

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 55377

Title: Impact of Amendments in Organised Crime and Terrorism in India,

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓,		
Techn. Quality		✓,		
Clarity	✓,			
Significance	✓,			

Reviewer Name: Dr Abdul Haseeb Mir

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The article “Impact of Amendments in Organised Crime and Terrorism in India” undertakes an ambitious and wide-ranging analysis of India’s evolving legal framework to combat organised crime and terrorism. By tracing the historical emergence of terrorism and organised criminal networks in India and examining legislative responses such as the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA), the National Investigation Agency Act (NIA Act), the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), and the NDPS Act, the paper seeks to evaluate how successive amendments have reshaped counter-terrorism and anti-organised crime governance. The topic is highly relevant, particularly in the contemporary context of heightened national security concerns, transnational crime, terror financing, and debates on civil liberties.

One of the article’s principal strengths lies in its comprehensive coverage of statutory developments. The author demonstrates a clear understanding of the evolution of key counter-terrorism and financial crime laws in India and provides a chronological account of major amendments. The discussion of the UAPA amendments (2008, 2012, and 2019) is particularly detailed, highlighting the expansion of definitions of terrorism, extension of pre-charge detention, stricter bail provisions under Section 43D(5), and the controversial power to designate individuals as terrorists. This section successfully conveys how

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

legislative amendments have strengthened the preventive and punitive capacity of the State. Similarly, the analysis of the PMLA amendments and their alignment with FATF standards effectively underscores the growing emphasis on disrupting terror financing and organised crime networks through financial surveillance and asset attachment mechanisms.

The article is also commendable for its use of judicial precedents to support doctrinal analysis. Landmark cases such as *NIA v. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali* (2019), *A.K. Roy v. Union of India* (1982), and *Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India* (2022) are correctly cited and contextually explained. The discussion of *Watali* is particularly effective in illustrating the judiciary's deferential stance towards national security considerations, especially in bail jurisprudence under UAPA. By integrating case law with statutory amendments, the article demonstrates doctrinal coherence and legal literacy.

Another strength of the paper lies in its historical contextualisation. The overview of terrorism and organised crime in India—from Partition-era violence and separatist movements to contemporary manifestations such as cross-border terrorism, left-wing extremism, cyber-terrorism, and narco-terrorism—provides useful background for understanding why legal responses have progressively hardened. The linkage drawn between organised crime syndicates, drug trafficking, money laundering, and terror financing is conceptually sound and reflects established criminological understanding.

Despite these strengths, the manuscript exhibits significant analytical and structural limitations. Most notably, the paper is predominantly descriptive, with limited critical evaluation of the actual impact of amendments beyond stated legislative intent. While the article repeatedly asserts that amendments have “strengthened” counter-terrorism mechanisms, it rarely substantiates these claims with empirical evidence such as conviction rates, prosecution outcomes, reduction in terror incidents, or comparative pre- and post-amendment analysis. As a result, the concept of “impact” remains largely normative rather than analytically demonstrated.

The treatment of civil liberties and constitutional concerns is also relatively underdeveloped. Although the article briefly acknowledges allegations of misuse, selective enforcement, and threats to individual liberty, these issues are not critically examined. There is insufficient engagement with scholarly critiques, constitutional jurisprudence on proportionality, or debates surrounding preventive detention, prolonged incarceration without trial, and reversal of the presumption of innocence. A more balanced analysis

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

would require deeper interrogation of the tension between national security and fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution.

From a methodological standpoint, the paper lacks a clearly articulated research design or analytical framework. The reliance on doctrinal and secondary sources is appropriate for a legal study, but the methodology section should explicitly state this and acknowledge its limitations. Structurally, the manuscript contains repetition, inconsistent formatting, typographical errors, and grammatical issues that detract from academic polish. Several sections read like statutory notes rather than analytical prose, and tighter synthesis would significantly improve coherence and readability.

The conclusion appropriately calls for a balance between security and civil liberties but largely reiterates earlier points rather than offering original synthesis or policy-oriented insights. Stronger concluding reflections—such as future challenges posed by cyber-terrorism, AI-enabled crime, and international cooperation—would enhance the paper's forward-looking relevance.

Overall, the article addresses an important and complex subject and demonstrates commendable effort in compiling legal developments and case law. However, to meet the standards of an academic law or social science journal, the manuscript requires substantial analytical strengthening, editorial refinement, and clearer engagement with constitutional and human-rights debates.

Recommendation: The article is recommended for publication after major revisions, particularly focusing on (i) strengthening analytical depth on “impact,” (ii) critically engaging with civil liberties and constitutional concerns, (iii) improving structure and language, and (iv) clearly articulating methodological orientation.