



Date: April 28, 2026

To,

**Shri Nikhil Gupta (IPS)**

Additional Director General (Law & Order), Maharashtra

Email: [adg.lo@mahapolice.gov.in](mailto:adg.lo@mahapolice.gov.in)

**Shri Shashi Kumar Meena**

Regional Addl. Commissioner of Police, North Region (Goregaon)

Email: [acpgoregaon.mum@mahapolice.gov.in](mailto:acpgoregaon.mum@mahapolice.gov.in)

**Shri Shailendra Raghunath Nagarkar**

Sr. Police Inspector, Malvani Police Station

Email: [ps.malvani.mum@mahapolice.gov.in](mailto:ps.malvani.mum@mahapolice.gov.in)

**Subject: Complaint against BJP MLA and Cabinet Minister Nitesh Narayan Rane for delivering a divisive hate speech during Ram Navami Yatra in Malad Malvani, Mumbai (Maharashtra) on March 26, 2026**

Dear Sirs,

We, at Citizens for Justice and Peace (CJP), a human rights movement dedicated to furthering the constitutional rights of all Indians, are deeply concerned about the divisive communal rhetoric expressed by Nitesh Narayan Rane, BJP MLA and Cabinet Minister for Fisheries & Ports Development, during his speech delivered during the **Ram Navami Yatra on March 26, 2026 in Malad Malvani, Mumbai (Maharashtra)**. At this event, Rane spread anti-Muslim hate speech while declaring India a "Hindu Rashtra," using dog-whistles referencing "Pakistan" to alienate the minority community, and issuing direct, graphic threats of physical violence. In his inflammatory speech, Rane warned that anyone opposing his ideology would have their "eyes taken out and played with like marbles." This rhetoric serves to intimidate Muslims, portraying them as subjugated targets within Hindu society. He specifically targeted a local place of worship, directing the crowd's aggressive chanting to ensure the "*voice must reach the big mosque.*" This statement not only spreads fear but also acts as a deliberate provocation intended to breach public peace and incite confrontation.

Rane openly encouraged physical violence and religious alienation, an anti-Constitutional move that violates Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution. By telling the audience that "*this is our Hindu Rashtra, this is not someone's Pakistan,*" he incites segregation and exclusion based on religion, attempting to strip a specific community of their equal citizenship. Later, he continued pushing intimidation tactics, leveraging the political power of the state by stating that under a "government with a Hindutva ideology," his opponents would face severe consequences. These dangerous, divisive narratives fuel communal hatred and further polarise Indian society. Rane's rhetoric,

delivered in his capacity as a public figure, holds the potential to incite hatred and discord between religious communities. His words are not only a blatant violation of constitutional values but also a direct threat to the communal harmony that is essential for the well-being of our diverse nation.

As an organisation promoting communal harmony, we are compelled to inquire whether appropriate action is being taken in accordance with the directives issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Bombay High Court. The Constitutional Courts have specifically ordered detailed investigations and prosecutions in relation to hate speech, and we urge the authorities to adhere to these directions, ensuring that such divisive rhetoric does not go unchecked.

In this context, we bring to your attention the disturbing video of Rane's speech that has surfaced, which not only encourages hatred but also seeks to justify extreme physical violence under the guise of religion. It is crucial that the police and authorities take stringent action to prevent further harm to the peace and harmony of our nation. Such unchecked hate-driven rhetoric threatens to undermine the secular fabric of our country.

Nitesh Rane's speech delivered in Malad Malvani, on March 26, 2026, exhibits clear traits of hate speech, aimed specifically at the Muslim community. This speech propagates communal narratives designed to incite fear, promote division, and propagate hatred. The speech targets a specific religious group, spreading intimidation and portraying them as enemies of the state who belong in "Pakistan." In doing so, Rane's rhetoric falls squarely within the definition of hate speech, as per the Supreme Court's judgment in *Amish Devgan v. Union of India (2021)*, (2021) 1 SCC 1. This judgment outlines that hate speech is not merely an expression but an act intended to foster hatred and fear against a specific group without any legitimate or reasonable purpose. Rane's inflammatory remarks in this speech serve no purpose other than to deepen communal divisions and sow mistrust.

The Supreme Court, in the *Amish Devgan* case, emphasised that hate speech must have a subjective intent to target and harm a particular community or group. The judgment noted that individuals in positions of influence, like Rane, must exercise caution in their public statements as their words can have a profound impact, potentially inciting hatred or discord. The Court stressed the importance of safeguarding the dignity, equality, and social status of all individuals, regardless of their religion, in ensuring a just and democratic society. Rane's speech directly contradicts these principles, using derogatory dog-whistles and unfounded, organic grounds of intimidation that only serve to dehumanise and isolate a particular community.

### **Rane's public influence and responsibility**

As a sitting MLA and Cabinet Minister, Nitesh Rane holds significant influence over the public, which magnifies the harm caused by his words. His position of power makes it especially irresponsible for him to engage in spreading such dangerous rhetoric. His remarks are not those of an ordinary individual but come from a person holding a constitutional office, who is expected to uphold values of inclusivity, equality, and harmony. Rane's speech violates the constitutional principles of equality and non-discrimination, both of which are critical to maintaining national unity and social peace. The Supreme Court, in its judgment, specifically warned against speech that exploits the influence of individuals in power to spread hatred, division, and fear. Rane's speech, therefore, exemplifies the kind of harmful rhetoric the Court cautioned against.

Rane's claims establishing a binary of "Hindu Rashtra" versus "Pakistan" and his inflammatory comments targeting the "big mosque" serve no legitimate purpose other than to foster a climate of fear, distrust, and potential rioting. His rhetoric propagates aggressive dominance, which fuels communal hatred. The speech depicts minorities as an opposing force that must be violently suppressed, further embedding stereotypes and justifying exclusionary practices. Such statements are intended to create an atmosphere of suspicion and hostility, thus violating Section 196 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), which criminalises speech that promotes enmity between communities.

We urge the authorities to take swift action to investigate these remarks under the relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The law provides for criminal consequences for hate speech, including the promotion of enmity and incitement to hatred. Rane's statements are a clear breach of these legal frameworks, and as a sitting Cabinet Minister, his role in potentially inciting communal enmity must be thoroughly investigated based on the facts. Immediate steps must be taken to hold him accountable, in line with the Supreme Court's ruling, to protect the dignity of individuals and uphold the unity of the country.

### **Transcript and English Translation of the Speech:**

Malad Malvani, Mumbai Maharashtra [Date: March 26, 2026]

*"If anyone is hiding anywhere, they can come out now, we are present here. Perhaps some people here in Malvani have forgotten that this is our Hindu Rashtra, this is not someone's Pakistan. is not."*

*"Therefore, again, and in this land, in the land of Maharashtra where there is a government with a Hindutva ideology, if anyone anywhere wants to hoist the saffron flag, then there, if anyone tries to remove that saffron flag, we will not let their cylinder come up again."*

*"Mafia leaders should not dare, otherwise I will come to Malvani tomorrow even without saying anything, remember this much. Therefore, in our Hindu Rashtra, whether it is Ram Navami or Hanuman Jayanti here, this Malvani is the Malvani of the saffron-clad, this remember, and here, if anyone again looks at our saffron flag with dirty eyes, then their eyes will be taken out and played with like marbles."*

*"Therefore, once again, to all of you, Jai Jai Shri Ram, Jai Shri Ram. That voice must reach the big mosque. Jai Jai Shri Ram, Jai Shri Ram, Jai Jai Shri Ram, Jai Shri Ram. Bharat Mata Ki Jai, Bharat Mata Ki Jai, Vande Mataram, Vande Mataram, Jai Har Mahadev, Jai Bharat. Thank you very much. Thank you."*

[Time Stamp: 00:01 – 02:14]

**Link:** [https://youtube.com/shorts/yWoe-YXX934?si=bKyL5rzLOo-OIa\\_f](https://youtube.com/shorts/yWoe-YXX934?si=bKyL5rzLOo-OIa_f)

### **How elements in the speech delivered constitute Hate Speech:**

#### **Declaration of unconstitutional "Hindu Rashtra" and alienation**

In his speech, the speaker begins with a highly inflammatory and anti-constitutional claim: *"Perhaps some people here in Malvani have forgotten that this is our Hindu Rashtra, this is not someone's Pakistan."* This statement fabricates a narrative that portrays Muslims as outsiders or foreign elements belonging to a hostile nation. The allegation that India is exclusively a "Hindu Rashtra" is completely unfounded in law and contradicts the secular fabric of the Constitution. This narrative exploits

majoritarian dominance and misrepresentation, creating an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion toward the minority religious group. By presenting an unconstitutional binary as truth, the speaker aims to create fear and division, which is a hallmark of hate speech.

### **Direct threats of severe physical violence and mutilation**

The speaker intensifies the fearmongering by introducing graphic threats of physical mutilation. He states, "if anyone again looks at our saffron flag with dirty eyes, then their eyes will be taken out and played with like marbles." These violent terms are designed to terrorise the minority community and incite the gathered crowd to commit acts of grievous physical harm. This rhetoric intentionally encourages the audience to view any perceived opposition not just as adversaries, but as targets for violent dismemberment. It fosters hostility and provides a direct trigger for physical violence based on religious identity.

### **Intimidation utilising political power**

The speaker explicitly uses his position and the power of the state government to intimidate citizens, stating, "in the land of Maharashtra where there is a government with a Hindutva ideology... we will not let their cylinder come up again." This is a clear threat implying that the state apparatus is aligned against the minority community and will actively suppress them. By encouraging people to believe that the government supports the violent and exclusionary acts he proposes, the speaker fosters a climate of impunity for mob violence. This form of political intimidation serves to deepen divisions within society, making it a direct incitement to systemic persecution.

### **Deliberate provocation targeting religious institutions**

The speaker continues with an aggressive provocation directed specifically at Muslim places of worship, stating, "That voice must reach the big mosque." He immediately follows this by leading religious chants. This statement is designed to turn a religious slogan into a weapon of intimidation, targeting a specific religious structure to provoke a reaction. The speaker uses confrontational language, associating the chanting with the assertion of dominance over the local Muslim population. Such rhetoric reduces minority religious sites to targets of majoritarian aggression, intensely polarising the communities and directly inviting a breach of public peace.

### **Violation of constitutional values**

The Supreme Court ruling underscores the crucial distinction between the speech of a public figure, such as Nitesh Rane, and that of an ordinary citizen. As someone holding a high office, Rane's words carry the weight of his position and can influence large sections of the population. His role in disseminating hate speech, threatening mutilation, and targeting mosques cannot be overlooked. The Court's ruling highlighted that speech from influential individuals is not only more potent but also more dangerous, as it has the potential to ignite hatred, deepen societal rifts, and undermine the constitutional values of equality, secularism, and fraternity. Rane's speeches directly threaten the communal harmony and peace essential for the country's well-being.

His remarks, specifically the call to target the "big mosque" and the threat to gouge out eyes, further breach the guidelines laid out by the Supreme Court. They incite violence and fear, leaving

Muslims vulnerable to physical attacks and discrimination. Given Rane's public stature, his responsibility to avoid such inflammatory statements is even more pronounced.

### **A clear case of hate speech**

The speech delivered at Malad Malvani is a textbook example of hate speech. Through unconstitutional declarations, graphic threats of violence, political intimidation, and deliberate provocation of religious sites, the speaker incites fear, division, and hostility. The content not only violates the core principles of equality, secularism, and justice enshrined in the Indian Constitution but also encourages violent actions that threaten public harmony. These statements serve purely to incite hatred, physical violence, and communal mistrust—hallmarks of hate speech.

### **Failure to uphold duty of responsibility**

Besides all else, Nitesh Rane's speech represents a direct violation of his duty as a public figure, as outlined in the *Amish Devgan* judgment (2021). The Supreme Court emphasised that individuals with substantial influence must exercise heightened responsibility, as their words can stir public sentiments and foster division. Rane's rhetoric, filled with such violent and divisive language, shows a blatant disregard for this responsibility. As a leader, Rane should have been aware of the harmful impact his words would have on the public, especially given his influence as an elected representative.

### **Past record of Nitesh Rane related to Incendiary Speech**

CJP, through a series of complaints dated March 7, March 18, and March 28, 2025, has raised serious objections to multiple speeches delivered by Nitesh Rane across Sindhudurg, Pune, and Ratnagiri districts. These complaints pertain to events such as the "Hindu Rashtra Adhiveshan" in Kundal (February 8, 2025), the "Shivjanmostav" event in Sawantwadi (February 19, 2025), a public felicitation at Nanijdham, Ratnagiri (February 20, 2025), and a religious gathering at Wagholi, Pune (February 5, 2025). CJP had made out a case, that across these events, Rane repeatedly invoked conspiratorial terms like "love jihad" and "land jihad," portrayed Muslims as a collective threat, and made statements that could incite hostility, social boycott, and fear among communities. The complaints emphasise that such rhetoric, especially from a sitting Cabinet Minister, is unsubstantiated, inflammatory, and violative of constitutional guarantees, and therefore warrant immediate registration of FIRs and prompt legal intervention by the concerned authorities.

### **FIRs and ongoing legal scrutiny against Nitesh Rane**

Under the judicial oversight of the Bombay High Court in *Aftab Siddique & Ors. vs The State of Maharashtra* (2024), a series of First Information Reports (FIRs) were formally documented against BJP MLA and Cabinet Minister Nitesh Rane. These legal actions follow a consistent pattern of alleged hate speech and inflammatory remarks made across various regions of Maharashtra. The High Court's proceedings specifically highlighted four primary cases where the police were directed to take action for violations of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) involving the promotion of religious enmity and criminal intimidation.

Mankhurd Police Station (C.R. No. 152/2024): Registered against Nitesh Rane under Sections 153A (promoting enmity between groups), 503 (criminal intimidation), 504 (intentional insult), and

505 (statements conducing to public mischief) of the IPC. This case originated from speeches perceived as threatening to the Muslim community and inciting public disorder.

Ghatkopar Police Station (C.R. No. 521/2024): Registered against Nitesh Rane and Subhash Ahir under Sections 153A, 504, 506 (punishment for criminal intimidation), and 188 (disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant) of the IPC. These charges relate to inflammatory addresses delivered in the Mumbai suburbs.

Kashimira Police Station (C.R. No. 259/2024): Registered against Nitesh Rane and Smt. Geeta Jain regarding the Mira-Bhayander incidents. The FIR invokes Sections 153A, 153B (imputations prejudicial to national integration), 143 (unlawful assembly), 504, and 506 of the IPC, alongside Section 37(1) read with Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act. These charges followed high-tension rallies and subsequent communal friction in the Mira Road area.

Malwani Police Station (C.R. No. 298/2024): Originally registered against Bhagwan Thakur, Nitesh Rane was subsequently added as an accused by the Malwani Police. The invoked sections include 153A, 504, and 506 of the IPC, centered on remarks made during public gatherings that targeted specific religious demographics.

Beyond these specific orders, Nitesh Narayan Rane's October 2024 election affidavit discloses a total of 38 FIRs registered against him, of which 20 pertain specifically to allegations of hate speech.

### **Recent Directions of the Supreme Court on preventing/prosecuting hate speakers in Maharashtra**

As you must know, the issue of rampant hate speech being delivered and the inaction by law enforcement agencies has been highlighted before the Supreme Court multiple times since 2023. We would like to highlight that on February 3, 2023, the Supreme Court issued directions with respect to an event which was scheduled to be held in Mumbai on February 5, 2023 by the Sakal Hindu Samaj, another extremist fringe Hindutva group. The petitioner, Shaheen Abdullah, had contended that similar to its anti-Muslim speech during 'Hindu Jan Aakrosh Morcha' held in Mumbai on January 29, it can be apprehended that the same will be repeated during the February 5 meeting as well. The apex court had thus sought a video of the entire event to be scrutinized by the court at the next hearing. The court has also taken an undertaking from the government of Maharashtra that if permission for this event is granted "it will be subject to the condition that nobody will make any hate speech and in defiance of law or disturbing the public order."

The court also outlined directives with respect to taking preventive action in such cases:

*"We also direct that the Officer(s), in case, permission is granted and, in case, the occasion arises for invoking the power under Section 151 of Cr.P.C. as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Officer(s) concerned to invoke the said power and to act as per the mandate of Section 151 of the Cr.P.C."*

Even in 2024 itself, while on January 17, the Supreme Court bench of Justices Sanjiv Khanna and Dipankar Datta had expressed their anguish at the petitioners being forced to approach the Supreme Court multiple times against individuals and organisations even after there being guidelines for tacking and taking action against hate speeches. During the said hearing, the

Supreme Court issued an order directing the District Magistrate and Superintendent of Police at Yavatmal, Maharashtra and Raipur, Chhattisgarh to take ‘appropriate steps’ to ensure that no incitement to hate speech occurs at the rallies scheduled in the said districts in the coming few days of January. The said order was passed following the concerns raised by the petitioners over delivery of potential hate speeches at rallies planned by Hindu Janjagruti Samiti and Bharatiya Janata Party Legislator T Raja Singh in the month of January.

The court had outlined directives with respect to taking preventive action in such cases:

*“We would require the authorities to be conscious that no incitement to violence and hate speech are permissible. The concerned District Magistrates and Superintendent of Police of Yavatmal, Maharashtra and Raipur, Chhattisgarh will take necessary steps, as may be required. If necessary and deemed appropriate, police/ administration will install CCTV Cameras having recording facility, so as to ensure identification of the perpetrators in the event of any violence/hate speech.”*

### **Circulars issued by DGP Maharashtra in February 2023 and May 2023 urging strict action on Hate Speech**

In Circular No. DGP 20/ Petition No.940/ 2022/54.2023. issued by Dr Suhas Warke (Spl. Inspector General of Police (L&O) for The Director General of Police M.S., Mumbai), dated February 2, 2023, the Supreme Court order dated January 13, 2023 has been highlighted where the court had asked the police to ensure that as and when any speech which attracts offences such as Sections 153A, 153B and 295A and 505 of the IPC take place, suo moto action is taken if no complaint is forthcoming.

The circular had directed all Unit Commanders to follow the Supreme Court order.

The Circular No. DGP/20/Petition No. 940-2022/54/2023 issued by Dr Suhas Warke (Spl. Inspector General of Police (L&O) for The Director General of Police M.S., Mumbai), dated April 3, 2023, entails “measures to be taken to maintain law and order due to agitations, *morchas*, speeches etc.”

It gives detailed instructions on what steps are to be taken when any *morchas* are to be held:

2. All the Unit Commanders should hold a meeting with the concerned organisers before such a *morcha* and fix the route of the *morcha* with appropriate terms and condition. A combined meeting of all social groups should be taken to convey clearly to all that they should maintain peace and keep law and order during the *morcha*. Preventive action against Anti-social elements should be taken. Those elements who help in maintaining peace and harmony should be encouraged. Audio Video recording of the *morcha* should be done. Police Head Quarters should ensure adequate supply of equipment’s, like Lathi, Helmets, etc. to police men deployed for *morcha bandobast*. If any law-and-order situation arises, offences should be registered immediately and arrest should be made. Intelligence machinery should be activated to collect advance information about *morcha*, agitation and efforts should be made to pre-empt any communal incidents.

### **Action taken against hate speakers and offenders**

Sir, it is also important to note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 940/2022, *Shaheen Abdulla vs. Union of India & Ors.*, mandated the police authorities in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and UT of NCT of Delhi to take suo moto action against those indulging in hate speeches as provided under the Indian Penal Code. Moreover, the state authorities have also been asked to issue directions to their subordinates in this regard that without looking at the religion of the accused, action has to be taken. In its order, the Supreme Court bench comprising Justices KM Joseph and BV Nagarathna had said the following:

*"Respondents (states) shall ensure that immediately, as and when any speech or any action takes place which attracts offences such as Section 153A, 153B, 295A and 506 of IPC etc, without any complaint being filed suo moto action be taken to register cases and proceed against the offenders in accordance with law. Respondents will issue directions to the subordinates so that appropriate action can be taken at the earliest. We further make it clear that such action be taken irrespective of the religion of the maker of the speech, so that the secular character of Bharat as envisaged by the Preamble is preserved."*

The apex court has, thus, again outlined already codified statutory duties of a police officer which makes it mandatory for them to take action under section 151 of CrPC in case there is apprehension of hate speech. Sir, given the well-orchestrated and numerous instances of hate speech and actual hate crimes being committed, the minority community in various parts of India already feels insecure and threatened. Furthermore, this was spoken at a public event and this speech has reached not only the audience at the event but also all those who may have seen these videos on their mobile phones, by the medium of social media. How large and wide the reach of social media can be, we are sure you must be aware. The consequences of such an inflammatory speech could have been worse.

### **Laws violated by the Hate Speech:**

#### **Under Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)**

##### **Section 196 – Promoting Enmity between Groups**

- In the speech delivered, the speaker makes the unconstitutional claim that the region is a "Hindu Rashtra" and not "Pakistan." The assertion that Muslims are outsiders fosters division and hostility between religious communities, directly violating Section 196.
- The speech targets a local mosque, turning religious chants into a tool for intimidation. This creates an atmosphere of mistrust and fear, clearly breaching the law against promoting enmity between groups.

##### **Section 197 (1) – Imputations against Allegiance to the Constitution**

- The speech indirectly implies that the targeted minority community belongs to Pakistan, stating "this is not someone's Pakistan." This undermines their allegiance to the Constitution, violating Section 197.

- Furthermore, the speech's portrayal of the region as an exclusive "Hindu Rashtra" casts aside the pluralistic nature of the nation, attacking the core secular tenets of the Constitution.

### **Section 299 – Malicious Act to Insult a Religion**

- The speech maliciously targets the Islamic place of worship by demanding that aggressive slogans "must reach the big mosque." By directing hostility toward a sacred space, the speech violates Section 299.
- The speaker's rhetoric is designed to insult the minority community, spreading intimidation and encouraging negative interactions based on religious identity.

### **Section 352 – Intentional Insult with Intent to Provoke Breach of Peace**

- The speech is designed to provoke fear and stir up communal unrest. By explicitly threatening that people's "eyes will be taken out and played with like marbles," the speaker incites violence, leading to a highly probable breach of public peace.
- The inflammatory language used in the speech—including the directive to intimidate the local mosque—could easily provoke communal enmity or a physical clash, disturbing public order and violating Section 352.

### **Section 353 – False Information with Intent to Incite**

- The speech spreads inflammatory and intimidating statements, leveraging the power of a "Hindutva ideology" government to suppress minorities. These narratives are intentionally spread to create fear, distrust, and division among different communities, fulfilling the criteria of Section 353.
- The violent threats and calls for dominance are intended to incite fear and alarm within the public, leading to social and communal unrest.

The speech delivered in Malad, Malvani on March 26, 2026, constitutes a clear violation of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, through the promotion of violent and malicious narratives. The speaker's deliberate use of severe physical threats, inflammatory rhetoric, and targeting of religious sites is intended to provoke enmity between communities and incite a communal divide.

The inflammatory and divisive speech delivered by Nitesh Rane amounts to insightful, hate speech which is a punishable offence under the various sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), in essence, the speeches violate the following sections:

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

**Section 197 (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;

**Section 299** - (Malicious act to insult a religion), 352 (Intentional insult with intent to provoke breach of peace)

**Section 302** - Uttering words, etc., with deliberate intent to wound religious feelings of any person.

**Section 352** - 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 353** - (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.

### **Judicial precedents against Hate Speech:**

In *Firoz Iqbal Khan vs Union of India [W. P (Civ.) No. 956 of 2020]*, the Supreme Court had held, “the edifice of a democratic society committed to the rule of law under a regime of constitutional rights, values and duties is founded on the co-existence of communities. India is a melting pot of civilizations, cultures, religions and languages. Any attempt to vilify a religious community must be viewed with grave disfavour by this Court as the custodian of constitutional values.” (Para 11).

In *Pravasi Bhalai Sangathan v. Union of India, (Ref: AIR 2014 SC 1591)*, the Supreme Court has unambiguously stated that “hate speech is an effort to marginalise individuals based on their membership to a group, that can have a social impact. Moreover, the Court stated that hate speech lays the groundwork for broad attacks on the vulnerable that can range from discrimination, to ostracism, deportation, violence, and even to genocide. Therefore, the aforementioned news items are tantamount to the perpetration of genocide, and must be considered to be in violation of Article 21 of the Constitution.” (Para 7).

On April 28, 2023, the division bench of Justice KM Joseph and BV Nagarathna in *Ashwini Kumar Upadhyay v. Union of India [W.P. (C) No. 943 of 2021]*, extended its order and directed all States/UTs to register Suo moto FIR against Hate Speech irrespective of religion. The court added that when any speech or any action takes place which attracts offences such as Section 153A, 153B and 295A and 505 of the IPC etc., suo moto action will be taken to register cases even if no complaint is forthcoming and proceed against the offenders in accordance with law.

In view of the above, we urge you to take cognizance of the speeches delivered by Nitesh Rane, as enclosed herewith, and register a case against the perpetrator, Nitesh Rane, as well as the

organisers of the events, under the relevant sections for cognizable offences. We also wish for you to inform us whether the said events were videotaped by the police officials, as per the orders of the Supreme Court. Additionally, we request that the Malad Malvani keep us informed of developments and actions taken in this case, based on the applicable sections, as this would go a long way in rebuilding faith and confidence in the rule of law in general, and the police-citizen relationship in particular.

Sir, do note that we are sending this complaint, by email and registered post, on which we urge you to register an FIR if one has not been filed yet.

In anticipation,

Yours sincerely,

**Nandan Maluste, CJP President**

**Teesta Setalvad, CJP Secretary**

**Annexures:**

Annexure A - Video of event dated March 26, 2026 downloaded by CJP