

**Date: December 2, 2025**

To,

**National Commission for Minorities (NCM)**

Government of India, New Delhi

[chairman-ncm@nic.in](mailto:chairman-ncm@nic.in)

[secy-ncm@nic.in](mailto:secy-ncm@nic.in)

**Subject: Urgent Complaint regarding hate speeches made during the Hindu Sanatan Ekta Padyatra, including calls for a 'Hindu Nation' and normalising systemic exclusion of Non-Hindu Religions.**

Respected Chairperson,

We, Citizens for Justice and Peace (CJP), are writing to bring to your urgent attention to an alarming increase in the incidents of hate speech at the recent Sanatan Ekta Padyatra, from November 7 to 16. This *yatra* calls for Hindu unification and creation of a Hindu Rashtra, while systematically othering Non-Hindu religions through civic and economic exclusion, and alarmist narratives framing Muslims as an existential threat. These inflammatory speeches, which encourage targeted harassment of individuals belonging to minority religions, especially Muslims, are a direct affront to the secular principles enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

We urge the National Commission for Minorities (NCM) to take immediate cognisance of these incidents, initiate an inquiry, and recommend necessary legal and administrative actions to prevent further communal polarisation and ensure the safety and security of migrant workers.

Below, we present the details of the incidents, the content of the hate speeches, their legal implications, and our request for urgent action.

## **Background**

The present escalation of inflammatory speeches was triggered by the Sanatan Hindu Ekta Padyatra, scheduled from November 7 to 16, which passed through 422 village panchayats across Delhi, Haryana, and Uttar Pradesh. Led by *Dhirendra Krishna Shastri* of Bageshwar Dham, the yatra was flagged off from Delhi with the stated objectives of establishing a Hindu nation, eradicating casteism, and fostering social unity.

As a part of the campaign, seven resolutions were announced, the most controversial being the demand for a ‘Hindu Rashtra’. As a secular and diverse country, such calls for the establishment of India as a Hindu nation that otherises other religions have the potential to create a public order situation. Across multiple stops in Delhi, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh, several speakers, including the Padyatra’s principal organisers, delivered inflammatory speeches that went far beyond calls for spiritual unity or social harmony. These speeches invoked communal conspiracy theories (“love jihad,” “land jihad”), portrayed Muslims as demographic threats, justified vigilante violence, and openly advocated for religious segregation and economic boycotts. Many of these statements raise serious concerns under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), and established Supreme Court jurisprudence on hate speech and incitement.

This complaint does not critique any religion or its festivals. It examines whether public religious mobilisations are being used to spread exclusionary rhetoric and whether authorities are responding.

## Summary of Incidents

Here is a chronological, city-wise analysis of the speeches delivered during the 10-day procession. The speeches are mapped onto the three categories of hate speech (Direct, Exclusionary, Fearmongering), along with additional patterns such as conspiracy theories, demographic panic, mocking minority practices, and calls for economic/ social boycotts.

### 1. Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh – Nov 3, 2025

Source: HindutvaWatch (Telegram)

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3187>

The Ghaziabad speech sets the tone for the entire padyatra, combining demographic fearmongering with explicitly exclusionary rhetoric. The repeated claim that “*Bharat ek Hindu Rashtra bane*” (0:39–0:42) signals a direct ideological rejection of constitutional secularism. Much of the speech revolves around invoking demographic panic — “*kis prakar se Bharat din-pratidin hum kam ho rabe hai... hum bi kyu khatam ho rabe hai*” (1:04–1:16), and the assertion that Hindus stand at the brink of becoming minorities. This narrative falls squarely under **Fearmongering Hate Speech**, stoking collective insecurity by suggesting “we” (Hindus) are disappearing.

The speaker extends this into **Exclusionary Hate Speech**, arguing that “*kam toh bona chahiye chadar aur father manne walo ko*” (1:17–1:20), implying that Muslims and Christians must be

reduced in number, while lamenting that Hindus are instead declining. Although framed indirectly, the statement carries a clear discriminatory thrust, normalising demographic engineering. The speech also deploys the conspiracy theory of “love jihad” (0:44–1:01), presenting Hindu women as under threat from a coordinated plot — a trope firmly embedded in India’s extremist discourse. Finally, the speaker claims that unless Hindus unite, they will remain unsafe because they are “*alpsankhyak hone ki tagaat pe hai*” (1:55–2:06). Narratives of imminent existential threat are historically linked to vigilante mobilisation and communal violence.

Overall, the Ghaziabad event blends **fearmongering** (demographic decline, Hindu endangerment) with **exclusionary hostility**, preparing the ground for subsequent speeches in the yatra.

## 2. Delhi – Nov 7, 2025

Source: HindutvaWatch (Telegram)

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3223>

The Delhi speech escalates the rhetoric further, combining **all three** categories of hate speech. At the core is a storyline of impending civilisational collapse — “*20 saal baad Bharat ka Hindu apne astitva ki ladai lad raha hoga*” — a classic instance of **Fearmongering Hate Speech**, mobilising anxiety about Hindu extinction. This is immediately tied to conspiracy theories such as “love jihad” and “land jihad,” warning that non-Hindu communities aim to seize Hindu property.

A significant portion of the speech is devoted to **Exclusionary Hate Speech**, where the speaker asserts that conversion to Christianity or Islam imbues individuals with foreign identities (“*sister, sir, bhai-jaan, amma-jaan*”), whereas only retaining Hindu identity affirms Indianness. This erases the constitutional right to religious freedom and equates non-Hindu identities with anti-national behaviour. Statements such as “*abhi aap 9 rajyo mein alp-sankhyak hue ho*” and predictions that Muslims will seize Hindu property once demographically dominant (2:30–2:44) deepen the fear narrative.

The speech borders on **Direct Hate Speech** when praising bulldozer justice — “*jo padroho karte hai, unke ghar pe bulldozer bhi chalti hai*” (2:52–2:57). This signals support for extrajudicial punishment selectively applied to Muslim communities in recent years. Finally, invoking “*ye desh Babar ka nahi, Raghuvar ka hai*” (3:02) reinforces an antagonistic Hindu-versus-Muslim civilisational frame.

This speech is among the most comprehensive examples of coordinated hate rhetoric in the padyatra: conspiratorial, exclusionary, and punitive.

### 3. Faridabad, Haryana – Nov 8, 2025

Source: HindutvaWatch (Telegram)

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3242>

Here the rhetoric becomes more explicitly derisive, invoking a communal slur wrapped in rhyme — “*tel lagao Dabur ka, naam mita do Babur ka.*” The juxtaposition of a consumer product with a call to erase the memory of “Babur” insinuates hostility toward Muslims under the guise of playful language. This is a clear instance of **Direct Hate Speech**, promoting historical resentment and encouraging the symbolic erasure of an entire community. It also implicitly links the present Muslim population with a medieval ruler, a common tactic in communal campaigns.

The line “*Jo Ram ka nabi wo kisi kaam ka nahi*” adds an **exclusionary** dimension, asserting that those who do not revere Ram are worthless. This directly ostracises religious minorities and weakens the fabric of secularism defined by the Constitution.

### 4. Faridabad, Haryana – Nov 10, 2025

Source: HindutvaWatch (Telegram), 0:04–2:56

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3226>

The Faridabad speech on November 10 deploys a mix of **fearmongering** and **exclusionary rhetoric**, beginning with a loaded set of questions designed to trigger panic about interreligious relationships (“*kye aap... apne bachhon ke sir pe topi dekhna chahte ho?*”). The repeated contrast between “topi-walas” and “tilak-walas” (0:30–0:37) is an unmistakable strategy of **othering**, portraying Muslims as a unified threat while demanding equal “unity” from Hindus.

The speech invokes Partition as a justification for Hindu Rashtra (“*Jinnah ki leadership mein... Pakistan ho sakta hai, toh Sanatan Dharma ke naam par Hindu Rashtra kyu nahi?*”). This weaponises historical trauma to push for religious nationalism — a hallmark of **Exclusionary Hate Speech**.

The most inflammatory line comes when the speaker predicts that unless Hindus “wake up,” India will turn into “Bangladesh,” where “*saman, sampatti tumhari hogi; baq kisi aur ka hoga*” (1:53–2:06). This is textbook **Fearmongering Hate Speech**, warning of dispossession and persecution at the hands of Muslims. It ends with a rhetorical threat: once “love jihad,” “land jihad,” and religious conversion supposedly take hold, Hindus will regret not supporting the Hindu Rashtra project.

## 5. Palwal, Haryana

### Hindu Rashtra Pledge (Nov 10)

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3223>

The speech on November 10 reiterates a central ideological demand of the padyatra: “*Bharat ko Hindu Rashtra banane ka karya pratidin karenge.*” Coupled with the pledge to stop “*awayed dharmantaran*” and “*love jihad*” (0:20–0:27), the speech merges conspiracy with **Exclusionary Hate Speech**, framing all religious conversions — especially to Islam or Christianity — as criminal acts. By demanding daily commitment to the Hindu Rashtra project, the speech advances a broader political agenda that marginalises minorities and delegitimises pluralism.

### Kajal Hindusthani's Call for Economic Segregation (Nov 10)

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3252>

Here, the hate speech shifts toward socio-economic exclusion: urging the crowd to “*be Hindus, buy from Hindus, and employ only Hindus.*” This is a direct violation of constitutional equality, and a classic form of **Exclusionary Hate Speech**, advocating an economic boycott of Muslims. The call for an “Akhand Hindu Rashtra” intensifies the ideological thrust of earlier speeches, transforming religious identity into the primary determinant of economic participation.

### “Muslims are terrorists” Narrative (Nov 12)

Source: ANI & Argus News Reports

Link: <https://x.com/ANI/status/1988507315151270159?s=20>

[https://x.com/ArgusNews\\_in/status/1988503090509869207?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1988503090509869207%7Ctwgr%5E9a280b28cc07ff9247eb893ee1f53cd9672a1a6e%7Ctwcon%5Es1\\_&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.freepressjournal.in%2Fbhupal%2Fmp-news-hindu-ek-nhi-huye-toh-8-nahi-80000-mareng-dhirendra-shastri-reacts-on-red-fort-blast-video](https://x.com/ArgusNews_in/status/1988503090509869207?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1988503090509869207%7Ctwgr%5E9a280b28cc07ff9247eb893ee1f53cd9672a1a6e%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.freepressjournal.in%2Fbhupal%2Fmp-news-hindu-ek-nhi-huye-toh-8-nahi-80000-mareng-dhirendra-shastri-reacts-on-red-fort-blast-video)

In Palwal on November 12, Bhageshwar Dham’s statements cross decisively into **Direct Hate Speech**. Referring to those arrested in the Delhi blast, he asks: “*yahi kyu aatangwadi bote hai?*” (0:27–0:39), insinuating that Muslims are inherently prone to terrorism. This is criminal stereotyping of an entire religious group.

The narrative is compounded when he blames madrassas for producing terrorists and demands changes in their curriculum — a combination of **conspiracy theory** and **targeted vilification**. Later, he warns that unless Hindus unite, “*Delhi jaisa bomb dhamaaka har gali kone mei boga,*”

extending the fear to an imagined future of nationwide terror. This escalates into

**Fearmongering Hate Speech**, painting Muslims as existential threats.

The claim that the arrested individual “*crore-o logon ki jaan lene ki tayaari kar raha tha*” without evidence further entrenches minority criminalisation.

#### 6. **Banchari, Haryana – Nov 12, 2025**

Link: <https://t.me/hindutvawatchin/3241>

Nagendra Maharaj’s remarks fully embody **Exclusionary Hate Speech**. He claims that anyone who opposes Vande Mataram or Ram should “*go to Pakistan or Afghanistan*” (0:33–0:41). This promotes a dangerous majoritarian logic that equates dissent or minority religious identity with foreignness. His additional metaphor that Hindus may soon be “expelled from their homes like in Srinagar” (0:15–0:31) heightens the fear narrative, tapping into the history of Kashmiri Pandit displacement to justify intolerance today.

Finally, his line — “*jo Ram ka nahi, wo humara nahi*” (0:43–0:53) — excludes all non-Hindu Indians from the national imagined community, violating the principle of equal citizenship.

#### 7. **Chattarpur, Madhya Pradesh – Nov 14, 2025**

**Source:** Free Press Journal video report

Link: [https://x.com/FreePressMP/status/1989269918869844166?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1989269918869844166%7Ctwgr%5E5988173f60ad8e5c3823b5883791a66d7d5b856%7Ctwcon%5Es1\\_c10&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.freepressjournal.in%2Fbhupal%2Fmp-news-jo-vande-matram-nahi-bolte-wo-lahore-ka-ticket-karwa-le-says-dhirendra-shastri-at-sanatan-hindu-ekta-padyatra](https://x.com/FreePressMP/status/1989269918869844166?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1989269918869844166%7Ctwgr%5E5988173f60ad8e5c3823b5883791a66d7d5b856%7Ctwcon%5Es1_c10&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.freepressjournal.in%2Fbhupal%2Fmp-news-jo-vande-matram-nahi-bolte-wo-lahore-ka-ticket-karwa-le-says-dhirendra-shastri-at-sanatan-hindu-ekta-padyatra)

In Chhatarpur, the rhetoric intensifies through mockery and conditional belonging. The speaker asserts that anyone who has an issue with Vande Mataram or Ram should immediately “*Lahore ki ticket katwa lena*” (0:00–0:13), a direct example of **Exclusionary Hate Speech** conflating Muslim identity with enemy nations. The statement “*Jo Ram ka nahi wo kisi kaam ka nahi*” (0:24–0:33) recurs here, once again delegitimising minority identities.

The suggestion that those who disagree with Hindu practices should undergo DNA testing transforms religious disagreement into a pseudo-scientific pathology. This constitutes **mockery of religious practices**, and echoes past rhetoric used to police ethnic belonging. The broader movement’s hostility is evident in the concurrent call by Dinesh Falhari to ban Muslims from the yatra entirely, undermining long-standing communal harmony in Mathura.



## 8. Mathura, Uttar Pradesh – Nov 15, 2025

**Source:** YouTube, Devkinandan Thakur speech (4:20–4:50)

**Link:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRaoF5Cc92k>

The Mathura speech is deeply inflammatory, invoking the violence of the 1992 Babri Masjid demolition to call for mobilisation toward Mathura and Vrindavan. This constitutes **Direct Hate Speech**, as it explicitly encourages the crowd to participate in actions historically associated with mass violence and property destruction. The reference to reclaiming the Shahi Idgah Mosque Land weaponises past communal tensions and signals future unrest.

By framing the mosque as illegitimate and positioning Hindus as reclaiming sacred land, the speech merges **fearmongering** (Hindu heritage under threat) with **exclusionary hostility** (Muslim structures treated as encroachments), making it one of the most dangerous speeches in the sequence.

### Legal Concerns

CJP’s complaint goes beyond documenting hate speech – it identifies the penal and constitutional provisions that these acts attract, within a broader framework of criminal and constitutional law. The complaint also draws on key judicial precedents, like *Pravasi Bhalai Sangathan v. Union of India* (2014) and *Tehseen Poonawalla guidelines*, which are stated in detail below.

### Constitutional Provisions

Various provisions of the Indian Constitution safeguard against hate speech and communal othering.

1. Article 14 — Equality before law  
Communal othering, demographic fear-mongering, and calls for exclusion (“be Hindus, buy only from Hindus”) violate the constitutional guarantee of equal protection to all communities.
2. Article 15 — Non-discrimination on grounds of religion  
Calls for a ‘Hindu Rashtra’, alongside statements urging economic segregation, employment discrimination, or “ghar wapsi” of all converts, contradict the constitutional prohibition against discrimination on religious grounds.
3. Article 19(1)(a) & 19(2) — Freedom of speech and its reasonable restrictions

Speech that threatens public order, incites violence, or promotes communal disharmony falls squarely within the restrictions permitted under Article 19(2).

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that advocacy crossing into **incitement** is not protected speech.

#### 4. Article 25 — Freedom of religion

### Sections of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

#### 1. Section 196 of BNS: *Promoting enmity between different groups on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, etc., and doing acts prejudicial to maintenance of harmony*

(1) Whoever—

by words, either spoken or written, or by signs or by visible representations or through electronic communication or otherwise, promotes or attempts to promote, on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, caste or community or any other ground whatsoever, disharmony or feelings of enmity, hatred or ill-will between different religious, racial, language or regional groups or castes or communities; or Liability of owner, occupier, etc., of land on which an unlawful assembly or riot takes place. Affray. Assaulting or obstructing a public servant when suppressing a riot, etc.

(b) commits any act which is prejudicial to the maintenance of harmony between different religious, racial, language or regional groups or castes or communities, and which disturbs or is likely to disturb the public tranquillity;

Section 196 applies because many Padyatra speeches directly distinguished Hindus and Muslims as opposing groups, portraying Muslims as encroachers and people whose origin lies in countries like Pakistan and Afghanistan. Statements calling for prohibiting conversion to other religions, like Islam, and alleging Muslim conspiracies, or warning Hindus to “fight back” clearly promote enmity on religious grounds.

#### 2. Section 197 of BNS: *Imputations, assertions prejudicial to national integration.*

(1) Whoever, by words either spoken or written or by signs or by visible representations or through electronic communication or otherwise,—

(a) makes or publishes any imputation that any class of persons cannot, by reason of their being members of any religious, racial, language or regional group or caste or community, bear true



faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India as by law established or uphold the sovereignty and integrity of India; or

(c) makes or publishes any assertion, counsel, plea or appeal concerning the obligation of any class of persons, by reason of their being members of any religious, racial, language or regional group or caste or community, and such assertion, counsel, plea or appeal causes or is likely to cause disharmony or feelings of enmity or hatred or ill-will between such members and other persons;

Section 197 is engaged because several speakers equated Muslim identity with disloyalty to the nation, often calling for ‘ghar wapsi’. Referring to the Delhi Bomb Blast incident, speakers also hint at an involvement by people following Islam, and portraying them as security threats, undermines the constitutional idea of an inclusive nation. By using analogies like ‘Babur and Dabur’ to show that those who don’t follow Sanatan are not ‘one of us’, the community is portrayed as inherently anti-national, thereby directly harming national integration.

**3. Section 299: *Deliberate and malicious acts, intended to outrage religious feelings of any class by insulting its religion or religious beliefs.***

Whoever, with deliberate and malicious intention of outraging the religious feelings of any class of citizens of India, by words, either spoken or written, or by signs or by visible representations or through electronic means or otherwise, insults or attempts to insult the religion or the religious beliefs of that class, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both.

Section 299 applies because several Padyatra speeches contained explicit attacks on Muslim religious identity, delivered in a manner clearly intended to provoke resentment. Statements that hint towards how the population of those associated with ‘Chadar’ and ‘Father’ should shrink, and how the Muslims are mostly involved in anti-nationalist activities due to flawed education provided in Madrasah, are deliberate statements made to incite and provoke people. Strong statements like how muslims have a whole country (Pakistan) to themselves, and how India is not a land of ‘Babar’, clearly outrage the religious feelings of that community.

**4. Section 352: *Intentional insult with intent to provoke breach of peace.***

Whoever intentionally insults in any manner, and thereby gives provocation to any person, intending or knowing it to be likely that such provocation will cause him to break the public

peace, or to commit any other offence, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

Section 352 applies because many statements were inflammatory and invited provocation in communally sensitive areas, like Mathura and Vrindavan. The slogan '*Jo ram ka nabi wo kisi kaam ka nabi*', was repeated throughout the rally, and delivered in charged public gatherings where the speakers could reasonably foresee that such language would provoke hostility or clashes.

#### 5. Section 353: *Statements conducing to public mischief.*

(1) Whoever makes, publishes or circulates any statement, false information, rumour, or report, including through electronic means—

(b) with intent to cause, or which is likely to cause, fear or alarm to the public, or to any section of the public whereby any person may be induced to commit an offence against the State or against the public tranquillity; or

(c) with intent to incite, or which is likely to incite, any class or community of persons to commit any offence against any other class or community, shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both.

Section 353 is triggered by the spread of harmful misinformation during the Padyatra — such as exaggerated claims of religious demographic takeover, false analogies with countries like Bangladesh, or warnings of organised “jihad” operations. These statements create public alarm and can incite groups to act on fabricated threats.

#### Judicial Precedents against Hate Speech

1. In ***Kesavananda Bharati v. Union of India (1973)***, the Court reaffirmed the inviolable constitutional commitment to secularism, equality, and fundamental rights by introducing the Basic Structure doctrine. This principle shapes the broader legal environment within which communal speech is assessed.
2. The ***Tehseen Poonawalla*** guidelines lay down the area of preventive, remedial, and punitive measures to suppress the activities of lynching in the country. The judgment calls for the creation of a Special Task Force as a preventive measure in areas of possible hostile environments.
3. In ***Pravasi Bhalai Sangathan v. Union of India (2014)***, the Supreme Court defined Hate Speech as follows:

*Hate speech is an effort to marginalise individuals based on their membership in a group. Using expression that exposes the group to hatred, hate speech seeks to delegitimise group members in the eyes of the majority, reducing their social standing and acceptance within society. Hate speech, therefore, rises beyond causing distress to individual group members. It can have a societal impact.*

In the numerous speeches delivered by leaders like Dhirendra Shastri and Kajal Hindustani, various statements were made, which directly/indirectly targeted the Non-Hindu religions as a whole community. Usage of words like ‘chadar’ and ‘father’, directly points towards the deliberate delegitimation of these minority groups. This precedent provides a solid background against which the speeches made during the *padyatra* fall.

4. The **Law Commission’s 267th Report** laid down six pointers to identify a hate speech-
  - (i) The extremity of the speech (ii) Incitement (iii) Status of the author of the speech (iv) Status of the victims of the speech (v) Potentiality of the speech (vi) Context of the Speech

Evaluating this criterion allows us to demarcate the various speeches made during the Sanatan Padyatra. In the previous section, the speech was classified into 3 heads, with further markings done for conspiracy theories, exclusionary hate speeches, bulldozer threats, etc. This goes on to incite the public, as seen Dhutia, MP, where a group of people assembled to put Dhirendra Shastri’s statue on fire. As reported by [Samagra Bharat](#), this matter further escalated and the police ordered a *lathi-charge*.

The authors of these speeches, like Acharya Dhirendra Krishna Shastri and Spiritual leader Devkinandan Thakur, have been associated with political parties like the BJP in the past, in supporting their claims of Hindutva and a Hindu Rashtra. Prime Minister Narendra Modi has also referred to Shastri as his ‘younger brother’. Further, a Bageshwar Dham Sarkar has come into action in the past few years, with Baba Shastri’s reach being around 7.5 million on social media. The yatra also saw the participation of around 3,00,000 Sanatan followers, raising any doubts on the potential of this yatra.

5. In ***Amish Devgan v. Union of India (2020)***, the Court set a higher standard for public figures and elected officials, holding that,
 

*Persons of influence, keeping in view their reach, impact and authority they yield on the general public or the specific class to which they belong, owe a duty and have to be more responsible.*

Moreover, the court further stated that: the mode of exercise of free speech, the context and the extent of abuse of freedom are important in determining the contours of permissible restrictions.

6. The Court's earlier ruling in ***Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015)*** further clarified that only speech amounting to "incitement to imminent lawless action" can be legitimately restricted under Article 19(2), reinforcing the centrality of context, intent, and likely consequences.
7. The court in ***Patricia vs State of Meghalaya (2021)*** also held that

*Only where the written or spoken words have the tendency of creating public disorder or disturbance of law and order or affecting public tranquillity, the law needs to step in to prevent such an activity. The intention to cause disorder or incite people to violence is the sine qua non of the offence under Section 153A IPC and the prosecution has to prove the existence of mens rea to succeed.*

Here, the communal statements are provocative enough to cause disturbance and disorder in society. Statements like 'Jo ram ka nahi, wo kisi kaam ka nahi' and 'jinhe pad yatra se dikekat ho, Lahore ki ticket beta tum jaldi katwa lena' ,are clearly exclusionary statements, that showcase the mens rea that is required for these speeches to succeed as a hate speech.

## Prayer

The systemic targeting of minority religions by the way of exclusionary statements, boycotts, fearmongering, conspiracy and targeted vilification undermines the secular nature of India. The Sanatan Ekta Padyatra must be subjected to penal implications and regulatory guidelines, without which power may go unchecked.

We, at CJP, urge this hon'ble commission to,

1. **Take Legal Cognisance:** Take immediate cognisance of this complaint under Section 9(1)(d) of the National Commission for Minorities Act, 1992, and initiate a full-fledged inquiry into the matter.
2. **Initiate a Fact-finding body:** The commission should initiate a fact-finding mission to look into the yatra in detail; the speeches delivered, the places traversed, the context behind the slogans/words, etc.

3. **Monitoring the rallies:** The local administrations, like panchayats and police, must keep a check on the rallies and processions taking place, including video-graphing and recording the speeches delivered.
4. **Protecting Targeted Communities:** As directed by the *Tebseen Poonawalla* guidelines, a Nodal officer, not below the rank of a Superintendent of Police, shall take measures to protect targeted communities from mob lynching and possible evictions from homes.
5. **Ensuring Accountability in Hate Speeches:** Immediate FIRs must be registered in cases of blatant hate speeches/slogans/violence, which come under relevant sections of the BNS like Section 196, Section 197, Section 352, etc.
6. **Recommend Social Media Regulation:** Urge social media platforms to immediately remove the documented hateful content and take action against the accounts that are systematically spreading communal disharmony.

We reiterate that our complaint is not against exercising any religion or faith, but pro-rule of law. We urge the Commission to recognise that this is not a conflict between communities, but a systematic campaign of hate speech that is meant to serve political purposes, and targeted violence against vulnerable sections of Indian citizens.

Yours sincerely,

**Nandan Malsute**

President

**Teesta Setalvad**

Secretary