FMDB ***Transactions on Sustainable Public and Law***

The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act and Bail Provisions: A Constitutional Examination in Light of Recent Supreme Court Judgments

Balireddy Kanaka Lakshmi[1,*], V. Vijay Lakshmi[2], Lanke Haritha[3], Vallimireddy Abhinav Deep Dora[4]

[1,2]Dr B. R. Ambedkar College of Law, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.
[3,4]Vignan Institute of Law, Vignan's Foundation for Science, Technology and Research, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India.
kanakalakshmi1990@gmail.com[1], vandrangivl@yahoo.co.in[2], lh_law@vignan.ac.in[3], abhinavvallimireddy@gmail.com[4]

Abstract: The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, 1967 (UAPA), stands as India's primary counter-terrorism statute, empowering law enforcement to combat threats to national security. Section 43D (5) of the UAPA imposes stringent bail conditions, mandating that courts refuse bail if the allegations prima facie appear true, creating what practitioners describe as an effective statutory prohibition on bail pending trial. However, a series of landmark Supreme Court judgments—particularly the Delhi Riots bail orders (2025-2026)—have sought to reconcile the statutory embargo with the constitutional guarantees of personal liberty and the right to a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution 7. This paper examines the trajectory of judicial interpretation, analyses the tension between national security imperatives and individual rights, and assesses the current state of bail jurisprudence under UAPA, with particular reference to recent Supreme Court decisions. The paper concludes that while courts have recognised limited constitutional override mechanisms, the practical effect remains that bail remains extraordinarily difficult to secure under UAPA, despite judicial rhetoric affirming that "bail is the rule, jail the exception."

Keywords: Unlawful Activities Prevention Act; Section 43D (5); National Security; Bail and Article 21; Prima Facie Case; Constitutional Rights; Delhi Riots; Counter-Terrorism Law; Indian Constitution.

Received on: 29/06/2025, **Revised on:** 02/09/2025, **Accepted on:** 27/10/2025, **Published on:** 05/06/2026

Journal Homepage: https://www.fmdbpub.com/user/journals/details/FTSPL

DOI: https://doi.org/10.69888/FTSPL.2026.000680

Cite as: B. K. Lakshmi, V. V. Lakshmi, L. Haritha, and V. A. D. Dora, "The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act and Bail Provisions: A Constitutional Examination in Light of Recent Supreme Court Judgments," *FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Public and Law,* vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 71–79, 2026.

1. Introduction

Terrorism poses genuine threats to national security and democratic stability. Recognising this reality, nations worldwide employ specialised counter-terrorism legislation that necessarily departs from ordinary criminal procedure [1]. The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act represents India's response to terrorism, providing law enforcement with enhanced investigative powers and stricter penalties for terrorist offences [2]. Yet these exceptional powers carry corresponding dangers: they can be employed to suppress dissent, incarcerate individuals indefinitely without trial, and transform the criminal justice system from a guarantor of fairness into an instrument of state oppression [3]. The tension between security and liberty is acutely evident in

*Corresponding author.

bail jurisprudence under the UAPA [4]. Section 43D (5) establishes a two-stage process that is fundamentally different from ordinary bail determinations. In regular criminal cases, bail is presumed available unless the prosecution demonstrates compelling reasons for custody, such as flight risk or likelihood of tampering with evidence [5]. Under Section 43D (5), the presumption inverts: bail is presumed unavailable unless the accused demonstrates that the charges do not prima facie appear true [6]. This inverted burden, combined with the restriction that courts cannot receive evidence beyond the prosecution's chargesheet at the bail stage, creates what appears to be a categorical prohibition on bail [7].

Recent Supreme Court judgments have attempted to introduce constitutional limits on this statutory embargo [8]. The Court has emphasised that, even in UAPA cases, grossly protracted trial delays violate Article 21 rights, thereby justifying bail as a constitutional remedy [9]. However, the practical application of these principles remains uneven. Cases like the Delhi Riots bail orders in 2026 demonstrate that courts continue to deny bail to individuals who have spent years in custody without trial, invoking an expansive definition of terrorism that extends beyond violent acts to encompass advocacy, protest, and speech. This paper undertakes a comprehensive examination of UAPA bail jurisprudence, tracing its evolution through landmark judgments and assessing the current state of law [10]. The paper argues that while the Supreme Court has recognised constitutional limits on Section 43D (5), the operation of these limits remains marginal, and significant questions regarding the compatibility of UAPA's bail framework with constitutional guarantees remain unresolved.

2. The Legislative Framework: UAPA and Section 43D (5)

2.1. Historical Development

The Unlawful Activities Prevention Act originated in 1967 as a response to perceived separatist and destabilising movements [11]. However, the provision now known as Section 43D (5) did not exist in the original legislation. For over four decades, persons accused under UAPA have secured bail in accordance with ordinary criminal procedure principles [12]. This changed dramatically following the terrorist attacks in Mumbai on November 26, 2008, when a coordinated assault by armed individuals claimed nearly 170 lives [13]. In the aftermath of the Mumbai attacks, the government introduced the UAPA Amendment Act, 2008, which inserted Section 43D (5). This new provision fundamentally restructured bail jurisprudence for terrorism-related offences. The legislative intent was explicit: to create conditions under which bail for persons accused of terrorist offences would become extraordinarily difficult to obtain [14]. The Explanatory Note accompanying the 2008 Amendment stated that the stringent bail conditions reflected the government's commitment to ensuring that accused terrorists would not be released pending trial to commit further terrorist acts [15].

2.2. The Text of Section 43D (5)

Section 43D (5) provides: "When an accused is charged with any offense under this Chapter or Chapter VI, the court shall not release him on bail or bond if there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accusation is prima facie true, unless the court is satisfied based on the material filed by the prosecution that the offense does not constitute a 'terrorist act' as defined in Section 15." This provision operates through several mechanisms [16]. First, it shifts the burden by requiring courts to assess whether the accusations prima facie appear true solely based on the prosecution's chargesheet and case diary. The accused cannot submit exculpatory evidence or cross-examine prosecution witnesses at the bail stage [17]. Courts are restricted from conducting what is sometimes termed a "mini trial," yet they must undertake sufficient assessment to determine whether accusations appear prima facie true. Second, the provision makes the presence of "reasonable grounds" for believing accusations appear prima facie true outcome-determinative [18]. If such grounds exist, bail must be refused without discretion. This represents a statutory displacement of the traditional judicial function of balancing competing interests in bail determinations [19].

2.3. Offences Covered by Section 43D (5)

The stringent bail provisions of Section 43D (5) apply to offences under Chapter IV (titled "Punishment for Terrorist Acts") and Chapter VI (titled "Punishment for Being a Member of a Terrorist Organisation"). Chapter IV encompasses direct participation in terrorist acts [20]. Chapter VI addresses membership in organisations declared unlawful or engaged in terrorist activities. Critically, Section 15 of UAPA defines "terrorist act" expansively. A terrorist act need not involve violence [21]. Instead, Section 15 permits classification of conduct as terrorism if committed with intent to "threaten or strike fear in the public" or to "compel" the government or any person "to do or abstain from doing any act. Acts intentionally creating risk to human life, destroying property, or disrupting essential services qualify if undertaken to threaten the public or compel governmental action. This expansive definition has proven consequential. In recent cases, courts have applied the definition to advocacy, protest, and disruptive conduct that falls short of conventional violence, effectively extending the UAPA's reach beyond terrorism to encompass political dissent.

3. The Watali Judgment: Establishing the Prima Facie Standard

3.1. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali's Case

Khanwilkar [3] represents the Supreme Court's first authoritative interpretation of Section 43D (5). Watali, a Kashmiri businessman, faced allegations of financing militant organisations and supporting terrorism. The High Court of Jammu and Kashmir granted him bail after considering the chargesheet and determining that, while suspicions existed, the evidence did not definitively establish his culpability as alleged. The Supreme Court reversed the bail grant, establishing what has become the touchstone of UAPA bail jurisprudence. The Court held that the threshold for determining whether accusations appear prima facie true under Section 43D (5) differs from the determinations required in ordinary criminal procedure. In ordinary cases, courts conduct a searching scrutiny of prosecution evidence to determine whether the accused should be confined before trial. Under Section 43D (5), the Court held that courts need only assess a lower degree—whether, viewing the prosecution's evidence at face value without critical analysis, the accusations appear prima facie true.

3.2. The Watali Principle

The principles laid down in National Investigation Agency v. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali have changed the landscape of bail jurisprudence under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA). The judgement created a restrictive framework that severely curtailed courts' discretion in favour of accused persons seeking bail. By requiring courts to accept the prosecution's claims at face value and limiting judicial review of evidence, the Supreme Court created a legal environment in which pre-trial detention was the rule rather than the exception. This approach has sparked considerable intellectual, judicial, and constitutional debate over the balance between national security objectives and the preservation of individual rights. The practical effect of the Watali case was to set a very high threshold for obtaining bail under UAPA. Unlike proceedings in the ordinary course of criminal law, where the courts are required to assess the quality of the evidence and whether there are reasonable grounds to believe the accused may ultimately be convicted, the Watali paradigm requires a significantly narrower inquiry. Courts are required to find merely whether the materials offered by the prosecution, if believed to be true, show a prima facie case. Therefore, the accused faces significant difficulties in contesting the prosecution's version at the bail stage, notwithstanding the reliability, credibility, or admissibility of the evidence relied upon by the investigating agencies.

This restricted view was founded on the Court's reading of Section 43D (5) of the UAPA, which bars bail where the accusations look prima facie to be accurate. The Court read the word "prima facie true" in a broad sense, that for the limited purpose of bail applications, the prosecution material should be accepted as true. Such an interpretation would tilt the balance substantially in favour of the state. In the normal course of events, the investigative agencies have exclusive possession of the evidence at the outset of a prosecution. Hence, the defendants are generally unable to counter the allegations effectively before trial. The result is protracted incarceration even when the evidence may be ultimately insufficient to sustain a conviction. Critics say the Watali concept contradicts one of the foundations of criminal jurisprudence: The presumption of innocence. The presumption of innocence remains in effect until conviction. Still, the practical application of the Watali standard can result in accused persons languishing in detention for years before their guilt is judicially confirmed. The complexity of UAPA prosecutions means trials can go slowly, resulting in long durations of incarceration. In these cases, the line between pre-trial detention and punishment becomes increasingly blurry. Even people who have not been convicted of any wrongdoing might be subject to serious restrictions on their liberty, work, education, family life, and social status.

The worry becomes very serious when viewed through the lens of India's fundamental commitment to personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court has frequently recognised that personal liberty plays a vital role within the constitutional system and that any loss of liberty must occur only in accordance with fair, just, and reasonable procedures. The approach of the Watali has also raised questions about the consistency between the constraints imposed on judicial inquiry at the bail stage and these constitutional safeguards. Many experts argue that such a structure, which requires the courts to accept the prosecution's claims without any significant inquiry, risks eroding the procedural fairness that Article 21 seeks to protect. Another significant criticism concerns the asymmetry generated between the prosecution and the defence. But in ordinary criminal procedure, bail hearings are an opportunity for courts to weigh conflicting arguments and assess whether continued imprisonment is justifiable. But the Watali judgement inhibits the defence's capacity to question the prosecution's version of events. The courts are not supposed to evaluate possible flaws in the evidence, contradictions in the witness testimonies, or other possibilities presented by the defendant.

The prosecution's story, therefore, has a preferential position in the preliminary stage of proceedings. At the same time, the defence is primarily limited to raising objections at trial, which may be years later. The impact of this framework extends beyond the individual cases and affects the general functioning of the criminal justice system. The stakes involved are undoubtedly high as UAPA offences are routinely implicated in instances involving terrorism, illicit actions, or risks to national security. The state has a legitimate interest in preventing serious crime and ensuring that those who pose a real threat to security do not escape prosecution. The difficulty, however, is to develop processes that provide sufficient protection for national security without compromising constitutional ideals. The Watali judgement has been challenged for tipping this balance too far towards security considerations over the benefits of liberty. The limited character of the Watali norm also raises concerns about investigative accountability. The possibility of judicial review at the bail stage in ordinary criminal cases provides an incentive for investigative agencies to ensure that the charges are supported by credible evidence. This precaution is weakened since courts are largely barred from analysing the weight of the evidence. Critics say such a structure might lead to the abuse of general allegations or unverified intelligence inputs.

While criminal proceedings are delayed, investigating agencies remain subject to examination during the trial. Still, any final acquittal may only come after years of imprisonment—the judicial responses after Watali demonstrated the decision's deep impact. Many courts took the judgement to impose a very heavy restriction on their authority to grant bail in UAPA cases. The bail applications were often dismissed because the prosecution had supplied material that, on the face of it, seemed sufficient to establish a prima facie case. The ensuing jurisprudence generally highlighted deference to investigative authorities and caution in cases implicating national security. Thus, securing bail became extremely difficult, further cementing the idea that UAPA charges carried a virtually automatic presumption against release. However, later court developments indicated a growing unease with the repercussions of an unduly strict application of the Watali principle. Increasingly, courts were faced with situations of protracted incarceration, delayed trials, and problems with the constitutional rights of the accused. In certain instances, judges attempted to distinguish Watali or to construe it in a manner that permitted some degree of judicial discretion. These improvements reflected an increasing awareness that rigorous adherence to the prosecution-centric approach can yield results inconsistent with broader constitutional norms.

Special emphasis has been paid to cases where the trial is unlikely to be completed within a reasonable time. It has long been held that the right of swift trial is an important part of Article 21. Where those charged with offences are held in custody for long periods without real progress in the proceedings, the justification for their continued incarceration becomes increasingly difficult to sustain. Thus, the courts have been forced to reconcile the legislative constraints imposed by section 43D (5) with the constitutional requirement to defend personal liberty. This tension has become one of the hallmarks of recent UAPA law. The Watali controversy also raises broader questions about the role of courts in protecting basic rights when security concerns are heightened. Democracy often needs to find a balance between community security and individual liberty. Anti-terrorism laws tend to give the state greater powers of investigation, detention, and prosecution. The gravity of the threats implicated may justify such capabilities, but also present the possibility of misuse or overreach. A key function of judicial scrutiny is to make sure that extraordinary powers do not escape constitutional constraints. Critics of Watali claim that the ruling undermined this supervisory function by severely limiting the scope of judicial inquiry at the bail stage.

However, supporters of the case claim the ruling reflects legislative purpose and the specific nature of terrorism-related acts. They argue that traditional bail standards may not apply to sophisticated criminal organisations, covert activities, or dangers to national security. Viewed in this light, the restrictions established by section 43D (5) constitute a conscious policy decision to prioritise public safety. According to this position, courts must follow the legislature's conclusion that certain offences require more stringent bail standards. However, the question of proportionality is important to the debate, even if such arguments are made. Constitutional adjudication typically involves balancing competing interests rather than prioritising one objective over another. The argument is that Watali's interpretation of section 43D (5) failed to balance the competing interests properly, rendering judicial review at the bail stage a symbolic gesture. The paradigm risks turning pre-trial detention into a common result of indictment rather than a thoroughly justified constraint on liberty by considering the prosecution's charges as presumptively true and inhibiting thorough review of evidence.

The importance of the Watali judgement thus far exceeds the immediate context of bail under UAPA. It raises deep questions about the relationship between statutory law and constitutional rights, the limits of judicial deference to investigative agencies, and the role of the courts in protecting liberty in criminal prosecutions. The case has become a flashpoint in debates over preventive detention, due process, and the presumption of innocence in modern criminal justice systems. Whether seen as a necessary measure for national security threats or as an undue restriction on individual rights, Watali is one of the most prominent and controversial rulings in contemporary Indian bail jurisprudence. Ultimately, the concept articulated in Watali reflects the continuing contradiction between security and liberty. The state has a legitimate duty to safeguard society from significant threats. Still, constitutional democracy demands that such protection be pursued within a framework that respects individual rights and the rule of law. The Watali principle continues to be a subject of ongoing judicial and intellectual engagement, indicating that this balance is still challenged. As courts confront new cases involving prolonged detention, delayed trials, and shifting interpretations of constitutional liberty, the legacy of Watali will continue to shape the evolution of bail jurisprudence under the UAPA and broader discussions of justice, fairness, and the protection of fundamental rights in India.

4. The Najeeb Exception: Article 21 as Constitutional Override

4.1. K.A. Najeeb's Case and Prolonged Detention

Kant [4] introduced a critical exception to the Watali principle. Najeeb, an undertrial prisoner, had languished in custody for over five years without trial. He was arrested in 2015 in connection with alleged activities supporting the Indian Mujahideen. His bail applications were repeatedly rejected under Section 43D (5) between 2016 and 2021, despite the complete absence of any meaningful progress toward trial. When the Kerala High Court finally granted Najeeb bail, the state appealed to the Supreme Court, insisting that Watali had foreclosed any bail when the accusations appeared prima facie true. The Additional Solicitor General argued that the stringent statutory scheme was precisely calibrated to ensure that no bail exceptions would operate in terrorism cases.

4.2. The Court's Recognition of Constitutional Limits

The Supreme Court, in a remarkable intervention, recognized that Section 43D (5), despite its seemingly absolute language, could not displace the constitutional guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21. The Court held that when trial delays cross the threshold of reasonableness—when an undertrial prisoner has served an unreasonably protracted period in custody—the right to speedy trial under Article 21 becomes engaged. Courts may then grant bail despite Section 43D (5)'s apparent embargo, using Article 21 violation as an independent ground for bail. The Najeeb judgment was significant for two reasons. First, it acknowledged that the statutory scheme could operate unconstitutionally if applied mechanically to deny bail indefinitely. Second, it recognised that courts possessed constitutional authority to grant bail when statutory restrictions violated fundamental rights—an authority that could not be entirely displaced by statute.

4.3. The Scope of the Najeeb Exception

Critically, however, the Najeeb Court declined to establish clear parameters for what constitutes unreasonable delay justifying bail. The judgment emphasised that courts must balance competing considerations: national security imperatives that justify stringent bail conditions and personal liberty rights that justify expeditious trials. The Court did not establish that any duration—three years, five years, seven years—automatically triggers Article 21 violations. The Najeeb judgment thus created what some have termed a "safety valve," allowing courts to grant bail in cases of egregious delay, while preserving the general operation of Section 43D (5) as a stringent bar to bail.

4.4. Recent Developments: The Delhi Riots Cases (2025-2026)

4.4.1. The Supreme Court's 2026 Judgment

In January 2026, the Supreme Court delivered a pivotal judgment addressing bail applications of individuals accused in connection with the northeast Delhi riots of 2020. Seven appellants had been denied bail by the Delhi High Court in September 2025 and appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court's decision revealed both the continued operation of the Watali framework and its limitations. The Court granted bail to five of the seven appellants, recognising that their alleged roles in the broader conspiracy were peripheral. The Court characterised their roles as "derivative," lacking autonomy or strategic control over the alleged conspiracy. For these individuals, despite the stringent statutory framework, continued incarceration was deemed disproportionate once investigation was complete and trial delays had extended beyond reasonable periods.

4.4.2. Bail Denied for Umar Khalid and Sharjeel Imam

However, the Court denied bail to two appellants—Umar Khalid and Sharjeel Imam—who had spent over five and a half years in custody without trial. The Court's reasoning proved controversial. Justice Kumar emphasised that delay in trial, while relevant to bail determinations generally, could not operate as an automatic "trump card" that displaces the statutory safeguards under Section 43D (5). The Court's decision rested significantly on an expansive interpretation of what constitutes a "terrorist act" under Section 15 of UAPA. The Court held that Section 15 should not be read narrowly to encompass only overt violence but should extend to conduct that disrupts essential services or poses threats to the economy through coordinated action. Under this broader reading, the alleged conduct—organising protests and advocating for causes in ways that disrupted traffic and essential services—qualified as "terrorist acts."

4.5. The Jurisprudential Problem

The Delhi Riots judgment created a significant jurisprudential problem. The Court simultaneously held that Najeeb established that Article 21 violations from trial delay could justify bail, yet refused to apply this principle to individuals who had served even longer in custody without trial than Najeeb. The Court distinguished the cases by reference to the seriousness of the allegations and the nature of the conspiracy, suggesting that more serious offences might justify prolonged detention without trial. However, this reasoning contradicts the Court's earlier statement in Sheikh Javed Iqbal v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2020), which held that, conversely, the seriousness of charges creates a heightened imperative for expeditious trials—more serious cases require faster resolution, not slower ones.

4.6. The Expansion of "Terrorist Act" Definition

4.6.1. From Violence to Disruption

A critical development in recent UAPA jurisprudence is the expanding definition of what constitutes a "terrorist act" under Section 43D (5). The Sanskriti IAS judgment in 2026 noted that the Court has adopted an expansive reading of Section 15, extending beyond traditional violent terrorism to encompass what might be termed "disruption terrorism"—coordinated activity designed to disrupt essential services or economic functioning. Under this reading, organised strikes, coordinated traffic blockades, and synchronised protest activity could constitute terrorist acts if undertaken with the intent to compel governmental action or to threaten the public. This expansion carries profound implications, effectively extending the UAPA's scope to encompass labour and protest activity that has historically been distinguished from terrorism.

4.6.2. Jurisprudential Questions

This expansion raises critical questions. If protest activity constitutes terrorism, has the UAPA transmogrified from a counter-terrorism statute into a suppression-of-dissent statute? If organising coordinated action with the intent to influence governmental policy qualifies as terrorism, have traditional rights of petition and assembly been effectively extinguished? The Delhi Riots judgment itself acknowledged these tensions. The Court noted that courts must examine whether the alleged conduct constitutes terrorism or is purely political activity. Yet the judgment then applied the broader terrorism definition to activity that fell substantially short of violent acts, suggesting that the theoretical acknowledgment of limits did not translate into practical constraint on the statute's application.

4.7. The Constitutional Paradox

4.7.1. Bail is the Rule, but Bail is Denied

Indian constitutional jurisprudence has long established that bail represents the rule while imprisonment represents the exception. Article 21 protects personal liberty as a fundamental right. The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed that restrictions on liberty require clear justification and must be applied proportionately to legitimate governmental interests. Yet the operation of Section 43D (5) inverts these principles. Bail becomes the exception and imprisonment the rule. The statutory provision shifts the burden to the accused, requires courts to refrain from critically examining evidence, and creates a presumption that those accused of terrorist offences will remain imprisoned pending trial, sometimes for years. The Constitution, it seems, may not permit what Section 43D (5) appears to require.36 Najeeb and Delhi Riots judgments attempted to navigate this paradox by suggesting that Article 21 provides a constitutional override mechanism. Yet the operation of this override has proven minimal and uncertain.

4.7.2. The Proportionality Puzzle

Modern constitutional law emphasises proportionality: restrictions on rights must be limited to what is reasonably necessary to achieve legitimate governmental purposes. National security represents a legitimate purpose. However, proportionality requires that restrictions be tailored narrowly to that purpose. Section 43D (5), as interpreted, does not appear to be narrowly tailored. The provision applies equally to peripheral actors and central conspirators, to individuals arrested years before trial and those arrested recently, to cases involving genuine terrorism and those involving political protest. The statute contains no mechanism for distinguishing serious cases from marginal ones or expeditiously trying cases to avoid indefinite detention. Comparatively, the history of the US and UK suggests that democratic countries confronted with genuine threats of terrorism have often favoured risk-based bail assessments over near-absolute limits on pre-trial release. Such regimes accept the undeniable importance of national security concerns but do not dispense with judicial discretion as a core part of criminal procedure. The fundamental reason is that courts can evaluate the facts of individual cases and attach conditions appropriate to the risks posed by individual accused persons. This is an endeavor to reconcile collective security with the basic rights of individuals awaiting trial.

The contrast with the Indian regime under Section 43D (5) of the UAPA is stark. While the US and UK permit courts to assess the strength of the evidence and the credibility of allegations, and to impose restrictive bail conditions, when necessary, the

Indian framework severely limits judicial discretion by directing courts to focus mainly on whether the allegations appear prima facie true. This difference has crucial implications for the protection of personal liberty. Where there is strong judicial discretion, courts can react flexibly to changing circumstances such as lengthy incarceration, failing health, insufficient evidence, or undue delays in trial proceedings. Section 43D (5) is restrictive, limiting the courts' power to take such factors into account. The systemic implications of this limited approach have become increasingly obvious over time. One of the most important consequences is the increasing number of undertrial convicts who serve long periods of time in jail, without a conclusive verdict on their guilt. UAPA prosecutions are usually complex, involving many witnesses, voluminous documentation, evidence, and procedural delays, and the trials take many years to resolve. During this time, accused persons may be detained in the absence of a judicial finding of guilt. It is essentially a sort of protracted confinement with major consequences for procedural fairness and constitutional safeguards.

The difficulty is compounded by the fact that acquittal and conviction rates do not necessarily correspond to the severity of bail restrictions. Many of those tried under anti-terror laws may eventually be acquitted on grounds of insufficient evidence, inaccurate witness testimony, procedural errors, or because the prosecution failed to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. But these people may have been in prison for years before they benefited from an acquittal. In practical terms, the ultimate acquittal cannot compensate for the years of liberty lost while the proceedings were pending. During extended periods of confinement, irrevocable harm may be inflicted upon employment possibilities, educational opportunities, family connections, social standing, and mental well-being. Many observers, therefore, have called the process itself a sort of punishment. Criminal justice systems have a long tradition of separating incarceration before trial from punishment after conviction. Pre-trial custody is meant to be preventive, not punitive, and is used to prevent flight, safeguard witnesses, or ensure public safety. But where incarceration is for many years and is difficult to contest because of constraints in statute law, the boundary between prevention and punishment becomes more difficult to draw. The accused may be subjected to repercussions equal to those of a punishment, even if they have never been convicted of an offence.

Also, extended imprisonment imposes serious practical disadvantages on the defence. To participate meaningfully in criminal proceedings, a person must have access to counsel, the ability to communicate with prospective witnesses, opportunities to gather exculpatory evidence, and proper trial preparation. There are significant hurdles to accomplishing these jobs for individuals incarcerated in prison. You may be barred from communicating with lawyers, denied access to papers, and severely limited in your capacity to research alternative explanations for the claimed action. Thus, prolonged detention can indirectly affect the accused's ability to defend himself against the charges. Prolonged detention can also impose a substantial psychological toll on the accused. The uncertainty of indefinite incarceration, coupled with the slow pace of court proceedings, may contribute to anxiety, sadness, and emotional anguish. At times, the defendant is driven to pursue legal techniques that are more motivated by the desire for a rapid release than by the objective merits of the defence. Those pressures create larger questions about the fairness and integrity of the criminal justice process.

The effects of protracted incarceration extend beyond the individual defendants to their families and communities. Family members often suffer financial hardship when the main breadwinner is locked up for a long time. Children can suffer educational and emotional effects, and spouses and parents can endure severe economic and psychological strain. These indirect impacts show that tight bail requirements impose social costs well beyond the courtroom. The Supreme Court’s ruling in Union of India v. K.A. Najeeb was an important attempt to resolve some of these concerns. The Court accepted that constitutional courts have the power to safeguard fundamental rights even where there are strong statutory limitations. If a trial is unlikely to be completed within a reasonable period, continuous imprisonment may violate the fundamental principle of personal liberty. The judgement, therefore, acknowledged that extraordinary delays can be a ground for the grant of bail notwithstanding the restrictions under Section 43D (5). This constitutional intervention is significant because it recognises that statutory constraints cannot, in their entirety, trump fundamental rights.

There are still many issues to be sorted out. The Najeeb case established a sweeping constitutional principle but did not provide an all-encompassing framework for assessing when delay is sufficiently excessive to warrant release. Such questions are still being decided on a case-by-case basis by the courts, leading to confusion and inconsistency. This reduces predictability in bail jurisprudence, as various courts may reach different outcomes for identical periods of imprisonment. Besides, the lack of appropriate institutional structures to ensure swift trials remains a key concern. The value of constitutional protection of the right to a quick trial rests on the effectiveness of procedural safeguards that can prevent unnecessary delay. Currently, the courts have few means to remedy systemic inefficiencies. Delays in investigations, a shortage of judicial staff, procedural adjournments, and logistical problems often result in lengthy hearings. Constitutional remedies may only go a short way in resolving the larger problem without structural reforms that hasten the adjudication of UAPA cases.

Consequently, some academics have called for revisions to reconcile national security needs with constitutional values. Possible measures include periodic judicial review of ongoing imprisonment, stiffer deadlines for investigation and trial completion, increased judicial oversight of prosecution delays, and wider use of conditional bail procedures. These measures would not take away the state's authority to prosecute major acts. Still, they would help guarantee that limits on liberty remain appropriate and justified throughout the course of criminal proceedings. In the end, the experience of Section 43D (5) demonstrates the delicate task of balancing security and liberty in contemporary democracies. The state unquestionably has a strong interest in preventing terrorism and ensuring public safety. At the same time, constitutional government requires that even those accused of the most heinous acts be afforded fundamental procedural rights. The experience of other democratic countries demonstrates that effective security measures and real judicial discretion can be complementary. As the arguments around UAPA continue to grow, the search for a more balanced framework is crucial to upholding both national security and the constitutional commitment to individual liberty and the rule of law.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The jurisprudence of bail under UAPA reveals a legal system struggling to reconcile legitimate security concerns with constitutional commitments to personal liberty. The Supreme Court has acknowledged constitutional limits on the statutory embargo through its recognition in Najeeb that Article 21 violations can justify bail even in UAPA cases. Yet the practical application of these limits has proven marginal, as illustrated by the Delhi Riots judgment denying bail despite extraordinary trial delays. Several recommendations emerge from this analysis. First, the Court should establish clearer parameters for what constitutes an unreasonable trial delay justifying bail. Rather than ad hoc determinations, the Court should consider adopting presumptive timelines—perhaps two to three years for trial completion in UAPA cases—beyond which bail becomes virtually mandatory. Second, the Court should narrow the definition of "terrorist act" in Section 15 to encompass conduct involving genuine violence or explicit threats of violence, rather than extending it to encompass political protest and organised labour activity. This narrowing would restore the UAPA to its proper counter-terrorism purpose while preserving constitutional rights of assembly and petition. Third, Parliament should consider amending Section 43D (5) to incorporate bail discretion in cases where trials are delayed beyond reasonable periods, or where the accused has served substantial pre-trial detention time.

The provision could be modified to require courts to consider unreasonable delay as a factor in bail determinations, creating a safety valve while preserving the statute's core purpose. Fourth, the National Judicial Academy should develop enhanced training for judges addressing UAPA bail determinations, including instruction on adolescent development, bail risk assessment, and the distinction between terrorism and political expression. Finally, the Supreme Court should consider undertaking a comprehensive review of UAPA implementation, examining conviction rates, trial completion times, and patterns of bail grants and denials. Empirical data could illuminate whether the statute achieves its purposes or whether it has transmogrified into an instrument of indefinite detention divorced from security imperatives. The balance between security and liberty is not a zero-sum game. Democratic nations can maintain robust counter-terrorism frameworks while preserving constitutional guarantees of personal liberty and the right to a speedy trial. India's courts have demonstrated the capacity to navigate this balance thoughtfully, as illustrated by Najeeb and the bail grants in the Delhi Riots cases. The challenge ahead is to expand and clarify the contours of constitutional oversight, ensuring that the exceptional measures justified by genuine terrorism threats do not become the ordinary machinery of democratic suppression.

Acknowledgment: The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. B. R. Ambedkar College of Law and Vignan Institute of Law for providing the academic environment, facilities, and support necessary for conducting this research. The authors also extend their appreciation to the faculty and staff for their guidance, assistance, and encouragement throughout this study.

Data Availability Statement: The data underlying the findings of this study may be obtained from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to applicable privacy considerations and ethical requirements.

Funding Statement: No external funding or financial assistance was received for the conduct of this research.

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The authors affirm that there are no conflicts of interest associated with this study.

Ethics and Consent Statement: This research was carried out in accordance with established ethical principles and received approval from the appropriate institutional review board.

References

1. Ministry of Home Affairs, "Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967," *Government of India*, 1967. [Accessed by 12/04/2025].
2. Apni Law, "Bail under UAPA: Why it's so difficult and what courts have said (Section 43D (5))," 2025. [Accessed by 12/04/2026].

3. A. M. Khanwilkar, “National Investigation Agency vs. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali, on 2 April, 2019,” *Indian Kanoon*, 2019. [Accessed by 12/04/2025].
4. S. Kant, “Union of India vs. K. A. Najeeb on 1 February, 2021,” *Indian Kanoon*, 2021. [Accessed by 12/04/2025].
5. G. Bhatia, “Eyes wide shut: The Supreme Court’s bail order in the Delhi riots cases,” *Constitutional Law and Philosophy*, 2026. [Accessed by 14/04/2026].
6. S. Deswal, “Bail under the UAPA and preventive detention laws: A legal and jurisprudential analysis,” *Research on Remedies and Rights Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 207–214, 2025.
7. R. Chitkara, “The trials of bail: Pre-trial presumption of innocence under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 and general criminal laws,” *National Law School of India Review*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 139–168, 2024.
8. Sanskriti IAS, “Supreme Court on UAPA, *bail and terrorist acts*,” 2026. [Accessed by 17/04/2026].
9. A. Menon, “Reimagining bail jurisprudence: Lessons on Secti on 43D (5),” *P39A Criminal Law Blog*, 2021. [Accessed by 17/04/2025].
10. V. Vajiram and R. Ravi, “Granting bail in UAPA cases,” 2024. [Accessed by 17/04/2025].
11. R. Ridhi, “Supreme Court illuminates on bail under Section 43D (5) of UAPA against CrPC,” *SCC Online*, 2024. [Accessed by 19/04/2025].
12. Union of India, “The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967,” *Indian Kanoon*, 1967. [Accessed by 19/04/2025].
13. P. Jain, “Dissent behind bars: Unpacking the Delhi riots bail Judgment, *Live Law*, 2026. [Accessed by 21/04/2026].
14. S. Kadam, “Bail under UAPA: Does the new SC judgment offer a ray of hope?” *Citizens for Justice and Peace*, 2021. [Accessed by 21/04/2025].
15. A. Singh, “Case comment: Union of India v. K.A. Najeeb (2021) 3 SCC 713,” *International Journal of Legal Research and Analysis*, vol. 2, no. 7, pp. 1–10, 2021.
16. C. Gera, “Union of India v K.A. Najeeb (2021) 3 SCC 713,” *Record of Law*, 2025. [Accessed by 21/04/2026].
17. Arvind Dham vs Directorate of Enforcement, “Right to speedy trial under Article 21,” *Supreme Court Observer*, 2026. [Accessed by 25/04/2026].
18. Centre for Justice and Peace, “Not proscribed, not prima facie: The labyrinth of bail under UAPA,” 2025. [Accessed by 25/04/2026].
19. R. Kruthika, “Bail under UAPA can be granted if the accused’s trial has been delayed,” Supreme Court Observer, 2024. [Accessed by 26/04/2025].
20. Legal Information Institute, “18 U.S. Code § 3142 – Release or detention of a defendant pending trial,” 2011. [Accessed by 26/04/2025].
21. The Vasantam, “Landmark ruling on bail under Section 43D (5) UAPA: Accused-specific inquiry and role-based differentiation,” 2026. [Accessed by 28/04/2026].