IJARSCT



International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal



Volume 5, Issue 3, December 2025

A Study on Impact of Judgments of Justice Krishna Iyer on the Protection of Prisoner's Right

Kamallini G¹ and Mohammed Suhail S²

BA LLB (HONS) 4th Year¹ LLB, 2nd Year²

Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Padur, Kelambakkam, Tamil Nadu

Abstract: Judiciary in every country has an obligation and a Constitutional role to protect Human Rights of citizens. As per the mandate of the Constitution of India, this function is assigned to the superior judiciary namely the Supreme Court of India and High courts. The Supreme Court of India is perhaps one of the most active courts when it comes into the matter of protection of Human Rights. It has a great reputation of independence and credibility. The independent judicial system stems from the notion of the separation of powers where the executive, legislature and judiciary form three branches of the government. This separation and consequent independence is key to the judiciary's effectiveness in upholding the rule of law and human rights. Since every society has a judicial system for the protection of its law-abiding members, it has to make provisions of prisons for the law breakers. But it doesn't mean that the prisoners have no rights. The prisoners also have their rights. The Supreme Court of India, by interpreting Article 21 of the Constitution, has developed human rights jurisprudence for the preservation and protection of prisoner's rights to maintain human dignity. Any violation of this right attracts the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution, which enshrines right to equality and equal protection of law. In addition to this, the question of cruelty to prisoners is also dealt with, specifically by the Prison Act, 1894 and the Criminal Procedure Code (CRPC).

Keywords: Prison, judgements, inhuman treatment, administration, Supreme Court

DOI: 10.48175/568





