decades, Chief Ministers are not queuing in Delhi's corridors of power, but are in boardrooms of multinationals and corporate conclaves, persuading investors that India's best destination is their State.

Central patronage to competitive federalism

To appreciate this shift, cast your mind back to pre-1991 India. For four decades after Independence, capital investment was largely a political decision made in New Delhi. The “commanding heights” of the economy were occupied by bureaucrats who dispensed patronage through licences, permits and quotas. The country's industrial geography was determined by political calculation rather than market forces. The Centre decided what should be produced, how much should be produced, and, crucially, where it should be produced.

States, on their part, vied for investment not by wooing potential investors but by wooing politicians in Delhi.

The reforms in 1991 changed that. By dismantling industrial licensing and opening India to trade and investment, liberalisation shifted power – at least partly – from the Centre to the States. One of the unstated hopes then was that economic freedom would unleash competition among States to attract investors through better infrastructure, governance and policy stability.

That transformation took time. For much of the next two decades, investment decisions remained Delhi-centric. Public enterprises continued to dominate and State bureaucracies were slow to adapt to a more entrepreneurial era.

The promise of reforms is now being realised.



Duvvuri Subbarao

is a former Governor,
Reserve Bank of India
(2008-2013)

The rise of competitive federalism has been one of the quiet revolutions of the past decade. States today compete not just with land, concessional utilities and tax breaks, but with reliability – predictable policy, faster clearances, skilled labour and good governance.

Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka vying for global tech mandates – from Google to Micron – is evidence of a maturing federal economy. When Foxconn debated where to locate its electronics facilities, States from Maharashtra to Tamil Nadu made pitches at the highest level. When Vedanta and Foxconn announced their semiconductor joint venture, both Maharashtra and Gujarat lobbied intensely, with Gujarat eventually breasting the tape. The tussle between Tamil Nadu and Telangana over electric vehicle (EV) manufacturing hubs underscored how investment courting has become a professional, high-stakes exercise.

Experience in other federations

India is not unique in this. Healthy subnational competition is a defining feature of all successful federations.

In the United States, when Amazon announced plans for a second headquarters, over 200 cities submitted proposals offering tax breaks, infrastructure support and workforce commitments. Although critics called it a subsidy race, it forced cities to improve governance and transparency. Many of the proposals later formed blueprints for urban renewal projects even where Amazon did not invest.

In Germany, the federal Länder (States) compete to attract high-tech industries. Bavaria's transformation into an innovation hub – home to BMW, Siemens and a cluster of “Mittelstand” firms – owes much to policy agility that other German States have since emulated.

Australia and Canada show similar patterns. Australian States compete to attract mining, clean energy and education investments, while Canadian provinces such as Ontario and British Columbia vie for technology and film production hubs. The result in all these cases is a virtuous cycle: competition that spurs innovation, efficiency and reform.

India's own States are now entering that league. The best-performing ones are magnets for both capital and ideas, setting governance benchmarks that others must meet or exceed.

The Centre, to its credit, has encouraged this shift. Rankings on ease of doing business, startup promotion and export readiness have intensified competition in constructive ways. Investors, once daunted by India's bureaucracy, now see its regional diversity as a positive – multiple entry

points, each with distinct strengths. Andhra Pradesh's ease of doing business, Punjab's entrepreneurial verve, Tamil Nadu's skilled workforce, Gujarat's infrastructure, Jharkhand's mineral base and Uttar Pradesh's vast untapped potential – each is part of a mosaic that together makes India a federation of opportunity.

Competition, of course, carries risks. It should not degenerate into a race to the bottom. States must guard against reckless subsidies or indiscriminate land giveaways that undermine fiscal stability. The smarter path lies in competing through competence and credibility, not concessions.

Healthy rivalry also fosters imitation of best practices. When one State reforms single-window clearances, others follow. When one launches an EV policy, others sharpen theirs. A Haryana success provokes a Himachal response; a Madhya Pradesh reform triggers a Chhattisgarh recalibration; an Odisha initiative spurs West Bengal to better it. This dynamic, cross-State learning is driving policy diffusion across India – a hallmark of vibrant federalism. The global manufacturing and services landscape is now in churn. As multinationals diversify away from China, they seek scale, predictability and credible governance. The “+1” in the China+1 formula must be earned – State by State. No investor lands in “India” in the abstract; they land in Bengaluru, Bhopal or Bhubaneswar. In that sense, India competes globally through its States.

The new federal compact

In just three decades, India has moved from a permission-based economy to a persuasion-based one. States no longer queue for Delhi's patronage; they campaign with CEOs and investors, pitching their case with confidence and data.

This is a transformation of mindset as much as of policy. The Andhra Pradesh-Tamil Nadu-Karnataka exchanges over Google's data centre may sound like parochial bickering, but they actually signify a maturing federal compact. States now view every investment not as central patronage but as a conquest earned through effort.

Every time Andhra Pradesh secures a tech data centre, or Gujarat wins a semiconductor plant, or Uttar Pradesh's electronics parks around Noida light up with new investment, or West Bengal breathes life into its ports and power grids to attract industry, the benefits ripple far beyond State borders. Each success strengthens supply chains, builds skills, and deepens India's industrial fabric. The bottom line: In the race for investment, every State that wins for itself, also wins for India.

States are no longer queuing for Delhi's patronage but are campaigning with investors and pitching their case with confidence and data

Topic: Inter-State Rivalry Fueling India's Growth

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance: GS Paper 2 – Federalism | Governance | Centre-State Relations | Economic Reforms

Linked Topics:

Competitive Federalism | Ease of Doing Business | Investment Promotion | Economic Reforms 1991 | State-led Development | Cooperative Federalism | China+1 Strategy

Context:

The article highlights how competition among Indian States for investments — like Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and Karnataka vying for global tech projects — reflects the rise of **competitive federalism** in India. This transformation marks a shift from the pre-1991 era of centralised industrial decisions to a modern system where States actively pitch to investors, promote industries, and improve governance.

Curiosity Question:

Can rivalry among Indian States for investment become the engine that powers India's next phase of economic growth?

Analytical Overview:

Post-liberalisation reforms dismantled the licence–permit–quota regime and gave States greater economic freedom. Over the last decade, India has seen a shift from “**Delhi-centric patronage**” to “**State-led persuasion**”. Today, Chief Ministers compete in boardrooms, not just in Delhi's corridors, to attract investors through better infrastructure, skilled labour, policy stability, and governance reliability.

This dynamic mirrors successful federal models in the **U.S., Germany, Australia, and Canada**, where subnational competition fosters innovation and reform. Central initiatives like the **Ease of Doing Business Index, Startup India**, and **Export Readiness Rankings** have institutionalised this healthy rivalry. However, competition must avoid turning into a **“race to the bottom”** through reckless subsidies or fiscal imprudence. The true strength lies in **competing through competence, not concessions**.

Each successful State investment contributes to national supply chains, job creation, and technological upgrading, proving that **“when one State wins, India wins.”**

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 246 & Seventh Schedule:** Division of powers between Union and States.
- **Finance Commission (Article 280):** Fiscal federalism and devolution of resources.
- **NITI Aayog:** Promoter of *Competitive & Cooperative Federalism*.
- **National Manufacturing Policy, 2011 & Industrial Corridors:** Encourage State-level industrial hubs.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Strengthen *institutional mechanisms* for inter-State cooperation and healthy competition.
- Focus on **governance, skill development, and infrastructure** over tax breaks.
- Build **transparent investment facilitation systems** with uniform standards across States.
- Promote **regional clusters** (EV, semiconductor, clean energy, textiles) through synergy, not rivalry.
- Adopt a *“Race to the Top”* model — where States emulate best practices in reforms and innovation.

Prelims Pointers:

- **Competitive Federalism:** Concept where States compete to attract investment and improve governance (coined post-1991 reforms).
- **Ease of Doing Business Rankings:** Introduced by DPIIT to assess business reforms in States.
- **China+1 Strategy:** Global diversification strategy; India's States compete to attract firms moving out of China.
- **Examples of State Competition:**
 - Gujarat vs Maharashtra – Semiconductor projects
 - Tamil Nadu vs Telangana – EV manufacturing
 - Andhra Pradesh vs Karnataka – Tech data centres

Mains Keywords:

Competitive Federalism | Ease of Doing Business | Liberalisation 1991 | Economic Reforms | State-led Growth | Fiscal Federalism | Investment Climate | Governance Competitiveness | NITI Aayog

Mains Practice Question:

Q: "India's economic transformation is increasingly being driven by its States." Discuss the rise of competitive federalism in India and evaluate its role in shaping the country's investment and growth landscape.

Dimensions:

- Historical context: From centralised planning to liberalisation
- Role of States post-1991
- Examples of inter-State competition
- Benefits and risks of rivalry
- Policy mechanisms and way forward

One Line Takeaway:

Healthy inter-State competition marks India's evolution from a centrally planned economy to a federation of opportunity — where every State's success contributes to national growth.

Fine-tune the AI labelling regulations framework

Two months ago, millions of Indians watched the Finance Minister Nirmala Sitharaman speak about indirect tax reforms. At the same time, a video travelled across instant messaging platforms in which the Minister appeared to endorse an investment scheme promising “30x returns in seven days”. A Roorkee resident (Uttarakhand) lost ₹66 lakh after viewing this viral video, later found to have been created using Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools.

The rapid rise of near-indistinguishable digital alterations demands urgent, multi-stakeholder action.

Although the government initially recognised the existing framework as sufficient to tackle synthetic media, it has now introduced draft amendments to the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. The amendments mandate that large social media platforms/Significant Social Media Intermediaries (SSMIs) clearly label synthetic or AI-generated media.

While the proposed rules mark a meaningful step forward, their real-world implementation will be complex and require engagement across multiple stakeholders.

Noble intent, ambiguous grouping

Synthetic media is defined as content that is artificially or algorithmically created, modified, or generated to appear authentic. However, labelling a broad range of content created with computer-generated imagery or altered with editing software can be complicated, since these are not technically made by generative AI. Given the volume of synthetic media and the fact that not all of it is problematic, the focus should be on harmful and/or misleading synthetic media. To put things in perspective, over 50% of all content on the Internet is now considered AI-generated, as per a recent report.

To fix accountability, the draft rules mandate that platforms introduce labels covering at least 10% of visual area of synthetic videos, or 10% of initial duration of synthetic audio; but its application to mixed media – say, real visuals



Rakesh R. Dubbudu

is President of the Trusted Information Alliance (TIA), a cross-industry collaborative effort dedicated to championing information integrity and safeguarding users online



Rajneil R. Kamath

is Vice-President of the Trusted Information Alliance (TIA)

Precision is the key for a balance between control and creativity

with cloned audio – remains unclear.

Additionally, will a three-second disclaimer in a 30 second audio clip be effective? Or will it be ignored like the fine print in advertisements? Similarly, will a three-minute disclaimer in a 30-minute video inform viewers or overwhelm them?

We are still in the development phase of AI, and any prescriptive mandate on labels would not be principle-based, future-proof and technology-neutral. In some cases, it may not meet the reasonable person test like the 10% rule.

But it is not the question of labels alone. Watermarks promised by AI companies lack reliability. Within days of a large company releasing a text-to-video social media platform, with assurances that these videos would bear watermarks declaring them synthetic, tools emerged that could scrub these markings entirely.

Consequently, the framework needs fine-tuning and precise standards for each category. A tiered-labelling system that distinguishes between ‘fully AI-generated’, ‘AI-assisted’, and ‘AI-altered’ content may be more effective.

Graded compliance, targeted intervention

The proposed rules mandate intermediaries such as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube and X to analyse and label synthetic media, and they must broaden the scope to include creators directly. Creators frequently employ AI for visual storytelling tasks and also generate avatars and digital twins. But few inform the audience about their use. Although certain videos exhibit clear indicators of manipulation, other synthetic media have now achieved such realism that viewers struggle to distinguish between human- and AI-created content.

Also, creators above a follower threshold should disclose AI use similar to SSMIs; voluntary self-labelling can be promoted among smaller ones.

Graded compliance will acknowledge that professional creators hold significant influence and, therefore, owe transparency to their

audiences. It can help creators not just gain and retain public trust but also keep up with evolving regulations.

Verification needs more hands on deck

Currently, the rules require SSMIs to ask users to label their content as synthetic. Platforms also have to deploy tools to verify the accuracy of such declarations. But synthetic media is multiplying faster than verification technology, and platforms have, so far, had limited success with labelling.

Most social media platforms adhere to Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (C2PA) standards to identify and establish the origins of digital content. However, as C2PA evolves, content is not strictly labelled as a norm. Besides, it is challenging for social media platforms to detect AI-generated or algorithmically-created content. Ultimately, the platforms would require the assistance of third-party detection tools, which are only as reliable as their training and accuracy.

So far, platforms have not refined their tools. An audit by Indicator, a publication that monitors digital deception, found that most failed to label AI content: Only 30% of its 516 AI-generated test posts across Instagram, LinkedIn, Pinterest, TikTok and YouTube were correctly flagged. Google and Meta did not label content from their own AI tools, TikTok only flagged its in-app creations, and Pinterest, the top performer, effectively labelled just 55%.

As the focus shifts to providing credible information, the social media ecosystem should also rely on the discernment of independent information verifiers and auditors. This is especially critical for harmful, fraudulent and misleading content where the stakes are high. Such auditors can be trusted to close gaps in automated detection systems through human judgment, helping platforms become more resilient to deepfakes and protecting users.

The adage, “If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is”, will soon be codified into India’s IT laws. With nuance, users will no longer need to second-guess authenticity. The label will provide clarity.

Topic: Fine-tuning AI Labelling Regulations Framework

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance: GS Paper 2 & 3 – Governance | Cybersecurity | Technology Regulation
| Ethical Use of AI | Information Integrity

Linked Topics:

Deepfakes | Information Technology Rules 2021 | AI Governance | Misinformation & Disinformation | Social Media Regulation | Digital Ethics | C2PA Standards | Trusted Information Alliance | Freedom vs Regulation Debate

Context:

The article analyses India's draft amendments to the **IT (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021**, which propose **mandatory labelling of synthetic or AI-generated media** by large social media intermediaries (SSMIs). It highlights the **complexity of implementation, technological limitations**, and the need for **graded, principle-based and future-proof frameworks** to ensure accountability without stifling innovation.

Curiosity Question:

Can India's AI-labelling mandate effectively protect citizens from deepfakes without compromising creativity and free digital expression?

Analytical Overview:

- The rise of **AI-generated deepfakes** poses a serious threat to public trust, as seen in viral fake videos involving public figures and financial scams.
- The **draft IT amendments** rightly aim to counter misinformation by requiring **platforms to label synthetic content**, covering at least 10% of screen area or duration.

- However, challenges remain:
 - Difficulty in identifying “mixed” content (part real, part synthetic).
 - Ineffectiveness of uniform labelling standards (like a 10% rule).
 - Easy removal of **AI watermarks** by advanced tools.
- The author suggests a **tiered labelling system** distinguishing between ‘**AI-generated**’, ‘**AI-assisted**’, and ‘**AI-altered**’ content.
- The compliance burden must be **shared by creators**, especially those with large followings, through **self-declaration** or **platform-based verification**.
- Current verification systems such as **C2PA** remain underdeveloped and inconsistent — with audits showing poor labelling success (only 30% accuracy across major platforms).
- The piece advocates **collaboration between platforms, government, and independent auditors** to combine human oversight with automated detection for stronger content authentication.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 19(1)(a)**: Freedom of speech and expression.
- **Article 19(2)**: Reasonable restrictions — public order, decency, and morality.
- **Information Technology Act, 2000** and **IT Rules (Amendments) 2021 & 2024 (proposed)**.
- **Digital India Programme & AI Mission**: Promoting safe, ethical AI development.
- **NITI Aayog’s Responsible AI Framework (2021)** – ensuring transparency and accountability.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Adopt **tiered labelling** based on level of AI involvement.
- Ensure **technology-neutral, future-ready** regulation.
- Combine **AI detection tools** with **human audit systems** for reliability.
- Encourage **creator accountability** through self-labelling thresholds.

- Promote **public awareness** on deepfakes and digital literacy.
- Support **global interoperability** of labelling standards (e.g., C2PA compliance).
- Build **independent verification bodies** to bridge tech and ethics.

Prelims Pointers:

- **Synthetic Media:** AI-generated or algorithmically modified content that mimics reality.
- **Deepfake:** Synthetic media where a person's likeness is convincingly replaced or manipulated using AI.
- **C2PA (Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity):** A standard for verifying origin and alterations in digital content.
- **SSMI (Significant Social Media Intermediary):** Platforms with large user bases, regulated under IT Rules (e.g., Meta, YouTube, X).

Mains Keywords:

AI Regulation | Deepfakes | Synthetic Media | Information Integrity | IT Rules 2021 | C2PA | Cyber Governance | Ethical AI | Digital Accountability | Media Literacy

Mains Practice Question:

Q: India's proposal to label AI-generated content marks an important step toward digital accountability. Examine the challenges and opportunities in implementing AI labelling frameworks to curb misinformation and ensure ethical AI use.

Dimensions:

- Background: Rise of synthetic media and fake videos
- Current regulatory framework
- Implementation challenges and loopholes
- Role of platforms, creators, and third-party auditors
- International practices and policy innovations
- Balancing regulation with innovation and free speech

One Line Takeaway:

India's draft AI-labelling rules signal a vital move toward digital transparency — but their success hinges on nuanced, multi-stakeholder, and technology-neutral implementation.

Can lawyers break client confidentiality?

Is the counsel between a lawyer and client a privileged communication? Which are the three circumstances in which a lawyer can communicate what his client has said? Why is safeguarding this evidentiary privilege important? Is a lawyer a constitutional actor?

EXPLAINER

Kartik Singh
Mukula Sharma

The story so far:

On October 31, the Supreme Court affirmed the indispensable role of advocates in a constitutional democracy. A Bench comprising Chief Justice of India (CJI) B. R. Gavai, and Justices K. Vinod Chandran and N. V. Anjaria ruled that a lawyer cannot be summoned merely to disclose what a client has communicated, except where legal advice is used to commit or conceal a crime. The *suo motu* proceedings arose from a notice issued to an advocate by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad, under Section 179 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), demanding his appearance "to know true details of the facts and circumstances" in a criminal case in which he was a defence counsel.

What are privileged communications?

Privileged communications refer to confidential exchanges between certain protected relationships, such as attorney-client and spousal, that the law shields from being disclosed or compelled as evidence in court. The underlying principle is to promote honesty and trust, thereby reinforcing justice and ethical responsibility. The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), 2023, outlines these protections in Sections 128 to 134.

Notably, Section 128 protects 'marital communications', preventing either spouse from being compelled, or even permitted, to disclose any communication made 'during' marriage, even after its dissolution, without the consent of the person who made it, except in cases where one is prosecuted for a crime against the other or in suits between them. Likewise, Section 129 bars the release of unpublished official records relating to affairs of State without

departmental approval in order to safeguard national interest. Further, the advocate-client privilege under Section 132 prohibits advocates from revealing professional communications.

What did the SC state?

The top court's judgment is a concrete assertion that when the State intrudes into the lawyer-client relationship, it endangers the citizen's right to equitable representation and the justice system's structural integrity of a fair trial and rule of law. Section 132 of the BSA prohibits an advocate from disclosing any communication made to him in the course of professional engagement, even after employment has ceased, except in three circumstances: (1) if the client consents to it; (2) the communication pertains to illegal purposes; (3) the advocate observes criminal activity being carried out during the employment.

Although, the privilege belongs to the client, an accused or litigant, its enforcement depends on the lawyer's silence. This silence has long shielded not just the powerful but also those with no power such as women reporting sexual violence, accident victims negotiating hostile insurers, and the families of those lost to custodial excesses. In a justice system where about 3.9 lakh citizens are undertrials, this privilege is what keeps the promise of a fair defence alive.

It's to safeguard this evidentiary privilege that the top court decided that an investigating/prosecuting agency or the police cannot directly summon a lawyer merely for appearing or advising in a case, unless there exists material showing that the summons falls within the exceptions of Section 132.

Moreover, by linking Section 132's protection to Article 20(3)'s guarantee against self-incrimination, the judgment



GETTY IMAGES

constitutionalises the privilege, which is a key element of a lawyer's function. If a citizen cannot be compelled to confess, the State cannot achieve the same end indirectly by coercing the citizen's lawyer to disclose confidential communication.

What about a lawyer's role?

Through the verdict, the SC positions the advocate not as a private agent but as a 'constitutional actor', essential to the survival of the constitutional architecture of legal representation. This distinction matters because professional privilege is neither a perk for lawyers nor a shield that places them above the law. It is a safeguard for citizens. The SC makes that explicit: the privilege "ensures that no prejudice is caused to the accused whom the lawyer represents." When the State summons a lawyer to divulge information about his client, it converts the advocate into an involuntary witness – collapsing the distance between defence and prosecution. The verdict rightly calls such acts a "blatant breach of the rule against non-disclosure," one that undermines both Article 21's guarantee of a fair defence and the constitutional promise of equality before law under Article 14.

Why is the verdict important?

This ruling indirectly strengthens the right to effective legal representation, a right the SC has long read into Article 21 and Article 22(1). The SC cited *M.H. Hoskot versus State of Maharashtra* (1978) and *Hussainara Khatoon versus State of Bihar* (1980), reminding that liberty without counsel is liberty in theory. At a time when investigating agencies routinely summon journalists, tax consultants, and even lawyers to "assist" investigations, the judgment restores institutional sobriety. It reminds the executive that investigative power is not unbounded. Section 179 of the BNSS empowers the police to summon witnesses, but that power stops at the lawyer's door when 'professional confidence' is at stake.

Kartik Singh and Mukula Sharma are lawyers based in New Delhi.

THE GIST

Privileged communications refer to confidential exchanges between certain protected relationships, such as attorney-client and spousal, that the law shields from being disclosed or compelled as evidence in court.

When the State intrudes into the lawyer-client relationship, it endangers the citizen's right to equitable representation and the justice system's structural integrity of a fair trial and rule of law.

Through the verdict the SC positions the advocate not as a private agent but as a 'constitutional actor', essential to the survival of the constitutional architecture of legal representation.

Topic: Lawyer-Client Privilege and Supreme Court Ruling on Confidentiality

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance: GS Paper 2 – Polity & Governance | Judiciary | Fundamental Rights

Linked Topics:

Attorney-Client Privilege | Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), 2023 | BNSS, 2023
| Right to Fair Trial | Article 20(3) & 21 | Role of Advocates

Context:

The Supreme Court, on October 31, 2025, ruled that lawyers cannot be summoned to disclose client communications unless the advice was used to commit or conceal a crime. This decision strengthens the evidentiary privilege and constitutional role of advocates in ensuring citizens' right to fair representation.

Curiosity Question:

Can the State compel a lawyer to reveal confidential client communication without violating the citizen's right to a fair trial and protection against self-incrimination?

Analytical Overview:

The verdict reinforces the *lawyer-client privilege* as a cornerstone of justice and fairness. Privileged communication fosters trust between lawyer and client, ensuring complete disclosure necessary for effective defence. Under **Section 132 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), 2023**, advocates are prohibited from disclosing professional communications except when

1. The client consents;
2. The communication involves an illegal purpose;
3. The lawyer observes ongoing criminal activity during engagement.

The SC linked this privilege to **Article 20(3)** (protection against self-incrimination) and **Article 21** (right to fair trial), elevating it to a *constitutional safeguard*. Summoning lawyers without valid grounds converts them into involuntary witnesses, violating Articles 14 and 21.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 20(3):** Protection against self-incrimination
- **Article 21:** Right to life and fair trial
- **Article 22(1):** Right to legal representation
- **Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (Sections 128–134):** Privileged communications
- **BNSS, 2023 (Section 179):** Police powers to summon witnesses (limited in this context)

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Codify clear procedural safeguards to prevent misuse of summons power against lawyers.
- Promote legal literacy among citizens about professional privilege.
- Strengthen institutional mechanisms to uphold independence of the Bar and protect advocates from intimidation.
- Ensure investigating agencies are sensitised to constitutional boundaries.

Prelims Pointers:

- **Section 132, BSA 2023:** Advocate-client privilege
- **Section 128, BSA:** Marital communication privilege
- **BNSS Section 179:** Limits police power to summon advocates
- **Landmark Cases:** *M.H. Hoskot vs State of Maharashtra (1978)*, *Hussainara Khatoon vs State of Bihar (1980)*¹²

Mains Keywords:

Lawyer-client privilege | Confidentiality | Fair trial | Self-incrimination | Rule of law | Professional ethics | Constitutional actor | Judicial independence

Mains Practice Question:

Q: “The lawyer-client privilege is not a privilege for lawyers but a protection for citizens.” In light of the Supreme Court’s recent ruling, discuss how professional confidentiality under Section 132 of the BSA, 2023, upholds constitutional guarantees under Articles 20(3) and 21.

Dimensions:

- Legal basis of privilege
- Constitutional implications
- Impact on fair trial and justice delivery
- State accountability and limits of police power

One Line Takeaway:

✦ *By constitutionalising lawyer-client confidentiality, the Supreme Court has reaffirmed that justice demands not just legal defence but protected trust between advocate and citizen.*

Tuberculosis incidence falling in India by 21% a year: WHO report

Bindu Shajan Perappadan
NEW DELHI

India's tuberculosis (TB) incidence, with new cases emerging every year, fell by 21% – from 237 TB cases per lakh population in 2015 to 187 per lakh population in 2024 – almost double the pace of decline observed globally, at 12%, according to the World Health Organization (WHO) Global TB Report, 2025, the Union Health Ministry said in a release issued on Wednesday. This was one of the highest declines in TB incidence globally, outpacing reductions noted among other high-burden countries.

“India's innovative case finding approach, driven by the swift uptake of newer technologies, decentralisation of services, and large-scale community mobilisation, has led to the

India leads global TB fight

India records one of the world's steepest tuberculosis declines, doubling global progress through innovation and outreach

■ TB incidence fell 21% (2015–2024), from 237 to 187 cases per lakh.

■ Treatment coverage rose from 53% (2015) to 92% (2024)

■ 26.18 lakh diagnosed out of 27 lakh estimated cases



■ The number of missing cases reduced from 15 lakh (2015) to <1 lakh (2024)

■ The treatment success rate in India was about 90%, against the global average of 88%

■ TB mortality declined from 28 deaths per lakh to 21 deaths per lakh (2015–2024)

country's treatment coverage to surge to over 92% in 2024, from 53% in 2015 – with 26.18 lakh TB patients being diagnosed in 2024, out of an estimated incidence of 27 lakh cases,” the release said.

The Ministry said this had helped reduce the number of “missing cases” – those who had TB but were not reported to the programme – from an estimated 15 lakh in 2015 to less than one lakh in 2024.

Also, there is no significant increase in the number of multidrug-resistant (MDR) TB patients in the country, adding that treatment success rate under the TB Mukta Bharat Abhiyan increases to 90%, ahead of the global treatment success rate of 88%.

India's TB mortality rate has also decreased from 28 per lakh population in 2015 to 21 per lakh population in 2024, reflecting significant progress in reducing deaths due to TB.

Since its launch in December 2024, India's flagship TB elimination mission, the TB Mukta Bharat Abhiyan, has achieved extensive reach, screening over 19 crore vulnerable individuals for TB across the country, leading to the detection of over 24.5 lakh TB patients, including 8.61 lakh asymptomatic TB cases, the report said.

Topic: India's TB Incidence Falls by 21%: WHO Global TB Report 2025

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance: GS Paper 2 – Health | Government Policies | International Reports

Linked Topics:

National TB Elimination Programme (NTEP) | TB Mukht Bharat Abhiyan | WHO Global TB Report | Public Health Infrastructure | SDG 3 (Good Health & Well-being)

Context:

According to the **WHO Global TB Report 2025**, India has recorded a **21% decline in tuberculosis incidence** — from **237 cases per lakh in 2015** to **187 per lakh in 2024** — nearly double the global rate of decline (12%). This marks one of the steepest reductions globally among high TB-burden countries.

Curiosity Question:

Can India's community-led, technology-driven model for TB elimination become a global blueprint to eradicate infectious diseases by 2030?

Analytical Overview:

India's progress against TB is attributed to innovation, decentralisation, and community participation under the **TB Mukht Bharat Abhiyan**.

Key achievements include:

- **Treatment coverage:** Increased from **53% (2015)** to **over 92% (2024)**.
- **"Missing" cases:** Reduced from **15 lakh (2015)** to **less than 1 lakh (2024)**.
- **Treatment success rate:** **90%**, exceeding the global rate of **88%**.
- **TB mortality:** Declined from **28 per lakh (2015)** to **21 per lakh (2024)**.
- **MDR-TB cases:** No significant increase reported.
- **Mass screening:** Over **19 crore individuals** screened; **24.5 lakh patients detected**, including **8.61 lakh asymptomatic**.

The report highlights how India's swift use of digital tools, local governance structures, and community health workers (ASHAs) accelerated early detection and adherence to treatment.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 21:** Right to health as part of right to life
- **National Health Policy (2017):** Commitment to end TB by 2025 (ahead of global 2030 target)
- **TB Mukht Bharat Abhiyan (2024):** Flagship elimination mission
- **SDG 3.3:** End the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria by 2030

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Maintain focus on **early detection**, **treatment adherence**, and **nutrition support** through Ni-kshay Mitra initiative.
- Strengthen **drug resistance surveillance** and **research on new vaccines**.
- Enhance **private sector participation** in TB case reporting.
- Continue community awareness to sustain behavioural change and reduce stigma.

Prelims Pointers:

- **WHO Global TB Report 2025:** Tracks progress toward global TB elimination goals.
- **TB Mukht Bharat Abhiyan:** Launched in **Dec 2024**.
- **India's TB incidence (2024):** 187/lakh; mortality: 21/lakh.
- **Global TB decline (2015–2024):** 12%; **India's decline:** 21%.
- **Treatment success rate:** 90%.

Mains Keywords:

TB elimination | Public health innovation | Community-based healthcare |
Decentralised health governance | Disease surveillance | Universal health coverage

Mains Practice Question:

Q: India's progress in reducing tuberculosis incidence has outpaced the global average. Examine the key factors behind this achievement and discuss how India can sustain its momentum toward TB elimination by 2025.

Dimensions:

- Technological & community innovations
- TB Mukht Bharat Abhiyan
- Health infrastructure & treatment success
- Challenges in MDR-TB & financing
- Role of WHO and SDG targets

One Line Takeaway:

◆ *India's rapid decline in TB incidence reflects a transformative shift toward technology-enabled, community-driven public health success — moving closer to the goal of a TB-free India by 2025.*

GI tag fee cut to ₹1,000; Minister promises backing for tribal goods

The Hindu Bureau

NEW DELHI

Commerce and Industry Minister Piyush Goyal announced here on Wednesday that the application fee for the Geographical Indications (GI) tag had been reduced to ₹1,000 from ₹5,000.

At the inaugural Tribal Business Conclave, he urged tribal artisans to register and protect traditional products and crafts. He further promised the support of his Ministry in creating export and e-commerce linkages for tribal enterprises and international warehouses for their products.

The conclave, held by the Ministries of Tribal Affairs and Culture and the Department of Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT) at the Yashobhoomi Convention



Ministers Jual Oram and Piyush Goyal with a tribal entrepreneur at the business conclave on Wednesday. SPECIAL ARRANGEMENT

Centre, featured panel discussions and masterclasses on topics such as financing innovations for, and investments in, tribal enterprises, partnerships, industry linkages, and skilling.

Mr. Goyal said schools, universities, industries, and the government must work together to ensure that products made by tribal artisans reach the larg-

er domestic and global markets. The Minister promised the full support of his Ministry and the DPIIT in this mission, by creating export and e-commerce linkages and facilitating international warehouses for tribal goods.

The conclave was part of the Government of India's Janjatiya Gaurav Varsh celebrations, to

mark the 150th birth anniversary year of tribal icon Birsa Munda.

Tribal Affairs Minister Jual Oram thanked Prime Minister Narendra Modi for coming up with the initiative.

GI tags distributed

The event also saw GI tag certificates being distributed for crafts and products such as *Kannadippaya* (bamboo mat) of Kerala, *Apatani* textile of Arunachal Pradesh, *Marthandam* honey of Tamil Nadu, *Lepcha Tungbuk* of Sikkim, *Bodo Aronai* of Assam, *Ambaji* white marble of Gujarat, and *Bedu* and *Badri* cow ghee of Uttarakhand.

The Tribal Affairs Ministry announced a Tribal Affairs Grand Challenge, inviting enterprises to design solutions for tribal communities.

Topic: GI Tag Fee Cut to ₹1,000; Government Backs Tribal Goods

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance: GS Paper 3 – Economy | Inclusive Growth | GS Paper 2 – Welfare Schemes | Tribal Empowerment | Intellectual Property Rights

Linked Topics:

Geographical Indications (GI) | Tribal Entrepreneurship | Janjatiya Gaurav Varsh | DPIIT | Make in India | Intellectual Property & Traditional Knowledge

Context:

At the inaugural **Tribal Business Conclave** in New Delhi, **Commerce and Industry Minister Piyush Goyal** announced a **reduction in the GI tag application fee** from **₹5,000 to ₹1,000**, aiming to encourage **tribal artisans and entrepreneurs** to protect and promote traditional products and crafts.

Curiosity Question:

Can lowering the GI registration cost truly transform tribal handicrafts into global brands and help India's indigenous communities gain fair market recognition?

Analytical Overview:

The move aligns with the government's push to **democratize intellectual property protection** and **expand market access for tribal and rural producers**.

- The **Tribal Business Conclave**, organised by the **Ministries of Tribal Affairs, Culture, and DPIIT**, discussed ways to connect tribal products with **export markets, e-commerce platforms, and international warehouses**.
- The conclave featured discussions on **financing innovations, industry linkages, and skilling for tribal entrepreneurship**.
- Mr. Goyal emphasised the importance of collaboration between **schools, universities, industries, and government bodies** to help tribal goods reach global consumers.

- The initiative forms part of **Janjatiya Gaurav Varsh celebrations**, commemorating **Birsa Munda's 150th birth anniversary**.

GI Tags Distributed at the Event:

- **Kannadippaya** (Bamboo mat) – *Kerala*
- **Apatani textile** – *Arunachal Pradesh*
- **Marthandam honey** – *Tamil Nadu*
- **Lepcha Tungbuk** – *Sikkim*
- **Bodo Aronai** – *Assam*
- **Ambaji white marble** – *Gujarat*
- **Bedu and Badri cow ghee** – *Uttarakhand*

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 19(1)(g)**: Right to practise any profession, or to carry on any occupation or trade.
- **Article 46**: Directive Principle – Promotion of educational and economic interests of SCs/STs.
- **Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999**.
- **Schemes**: TRIFED, Van Dhan Yojana, and GI Promotion under DPIIT.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- **Promote awareness** among tribal artisans on benefits of GI registration.
- Strengthen **marketing infrastructure**, branding, and **digital training**.
- Facilitate **cluster-based support** for GI-linked products.
- Ensure **fair trade practices** and protection from counterfeit goods.

Prelims Pointers:

- **New GI registration fee:** ₹1,000 (earlier ₹5,000).
- **Organised by:** DPIIT + Ministries of Tribal Affairs & Culture.
- **Location:** Yashobhoomi Convention Centre, New Delhi.
- **Purpose:** Promote tribal products through GI protection and global linkages.
- **GI Act Year:** 1999; India's GI registry is based in *Chennai*.

Mains Keywords:

Geographical Indications | Tribal entrepreneurship | Intellectual property rights | Traditional knowledge | Inclusive growth | Market access | Skill development

Mains Practice Question:

Q: The reduction in Geographical Indication (GI) registration fees aims to empower tribal artisans and local producers. Discuss how GI tagging can promote inclusive and sustainable economic development in India.

Dimensions:

- Role of GI in protecting traditional knowledge
- Economic empowerment of tribal communities
- Branding and export potential
- Challenges in awareness and market penetration

One Line Takeaway:

◆ *By reducing GI tag fees and integrating tribal products into global value chains, India takes a major step toward empowering its indigenous communities and preserving cultural heritage.*