TORTIOUS LIABILITY OF STATE IN INDIA

Author's Name- Naveen Kumar(BALLB 5th Year Uttranchal University)

ABSTRACT:

The paper talks about the liability of the state in tort under administrative law. he term Administration" is used here synonymously with „state" or „Government". To what extend the Administration would be liable for the torts committed by its servants is a complex problem especially in developing countries with ever widening State activities. The liability of the government in tort is governed by the principles of public law inherited from British Common law and the provisions of the Constitution. It mainly focuses on the recognition of the liability and providing compensation to the citizens especially by the judiciary in the event of legal injury. The scope of the paper is limited to assessing the extent of tortious liability before the Constitution and the gradual changes in judicial approach in post Constitutional era. The Hypothesis mentioned is the liability of the state is considered or not considered to be a tortious liability that undergoes major changes and new dimensions of liability have been explored by the courts to afford remedies and compensate the victims of state action. The paper deals about the tortious liability for the state and it explains the pre-constitutional and post-constitutional judicial Decisions with case laws and it also explains the before commencement and after Commencement of the constitution regarding the sovereign and non-sovereign functions. Finally it deals with the doctrine of public accountability in the field of judicial and personal liability in comparison with both English and Indian laws. It also deals with the statute that bounds by the state, under that it includes the comparison with both English and Indian laws.

KEYWORDS: State liability, sovereign, non-sovereign, public accountability, Statute

INTRODUCTION-:

Tortious Liability emerges from the breach of an obligation essentially settled by the law: this obligation is towards persons by and large and its breach is redressible by an activity for Unliquidated damages. The torts submitted by people against another were perceived in

custom based law and the saying 'Ubi Jus Ibi Remedium' pushed the development of the Law of Torts more than ever. Under the Roman law, the state was not liable in torts towards its subjects, Since it was a Sovereign. It was viewed as a characteristic of Sovereignty that a State couldn't be sued in its own courts without its assent. So also, in England, the Crown delighted in in susceptibility from tortious liability and the proverb 'The King can't take the blame no matter what' won. Neither a wrong could be ascribed to the King or the Government nor might it be able to approve any off-base. In the post constitutional time, the approach of Welfare State logic prompted the all overrunning State mediation, diminishing the refinement amongst open and private capacities. The welfare measures and orders duplicated and the probability to singular damage expanded.

The State was in every way that really matters an enterprise total along these lines making it a juristic person acting through its authorities and operators suable under law. The courts made another open law cure which made the State liable for wrongs perpetrated over the span of activity of non-sovereign capacities. The insusceptibility was limited to the conventional elements of State like enactment, organization of equity, war, making of settlements and wrong doing anticipation.

The subject of State Liability in torts has accepted extraordinary significance today. The very idea of welfare state imagines that state deals with the natives and sets up an only connection between the privileges of the individual and the obligations of the State. While these obligations have expanded, the expansion in State exercises has prompted a more noteworthy effect on the subjects. Article 12 of the Indian Constitution characterizes 'State'. As per this article, State implies the Union, the State government and the Local Authorities. Subsequently the state is both the supplier and defender. The vicarious liability of state for the demonstrations of its worker abuse of energy by them or their carelessness expect importance especially with regards to extending extent of central and lawful rights. This circumstance requires a satisfactory system for assurance of State liability and granting remuneration to the casualty in the occasions of wrongs conferred against them. The progression of the law in England through the Crown Proceedings

Act 1947 and in U.S.A. concretization of liability by the Tort Claims Act, 1946 couldn't be overlooked in this regard.

Aim of the Study:

To know about the obligations of State in proper functioning of the state in its judicial proceedings.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Whether the state is liable to the concepts of tortious liability and vicarious liability?

OBJECTIVES:

- To identify the provisions available for the Doctrine of liability.
- To analysis whether State is bound by Statute.
- To find the Doctrine of Public Accountability in matter of Public concern.

TORTIOUS LIABILITY OF THE STATE-:

Article 300 of the Constitution sets out the convoluted liability of Indian government. It peruses: "The government of India may sue or be sued by the name of Union of India and the Government of a State may sue or be sued by the name o the State and may, subject to any provisions which may be made by Act of Parliament or of the Legislature of such State enacted by virtue of powers conferred by this Constitution, sue or be sued in relation to their respective affairs in the like cases as the Dominion of India and the corresponding Provinces or the corresponding Indian States might have sued or been sued if this Constitution had not been enacted." This is anyway subject to any law made by the Parliament or a State Legislature

In this way this makes the liability co-end with that of East India Company in light of the fact that the liability of the Dominion of India before the Constitution was same as that of Secretary of State for India under section 176 of Government of India Act 1935 and the Government of

India Act 1915 made the liability of the Secretary of State for India same as that of East India Company preceding Government of India Act 1858. In this way the situation of the tortious

liability was solidified at 1858 . The company administered in a double limit Commercial and Sovereign. When it started activities in India, the company was absolutely a trade body. Bit by bit, it gained domains and furthermore the sovereign powers to make war and peace and raise armed forces. Since it was an independent company not being the hireling or specialist of the British Crown, the resistance delighted in by the Crown was never reached out to it. In its sovereign limit, it was absolved from any tortious liability. In accordance with this rule after autonomy, the invulnerability of the State proceeded in a few regards i.e. sovereign powers.

The Doctrine of Vicarious Liability depends on 'social comfort and unpleasant equity'.

English law: – In England, under precedent-based law, outright insusceptibility of the Crown was acknowledged couldn't be sued in tort for wrongs conferred by its hirelings in their business. The administer depended on the notable maxim "the King can't be blamed under any circumstance". In 1863, in Tobin v. R. the court watched "if the Crown were at risk in tort, the rule (the King can't take the blame no matter what) might have appeared to be insignificant". Be that as it may, with the expansion of governmental capacities, the invulnerability stood to the Crown in convoluted liability turned out to be inconsistent with the requests of equity.

In **Adams v. Naylor** the Dicey gave a crazy illustration. "On the off chance that the Queen were herself to shoot the P.M through the head, no court in England could take comprehension of act". The significance of maxim would signify "king has no lawful energy to do wrongs." But the English Law never prevailing with regards to recognizing the King's two limits individual political. The time had come to nullify the general resistance of the crown in tort and in 1947 the Crown Proceeding Act was enacted. This Act put the Government in an indistinguishable position from a private person.

Indian Law:

A. General - So far as Indian law is concerned, the maxim 'the king can't be blamed under any circumstance' was never completely acknowledged. Total insusceptibility of the Government

was not perceived in the Indian lawful framework preceding the commencement of Constitution and in various cases the Government was held subject for convoluted acts of its workers.

B. Established Provision - Under Article 294 (4) of the constitution, the liability of Union Government or a state Government may emerge 'out of any contract or something else. The word generally recommends that the said liability may emerge in regards of convoluted acts too.

Under article 300 (1), the degree of such liability is settled. It gives that the liability of the Union of India or State Government will be same as that of Dominion of India and the Provision before the commencement of the Constitution.

DOCTRINE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY-:

The idea of open responsibility involves imperative open concern. All the three organs of the government-lawmaking body, official and legal are liable to open responsibility.

A. **Doctrine Explained:** It is settled law that every single optional power must be practiced sensibly and in bigger open intrigue. In Henley v. Lyme Corporation Best C.J stated: – "Now I take it to be impeccably clear, that if an open officer, manhandle his office, either by an act of exclusion or commission and the outcome of that is damage to an individual an action might be kept up against such open officer."

B. **Personal liability**: - A rupture of obligation gives ascend out in the open law to liability Which is known as "misfeasance in broad daylight office". Exercise of energy by priest and open officers must be for open merchandise and to accomplish welfare of open on the loose. Wherever there is mishandle of energy by an individual, he can be held obligated.

CONCLUSION:

All actions of state and its instrumentalities must be toward the targets set out in the constitution. Each progression of government ought to be toward fair conventions, social and financial improvement and open welfare. The established court practices energy of judicial survey with

limitation to guarantee that the experts on whom such power is endowed under the lead of law practice is truly, equitably and for the reason for which it is planned to be worked out. Sovereign insusceptibility as a safeguard might have been, consequently, never accessible where the State was engaged with business or private undertaking nor it is accessible where its officers are blameworthy of meddling with life and freedom of a native not justified by law. In both such encroachments the State is vicariously subject and bound, naturally, legitimately and ethically, to remunerate and repay the wronged individual. The teaching of sovereign invulnerability has no importance in the present-day setting when the idea of sovereignty itself has experienced radical change.

'Sovereignty' and "acts of State" are in this manner two unique ideas. The previous vests in a man or body which is free and preeminent both remotely and inside while last might be act done by a delegate of sovereign inside the points of confinement of energy vested in him which can't be addressed in a Municipal Court. The idea of energy which the Company delighted in was appointment of the "act of State". An activity of political power by the State or its delegate does not outfit any reason for action for documenting a suit for damages or pay against the State for negligence of its officers.