

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL
RESEARCH

(ISSN: 2583-7753)

Volume 2 | Issue 2

2024

© 2024 *LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research*

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com
Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact info.lijdlr@gmail.com

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research**, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

BHOPAL GAS TRAGEDY: THE ESCAPE OF WARREN ANDRESON FROM INDIA

*Anisha Parveen*¹

I. ABSTRACT

One of the worst industrial accidents that has ever happened in the world is Bhopal Gas Tragedy. During December 1984 night a poisonous gas leaked from Union Carbide India Limited plant in Bhopal Madhya Pradesh. The leaking gas caused thousands of deaths and severe health conditions to many others. A US firm called Union Carbide Corporation possessed the factory where Warren Anderson acted as its CEO by then.

Anderson went straight to India after the calamity, and Anderson was arrested by the Madhya Pradesh police for negligence causing deaths. Nevertheless, they released him some hours later on bail and he immediately left India. His sudden departure generated a lot of debate among many people who viewed it as a failure to deliver justice to victims. It is believed that political and diplomatic pressure also contributed towards helping Anderson escape so easily.

He never made any attempts to go back to India in order to face the charges. The Indian courts endeavoured to summon him multiple times, even declaring him an absconder but Anderson spent his remaining days living in America where he was not put on trial for any crimes committed within India's jurisdiction. His flight revealed loopholes in the Indian legal system especially when dealing with influential corporations. To date, the Bhopal Gas Tragedy victimizes still feel agonizingly incomplete about how Andersen managed to run away without ever being tried.

II. KEYWORDS:

Bhopal Gas Tragedy, Warren Andreson, legal accountability, Union Carbide Corporation.

¹ Jamia Hamdard, New Delhi

III. INTRODUCTION

On December 1984, like any other normal night, it was also a normal night for Bhopal. In Bhopal, there was an insecticide manufacturing factory where some workers were working. It was nearly midnight suddenly some workers complained that their eyes were burning. They assumed that it was a gas leak and of course the workers started investigating to look for the source of the gas leak. The worker told his supervisor what he saw but the supervisor thought that it was water leaking and these types of minor leaks were common at a plant of that scale, it was not unusual. Supervisors decided to check it out after their tea break so like every night the workers went for their tea break at about noon in the night. But by 12:45 am the smell had become pungent. The workers realised that not only there was a strong smell, but their eyes were also burning badly, and they had a bad bout of coughing too. Over the next 2 hours, this gas spread all over Bhopal carried by air it got inside homes and over the next 2 days thousands of people lost their lives in this disaster which is known as the Bhopal gas tragedy. Final death was estimated to be around 15,000 and 6 lakh people suffered injuries and around 20,000 people also died prematurely in the next two decades.

“This was the first industrial disaster of independent India. It is believed to be the most dangerous industrial disaster in the world. But the question was, who was responsible for it? Ultimately, who should be responsible for this incident, just after this disaster, Union Carbide Corporation [UCC] washed its hands of it and blamed Union Carbide India Limited [UCIL] entirely for the whole incident, stating that the plant was wholly built and operated by UCIL”.² “Even when November 16, 1988, the magistrate of Bhopal, India issued a warrant for the arrest of the former Chair of the Board, Warren Andreson, and two company officials and the manslaughter and other charges mentioned previously were increased to felony murder.”³

Four days after this incident, on December 7, the company’s chairman Warren Andreson, arrived in India. Upon his arrival, he was immediately arrested in Bhopal

² I.P.S Rajiv Ahir, ‘A Brief History of Modern India’ [29th Revised and Enlarged Edition 2023]

³ R. Clayton Trotter, Susan G. Day and Amy E. Love, ‘Bhopal, India and Union Carbide: The Second Tragedy’ (1989) 8(6) JSTOR < <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25071921> >

along with two company officials. Instead of being taken to the police station, they were kept in the company's guest house. After a few hours of house arrest, Anderson was granted bail mysteriously, and he was escorted to Bhopal airport in official cars. From there, he was flown to Delhi with special plane, and same day he left India, never return to face any trail. From here where all the conspiracy theories begin.

IV. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To analyse the Bhopal gas tragedy case Union Carbide Corporation vs Union of India, (1991)
- To understand the evolution of strict liability.

V. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What were the legal and political circumstances that allowed Warren Anderson to escape from India following the Bhopal Gas Tragedy? Why was he released from house arrest? What were the reasons for granting bail? Who approved his bail? who aided him in leaving from Bhopal to Delhi and then from Delhi to the US? Who helped Anderson?

- What are the principle of strict and absolute liability?
- What were the acts that formed after Bhopal gas tragedy and how absolute liability evolved in India?

VI. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Warren Anderson's escape from India was facilitated by both international political pressures and domestic legal inadequacies, highlighting significant challenges in holding multinational corporations accountable for industrial disasters.

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper utilizes a strictly doctrinal research approach. Doctrinal research, known as library-based research, primarily involves the study and analysis of legal statutes,

case law, and academic writings. This method is ideal for exploring the theoretical and conceptual dimensions of law. It systematically presents legal doctrines and principles. In doctrinal research, primary sources include statutory materials, judicial decisions, and authoritative literature. Secondary sources like commentaries, articles, and legal summaries are also essential. The research process entails identifying, gathering, and critically evaluating these sources. The goal is to form logical conclusions and provide insights on the legal questions being studied. This paper aims to deliver a thorough and unified view of the legal structure relevant to the topic addressed.

VIII. LITERATURE REVIEW

“According to INDIA TODAY, several reports have suggested that the government of PM Rajiv Gandhi was pressured by the US to let Anderson go. Further in this report, it is revealed that Arjun Singh who was the chief minister of Madhya Pradesh at that time, he wrote in his autobiography [A Grain of Sand in the Hourglass of Time] that home secretary R.D. Pradhan called him on the instruction of the Union home minister P.V. Narasimha Rao. In this call, approval for Anderson’s bail was given. When R.D. Pradhan was questioned, he denied the allegation, he clarified that he was the chief secretary of Maharashtra at that time. Apart from this Moti Singh, the Bhopal collector during the disaster, said that Anderson escaped by using a phone in his room where he communicate people in US, “Had we removed the landline phone from his room, Anderson would not have escaped. He possibly made calls to contacts in the US to help him leave India” Singh added.”⁴

“The US embassy pressured the Indian government, leading to Anderson's release on a personal bond of ₹25,000. He never came back for trial and was declared a fugitive by Indian courts. Rights activists blame successive governments for failing to extradite him, as he was held responsible for around 15,000 deaths. Over half a million people were injured by the gas, with many dying slowly from illnesses like lung cancer, kidney failure, and liver disease. Swaraj Puri, who was Bhopal's Superintendent of

⁴AtMigration. ‘Bhopal gas tragedy: How Warren Anderson got away from our grasp’ [INDIA TODAY, 1 November, 2014] <<https://www.indiatoday.in/india/north/story/bhopal-gas-tragedy-warren-anderson-union-carbide-dow-chemicals-rajiv-gandhi-congress-arjun-singh-225398-2014-11-01> >

Police in 1984, said that Anderson was initially arrested based on a written order but later released based on an oral order. "We arrested him on the basis of a written order but released him on an oral order," Puri told the Union Carbide Toxic Gas Leakage Enquiry Commission. He added that the oral order came "from higher-ups".⁵

"Even when November 16, 1988, the magistrate of Bhopal, India issued a warrant for the arrest of the former Chair of the Board, Warren Andreson, and two company officials and the manslaughter and other charges mentioned previously were increased to felony murder charges. On this warrant Union Carbide Corporation claim that Indian magistrate has no jurisdiction over Warren Andreson, or the Union Carbide Corporation."⁶

"Pilot who flew Anderson to Delhi reveals 'flight authorized by CM'. This article was published in The Times of India, in which the pilot who flew Anderson to Delhi reveals many things that somewhere prove that our government was involved in helping Anderson escape from India. 'Flight authorised by CM' this is what the pilot, Captain Sayed Hafiz Ali, revealed before the retired Justice S.L. Kochhar commission. "Orders for flying out the VIP passenger came from the then director of state aviation captain R C Sodhi," captain Ali said, ending the 30-year-old controversy over Anderson's safe passage from Bhopal, just hours after his arrival. "It was only after landing the aircraft at Delhi airport that we came to know that the passenger we ferried from Bhopal was Anderson. For us it was a routine flight," captain Ali told TOI. He further said that "We usually don't interact with passengers. I remember a senior police officer (then superintendent of police Swaraj Puri) coming to drop Anderson at the state hangar and then an unknown person came to receive him at Delhi airport. I went to drop him at the airport, but we did not talk. He got into the car and went away." Several requests made through RTIs to obtain information about the use of a state plane to transport Anderson were denied by the state aviation department in recent years. The reason given was that the matter is decades old. But

⁵ AtMigration. 'Bhopal gas tragedy: How Warren Andreson got away from our grasp' [INDIA TODAY, 1 November, 2014] <<https://www.indiatoday.in/india/north/story/bhopal-gas-tragedy-warren-anderson-union-carbide-dow-chemicals-rajiv-gandhi-congress-arjun-singh-225398-2014-11-01> >

⁶ R. Clayton Trotter, Susan G. Day and Amy E. Love, 'Bhopal, India and Union Carbide: The Second Tragedy' (1989) 8(6) JSTOR < <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25071921> >

the applicant wanted to know details such as the file approving the flight, the person authorizing it, and the passengers onboard.”

IX. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND / EVOLUTION

“In the 1970s, the Indian government encouraged foreign investments to boost local industries. The company Union Carbide Corporation, which manufactured a famous pesticide called Sevin, was requested to start operating a plant in India. The Indian Government held 22% of the shares and most of them belonged to domestic investors. The transportation convenience occasioned by its setting in central Bhopal made it an ideal factory location. The plant’s location was close to residential areas; and just three kilometres away from the railway station and bus stand. Nevertheless, city officials would have preferred if the plant relocated to the far outskirts citing safety measures but this plea fell on deaf ears. Non-hazardous industrial developments were meant for this particular zone where that plant had been located. Market competition forced the company into using an improved but more perilous process for producing Sevin. By 1984, there was very little interest in pesticides and the factory operated at only 25% capacity. Cereal crop failures, lack of buyers and increasing debts affected negatively on these plants' financial performance. Managers were told to close down the unprofitable plant and sell it instead as per directive. However, even with substandard safety measures taken, this facility remained operational.

The gas started its leakage into the atmosphere on 2nd December, 1984 between 11.00-11.30 pm and at this time the pressure of the storage tank had also risen. Vent-gas, safety equipment was not functioning as it had been turned off three weeks earlier. The system makes the toxic discharges to be harmless. Another mistake is about a valve used for washing that failed thereby resulting in mixing water with 40 tons of Methyl Isocyanate. The refrigerator which acted as a coolant for MIC was also ineffective as it was being used by some other plants too. Since there were two hours before this one could hear the sound of voices echoing all around and that until morning poisonous MIC gas hung over the air.

Within a few hours, dead bodies of people were scattered all over the streets; buffalo, cows, dogs, etc., lay dead on roads.[3] It is estimated that around 3800 people died instantly and most of them belonged to slum-dwellers living near the factory.[1] During such a tragic period, hospitals would be overcrowded with victims during this incident was rated as the worst industrial tragedy ever recorded. In addition to thousands dying, one government report announced exposure of half a million to poisonous gas.”⁷

A. Causes / Effect

Cause of Leakage -

Following reason contributed to the Bhopal tragedy :

- “An inspection team from Danbury, United States, visited the Bhopal plant and identified 61 safety issues. Among these, 31 were considered major problems.
- The main refrigeration and cooling system at the Bhopal plant was shut down 150 days before the accident. This shutdown significantly increased the risk of a chemical leak, as these systems were crucial for maintaining safe conditions during the storage and handling of hazardous materials.
- To reduce costs, the number of workers at the Bhopal plant was reduced. This likely led to fewer personnel available to manage operations, maintain safety protocols, and respond to emergencies, further compromising the safety of the plant.
- Additionally, the unskilled workers at the Bhopal plant were not provided with specialized training. As a result, they lacked the necessary knowledge and understanding of the potential consequences of their actions, which further increased the risk of an accident.

⁷ Menon, A. (2021, July 20). Bhopal Gas Catastrophe: A Critical analysis of tragedy and its impact on the Human Rights of Victims. Libertatem Magazine.< <https://libertatem.in/blog/bhopal-gas-catastrophe-a-critical-analysis-of-tragedy-and-its-impact-on-the-human-rights-of-victims/> >

- During the night shift at the Bhopal plant, there was no supervisor present. This lack of supervision during a critical time further compromised safety, as there was no experienced personnel to oversee operations or respond to potential issues.
- The pressure control valve of Tank E610 at the Bhopal plant had not been functioning properly for over a month. This malfunction was a critical safety issue, as the valve was essential for maintaining safe pressure levels within the tank, and its failure contributed to the catastrophic gas leak.
- There was negligence on the part of the maintenance authorities at the Bhopal plant. They failed to properly maintain critical equipment, and there was no backup plan in place to handle emergencies, leaving the plant unprepared for the disaster that occurred.”⁸

B. Effect on health

- “Ophthalmic problems – The MIC gas affected people's eyes, causing discomfort and pain. It led to symptoms like burning sensations, watery eyes, sensitivity to light (photophobia), redness, and swollen eyelids.
- Respiratory and Pulmonary problems – Breathing in MIC gas caused serious problems like shortness of breath, a feeling of suffocation, and chest pain. When doctors examined some victims, they found that their respiratory organs had suffered severe damage, including areas where the tissue had died (necrotizing lesions).
- Reproductivity Toxicity – The gas leak posed significant risks to unborn babies. It wasn't just the gas itself that increased these dangers, but also other factors like the stress experienced by pregnant women and the medications they might have taken”⁹.

⁸ Rai, D. (2019, July 30). Everything you need to know about the Bhopal Gas Tragedy. iPleaders. <<https://blog.ipleaders.in/bhopal-gas-tragedy-case-study-2/>>

⁹ Rai, D. (2019, July 30). Everything you need to know about the Bhopal Gas Tragedy. iPleaders. <<https://blog.ipleaders.in/bhopal-gas-tragedy-case-study-2/>>

C. Litigation

“Union Carbide Corporation vs Union of India, (1991) 4 SCC 548. As a result of the increasing backlog of lawsuits being handled in the courts, the Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985 (commonly known as the Bhopal Act) was passed into law on March 29, 1985. The Central government has been given the exclusive authority to represent and act (in India or abroad) on behalf of claimants regarding the Bhopal gas leak under the Bhopal Act. By virtue of this provision, the Central Government was able to represent and take legal action on behalf of claimants. The Central Government was able to act as the "parent of the nation," or "parens patriae," and advocate for those who had been harmed by the gas spill. The government may be partially liable for the accident because it owns a stake in UCIL. The government's actions were deemed an attempt to avoid responsibility by blocking victims from taking legal action. The Supreme Court was asked to rule on the constitutionality of this law, and it agreed that it should be allowed to remain in effect. UCC was sued by the federal government in the United States' Southern District Court in New York. The complaint claimed that the Indian courts were powerless to handle the case and that the subject should instead be heard in American courts. Still, the company made a concerted effort to have the lawsuit handled in Indian Courts, even though it knew the compensation would be far higher if the case were heard in American Courts. Because the claims were filed in the wrong court, the judge dismissed them.

At September 1986, the Indian government filed a complaint in a district court in Bhopal, demanding 3.5 billion rupees in interim compensation. Later, the Madhya Pradesh High Court reduced the amount to 2.5 billion Indian rupees. UCC has asked the Supreme Court to review their case. After the Bhopal gas disaster, the court ordered UCC to pay 470 million dollars, which is equivalent to around 750 crore rupees. This was to satisfy all claims, rights, and liabilities related to and originating from the disaster. All civil actions were closed, and criminal proceedings were dismissed per the terms of the settlement.

Compensation from the government was initially requested at the three billion US dollar mark; however, the company eventually settled for only \$470.5 million. Those who have lost a loved one or are permanently disabled will find the sum to be grossly inadequate. Since the criminal procedures were dropped and an excessive amount of compensation was paid, this settlement was widely panned. The Supreme Court merged numerous petitions, revived the criminal proceedings, and ruled that the state must make up any deficiency in compensation in 1989.

For the victims' economic, social, and environmental recovery, the central government approved a budget of 258 crore rupees in 1990, the first year of the first five-year plan. Seven ex-employees, including UCIL's former chairman, were found guilty of causing death by carelessness in a Bhopal court in June 2010 and sentenced to two years in prison and fines totalling \$2,000 USD.”¹⁰

D. Principle of Strict and Absolute Liability

- **Strict liability**

“The case of Rylands vs. Fletcher, which took place in 1868, is credited with being the catalyst for the development of the rule of strict liability. If someone (the defendant) maintains or takes dangerous substances onto his premises, then that person will be held accountable under this principle if the substances leave the premises and cause harm to another individual (plaintiff). The defendant does not want to cause harm to another person, despite the fact that there is no evidence of negligence on his part. This indicates that the primary responsibility for culpability is with the individual who stores the potentially dangerous chemicals.

Even the excuse that it was an accident that could not have been avoided is not a valid defense in these kinds of scenarios. The legal concept for this idea is the "principle of strict liability." In addition, the defendant always has the responsibility of bearing the burden of proof in cases involving strict liability. This indicates that the defendant needs to present evidence to justify why he should not be required to pay for the

¹⁰ (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from < <https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical-analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat> >

damages. In addition, it is not necessary to provide evidence of blame, negligence, or intent. The burden of proof lies with the claimant, who must demonstrate both the existence of the tort and the defendant's liability for it."¹¹

E. **Absolute liability and its necessity in India**

"The amendments to the strict liability doctrine that were established in *Rylands vs. Fletcher* contributed to the establishment of the absolute liability doctrine in India, which precluded defendants from raising any defense against the payment of compensation. These amendments are as follows to the strict liability doctrine that was established in *Rylands vs. Fletcher*.

- If an industry or company is engaging in any activity that is inherently harmful, then the defendants (the owners of the industry) will not have any defense or exception, and they will be totally liable to pay compensation to the person that was damaged as a result of the action.
- The business sector or industry will be held accountable for any and all potential harms or repercussions that may be a direct result of the activity. As a consequence of this, businesses in these types of industries will be forced to supply their employees with safety equipment in order to lower the likelihood that their employees will be involved in an accident. As a consequence of this, the interests of the workers will be protected, and a safe atmosphere in which they may carry out their jobs will be provided for them.

As this limits how the Doctrine of Absolute Liability can be used, the fact that there is a chance to get away, which is a key part of strict liability, can be ignored here. Often, dangerous things like poisonous fumes can get out of an industry's building, but they can still hurt the people who work there. In this case, workers won't be denied their right to get paid. So, this principle needs to be used in a broader way, leaving no room for escape.

¹¹ (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from <<https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical-analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat>>

The Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991 is another act that aims to help people quickly who have been hurt by accidents that happened while they were handling dangerous substances. It also covers things that are related to or happen because of the other acts. One part of the Act says that the owner of an industrial unit must buy one or more insurance policies before starting to work with a dangerous substance and must continue to do so regularly until the policies' terms expire. This part of the law says that owners of industrial units must follow the law. It will let people who have been hurt by these kinds of things get money right away, and it won't stop them from asking for more money in the future. The law recognizes the idea of "absolute liability," which is also called "no-fault liability."

Our country is a pioneer in industrial development, and with complexity in life and geography, no-fault liability must be harsher and more absolute.

In addition, Ryland's v. Fletcher's strict responsibility theory was developed in the 19th century, and in the midst of the industrial revolution, this two-century-old tortuous liability principle cannot be applied without change.

Our country is on the verge of becoming one of the world's most globalized, thus the participation of multinational corporations (MNCs) causes both praise and concern. The protection of human rights and lives should be considered due to the rising complexity and nature of industrial development and the industrial sector's large contribution to our GDP. Therefore, strict responsibility cannot be the only principle of redress. "This rule evolved in the 19th Century at a time when all these developments of science and technology had not taken place cannot afford any guidance in evolving any standard of liability consistent with the constitutional norms and the needs of the present day economy and social structure," Bhagwati J. stated in *M. C. Mehta v. Union of India*. We shouldn't feel constrained by this rule, which was developed in a different economy. To meet society's changing requirements and the nation's economic growth, law must grow. The law must adapt to new situations. Law can't stand still. In a highly industrialized economy, we need new ideas and norms to address new issues. "We cannot allow our judicial reasoning to be constrained by reference to the law as it prevails in England or any other foreign country." Because

hazardous and fundamentally dangerous businesses are vital for industrial progress, they must take responsibility for protecting people from accidents and other dangers. "Such hazardous or inherently dangerous activity for private profit can be tolerated only on condition that the enterprise engaged in such activity indemnifies all those who suffer on account of the carrying on of such activity regardless of whether it is carried on carefully or not," Justice Bhagwati said. "The enterprise alone has the resources to find and guard against hazards or dangers and to provide warning against prospective hazards," also observed. From the above, such a theory is essential to shaping our jurisprudence and avoiding strict responsibility in modern society.

Thus, the necessity element stated above helps us see that the principle of absolute liability is needed to defend core human rights, develop tort law in India, and grow our country's jurisprudence."¹²

F. Judicial precedents

- Rylands vs Fletchers (1868)

Background: Rylands Vs. Fletcher is a landmark torts case. The 1868 English decision established Strict Liability for unreasonably unsafe conditions and activities. Many nuisance and negligence cases were decided after this case. Negligence can result in liability. Strict liability holds a person responsible for the harm they cause without considering carelessness, mens rea, or distant culpability.

Facts: Fletcher lived near Rylands. Rylands built a reservoir for his mill's water. He hired independent contractors and engineers. Fletcher lost a lot of money when the private contractor broke the shafts to his mine, flooding it. Fletcher sued Rylands for damages.

Issues raised: Negligence and nuisance, damage to neighbours' property Injury to human, Liability of the owner. It was unclear whether the plaintiff was entitled to compensation.

¹² (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from < <https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical-analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat> >

Judgement according to the (i) Exchequer chambers- The Court of Exchequer Chamber found Rylands responsible for Fletcher's injuries. The defendant a duty of care to the risk he took by using his land unnaturally and bringing any object that was not harmful at the time but would be dangerous if it escaped. Even if the defendant was unaware that shafts could lead water into the plaintiff's mine, he is liable. (ii) House of lords: The appellant argued that an independent contractor and engineer inspected the construction. The appellant was not involved. Construction security was unknown to him. The appellant was accountable for the harm because he introduced a risky item to his premises. Fletcher was compensated.

Justice Blackburn observed that "The rule of law is that the person who for his own purpose, brings on his land and collects and keeps there anything likely to do mischief if it escapes, must keep it at his own risk; and if he does not do so, he is prima facie answerable for all the damage which is the natural consequence of its escape."

A person is liable because he maintained a harmful thing on his land that escaped and caused damage."¹³

- MC Mehta vs Union of India (1987)

MC Mehta, a social activist lawyer, petitioned to close Shriram Industries because it manufactured hazardous compounds in a highly populated area of Delhi. On December 4 and 6, 1985, Shreeram Foods and Fertilizers spilled oleum gas, harming several people. The Delhi Legal Aid & Advice Board and Delhi Bar Association sought compensation for gas spill victims. These joined MC Mehta's petition.

The Doctrine of Absolute Liability was created by a five-judge Supreme Court Constitution Bench that rejected the Strict Liability Principle. Hazardous or intrinsically risky businesses are exempt from the strict liability rule and its exceptions. The court subsequently ordered the petitioning organizations to sue the industry within two months to seek compensation for the victims. The Court noted that the strict liability rule originated in England in the 19th century before these

¹³ (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from <<https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical-analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat>>

scientific and technological advances. Modern issues in a highly industrialized economy require new concepts and conventions. Thus, the Court might create a new regulation that suits India's current social and economic situations."¹⁴

X. CONCLUSION

So, this was the story of the Bhopal Gas Tragedy and the conspiracy theories behind Anderson's escape. Well, in September 2014, Anderson passed away in the US. Over the past three decades, many litigations and appeals were filed, and compensations were provided to the victims, but some still seek justice because those affected by this tragedy still consider Anderson guilty. As much as Anderson was responsible for the enormity of the crime he committed, those whose actions allowed him to escape from India share a similar burden of guilt. However, the entire truth of this incident seems to have been somewhat lost in history.

XI. REFERENCES

A. Books / Commentaries / Journals Referred

- A. I.P.S Rajiv Ahir, 'A Brief History of Modern India' [29th Revised and Enlarged Edition 2023]
- B. R. Clayton Trotter, Susan G. Day and Amy E. Love, 'Bhopal, India and Union Carbide: The Second Tragedy' (1989) 8(6) JSTOR <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25071921> >
- C. R. Clayton Trotter, Susan G. Day and Amy E. Love, 'Bhopal, India and Union Carbide: The Second Tragedy' (1989) 8(6) JSTOR<<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25071921> >

B. Online Articles / Sources Referred

- A. AtMigration. 'Bhopal gas tragedy: How Warren Anderson got away from our grasp' [INDIA TODAY, 1 November, 2014] <<https://www.indiatoday.in/india/north/story/bhopal-gas-tragedy-warren-anderson-union-carbide-dow-chemicals-rajiv-gandhi-congress-arjun-singh-225398-2014-11-01> >
- B. (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from <<https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical->

¹⁴ (N.d.). Retrieved August 20, 2024, from <<https://www.ijlra.com/paper-details.php?isuurl=critical-analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat> >

[analysis-of-bhopal-gas-tragedy-in-relation-to-evolution-of-absolute-liability-by-shreyansh-dumawat](#) >

- C. Menon, A. (2021, July 20). Bhopal Gas Catastrophe: A Critical analysis of tragedy and its impact on the Human Rights of Victims. *Libertatem Magazine*.
<<https://libertatem.in/blog/bhopal-gas-catastrophe-a-critical-analysis-of-tragedy-and-its-impact-on-the-human-rights-of-victims/>>
- D. Desk, N. N. (2017, February 7). NDTV. NDTV.
<<https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/bhopal-gas-leak-fresh-warrant-against-2-who-helped-warren-anderson-escape-1656663>>
- E. The Meghalayan Bureau. (2022, December 3). Looking Back: Rajiv Gandhi's hand ensured Union Carbide chief Warren Anderson's escape. *The Meghalayan*.
<<https://themeghalayan.com/looking-back-rajiv-gandhis-hand-ensured-union-carbide-chief-warren-andersons-escape/>>

C. Cases Referred

- a. Rylands vs Fletchers LR 3 HL 330
- b. MC Mehta vs Union of India (1987) AIR 1988 SC 1037; (1987) 4 SCC 463

D. Statutes Referred

- a. The Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991