



ISSN: 2583-7753

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 1

2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.74>

© 2026 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](#)

MOB LYNCHING AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY: A CRITICAL LEGAL ANALYSIS

Aujlaan Hamid¹

I. ABSTRACT

*Mob lynching has emerged as one of the most disturbing manifestations of collective violence in contemporary societies. It refers to acts of violence committed by a group of individuals against a person suspected of wrongdoing without lawful authority or judicial sanction. Such incidents often arise from rumours, communal tensions, or identity-based prejudice and frequently result in severe injury or death. In recent years, India has witnessed several incidents of mob violence triggered by misinformation circulated through digital platforms and social networks. These developments have generated serious concerns regarding the adequacy of existing criminal law provisions and the ability of the criminal justice system to prevent extrajudicial punishment. This research paper examines the phenomenon of mob lynching from the perspective of criminal law and constitutional governance. The study analyses the doctrinal foundations of criminal liability in cases of collective violence, including the principles of unlawful assembly, common object, and constructive liability. It further evaluates the role of the judiciary in addressing mob violence, particularly the landmark judgment of the Supreme Court in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*. The paper also explores recent legislative developments under the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*, which introduces enhanced punishment for murders committed by groups motivated by identity-based factors. The research argues that although existing legal provisions provide mechanisms for prosecuting offenders, they do not fully capture the complex social and structural dimensions of mob lynching. The absence of a comprehensive statutory framework specifically addressing lynching continues to create challenges for investigation, prosecution, and prevention. The paper concludes that effective responses to mob lynching require a combination of legal reforms, institutional accountability, and broader societal awareness regarding the rule of law and constitutional values.*

¹ LLM, Scholar at University of Kashmir (India). Email: aujlaanh@gmail.com

II. KEYWORDS

Mob Lynching; Criminal Liability; Collective Violence; Rule of Law; Unlawful Assembly; Hate Crimes; Constitutional Rights.

III. INTRODUCTION

The administration of criminal justice is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of the modern state. In democratic societies governed by constitutional principles, the power to determine guilt and impose punishment rests exclusively with the judiciary. However, incidents of mob lynching represent a serious departure from this foundational principle. When groups of individuals take the law into their own hands and inflict violence upon suspected offenders, the authority of legal institutions is undermined, and the rule of law is threatened.

Mob lynching has increasingly become a subject of public concern in India. Several incidents reported in recent years have involved large groups of individuals attacking people accused of crimes such as cattle smuggling, theft, or child abduction. In many cases, these incidents have been triggered by rumours circulated through social media platforms, leading to widespread panic and collective violence.²

The phenomenon raises important legal and constitutional questions. From a criminal law perspective, mob lynching presents significant challenges because the crime is committed by a group rather than an identifiable individual. The diffusion of responsibility among participants complicates the process of determining criminal liability. From a constitutional perspective, mob violence threatens fundamental rights, particularly the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.³

Understanding the legal implications of mob lynching therefore requires a comprehensive analysis of criminal law doctrines, constitutional principles, and the evolving jurisprudence of the courts. This paper seeks to examine these issues and evaluate the adequacy of existing legal frameworks in addressing mob violence.

² Mohsin Alam Bhat, "The Crime Vanishes: Mob Lynching, Hate Crime and Police Discretion in India," *Jindal Global Law Review* (2020).

³ M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (LexisNexis, 8th ed., 2018).

A. Research Objectives

This study seeks to examine the legal and constitutional dimensions of mob lynching in India with particular reference to criminal liability and state responsibility. The primary objectives of the research are:

1. To analyse the applicability of existing criminal law doctrines, including unlawful assembly, common objects, and constructive liability, in cases of mob violence.
2. To evaluate the constitutional implications of mob lynching, particularly in relation to the right to life and the rule of law.
3. To assess the judicial response to mob lynching with special emphasis on the decision in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*.
4. To examine recent legislative developments under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in addressing collective violence.

B. Research Questions

The present study is guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent do existing provisions of criminal law adequately address the phenomenon of mob lynching?
2. How do principles such as unlawful assembly and common object operate in determining liability in cases of collective violence?
3. What are the constitutional implications of mob lynching in relation to fundamental rights and the rule of law?
4. How effective has the judicial response been in preventing and addressing incidents of mob violence?

C. Research Methodology

This research adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology based primarily on the examination of legal texts, judicial decisions, and secondary sources. The study relies on statutes such as the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and relevant provisions of criminal law to analyse the framework of liability in cases of mob violence. Judicial pronouncements, particularly those of the Supreme Court of India, have been examined to understand the

evolving jurisprudence on mob lynching. In addition, academic literature, reports, and scholarly commentaries have been consulted to provide sociological and criminological perspectives. The research is qualitative in nature and aims to critically evaluate the adequacy of existing legal mechanisms.

IV. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LYNCHING

The concept of lynching has a long and controversial history. The term “lynching” is believed to have originated in the United States during the eighteenth century and was associated with extrajudicial punishments carried out by groups of individuals against persons accused of criminal conduct.⁴ In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, lynching became particularly associated with racial violence in the United States, where mobs frequently targeted African Americans under the pretext of maintaining social order. Although the historical context of lynching in the United States was shaped by racial discrimination and segregation, the broader concept of mob justice has appeared in many societies across different periods. In each case, the underlying feature remains the same: individuals or groups assume the authority to punish alleged offenders outside the framework of formal legal institutions.

In India, mob violence has historically been linked to communal tensions, caste conflicts, and social unrest. However, the emergence of digital communication technologies has introduced new dynamics into the phenomenon. Rumours and misinformation can now spread rapidly through social media platforms, increasing the likelihood of spontaneous mob mobilisation.

V. SOCIOLOGICAL AND CRIMINOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MOB LYNCHING

Mob lynching cannot be understood merely as an isolated criminal act committed by individuals. Rather, it represents a complex social phenomenon shaped by group psychology, social identity, structural inequalities, and the circulation of rumours within communities. Criminological and sociological scholarship therefore attempts to explain

⁴ Christopher Waldrep, *Lynching in America: A History in Documents* (New York University Press, 2006).

mob violence through a variety of theoretical perspectives that analyse how individuals behave when they become part of a collective.

One of the earliest theoretical explanations of crowd behaviour was offered by sociologists studying collective behaviour. According to this approach, individuals within a crowd often experience a temporary loss of individual identity and personal responsibility. This psychological transformation, commonly referred to as deindividuation, reduces the sense of accountability that normally restrains individuals from engaging in violent acts.⁵ When individuals perceive themselves as anonymous members of a crowd rather than as independent actors, they may participate in actions that they would otherwise avoid in ordinary circumstances. Within the context of mob lynching, this phenomenon explains how ordinary individuals may become participants in acts of extreme violence once they are absorbed into a large and emotionally charged group.

Another important theoretical explanation is provided by social identity theory. This theory suggests that individuals derive a significant part of their identity from membership in social groups such as religion, caste, ethnicity, or nationality. When individuals perceive that their group identity is threatened by outsiders, they may react defensively or aggressively in order to protect the perceived interests of the group. In many instances of mob lynching, the victim is targeted not merely as an individual but as a representative of an out-group perceived to be hostile or threatening.⁶ Consequently, violence is often justified by participants as a defence of collective values or traditions.

The spread of rumours and misinformation also plays a critical role in triggering mob violence. In several recent incidents, rumours about child abduction, cattle slaughter, or criminal activity have circulated rapidly through messaging platforms and social media networks. When such rumours spread within communities lacking reliable mechanisms for verifying information, they can create widespread fear and suspicion. Sociologists describe this process as moral panic, in which a perceived threat to social order generates exaggerated reactions within society. Once panic spreads through a community, individuals

⁵ Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (Dover Publications, 1895).

⁶ Henri Tajfel & John Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict," in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*.

may feel compelled to take immediate action against the perceived threat, often without waiting for verification or intervention by law enforcement authorities.⁷

Another factor frequently discussed in the literature is the relationship between mob violence and structural inequalities within society. Economic marginalisation, unemployment, and limited access to justice may contribute to feelings of frustration and alienation among certain sections of the population. When individuals perceive that formal legal institutions are slow, ineffective, or inaccessible, they may become more inclined to resort to extrajudicial forms of punishment. Although such behaviour cannot be justified within a legal framework, understanding these underlying social dynamics is essential for developing effective preventive strategies.

The sociological and criminological perspectives discussed above demonstrate that mob lynching must be analysed not only as a criminal offence but also as a product of broader social and psychological forces. Addressing the phenomenon therefore requires a comprehensive approach that includes legal reforms, institutional accountability, and social awareness.

VI. CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSIONS OF MOB LYNCHING

The phenomenon of mob lynching raises profound constitutional concerns because it directly threatens the fundamental principles upon which democratic governance is based. The Constitution of India guarantees a range of fundamental rights designed to protect the dignity, liberty, and security of individuals. Among these rights, the most significant in the context of mob violence is the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21.

The Supreme Court has consistently interpreted Article 21 as encompassing not merely the right to exist but the right to live with dignity and security. Any act of violence that deprives an individual of life or bodily integrity without lawful authority therefore constitutes a violation of this constitutional guarantee.⁸ When individuals are attacked or killed by mobs, the protection offered by Article 21 is directly undermined.

Mob lynching also challenges the constitutional principle of the rule of law. The rule of law requires that all people are subject to the authority of law and that punishment for criminal

⁷ Cass R. Sunstein & Adrian Vermeule, "Conspiracy Theories," *Harvard Law Review* (2009).

⁸ *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248.

conduct must be imposed through established legal procedures. Courts of law, rather than private individuals, possess the authority to determine guilt and impose punishment. When mobs assume this authority, they effectively replace the judicial process with arbitrary violence.

Another important constitutional issue concerns the responsibility of the state to protect individuals from unlawful violence. The state has a positive obligation to ensure the safety of citizens and maintain public order. This obligation includes the duty to prevent acts of mob violence, investigate incidents promptly, and prosecute those responsible. Failure to fulfil this duty may erode public confidence in the criminal justice system and weaken the legitimacy of state institutions.⁹

The constitutional implications of mob lynching therefore extend beyond individual incidents of violence. They raise broader questions regarding the capacity of the state to uphold fundamental rights and maintain the rule of law in a democratic society.

VII. CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN CASES OF MOB LYNCHING

The determination of criminal liability in cases of mob lynching presents significant challenges because the offence involves collective participation rather than individual conduct. Traditional criminal law doctrines were primarily developed to address crimes committed by identifiable individuals. However, mob violence often involves large groups of participants whose individual roles may be difficult to determine.

Despite these challenges, criminal law provides several mechanisms through which liability can be attributed to members of a violent crowd.¹⁰ One of the most important mechanisms is the doctrine of unlawful assembly. When five or more people gather with the intention of committing an offence, the assembly may be deemed unlawful. Once an assembly is classified as unlawful, each member of the group may be held responsible for offences committed in pursuit of the common objective of the assembly.

Closely related to this principle is the doctrine of common object. Under this doctrine, if an offence is committed by any member of an unlawful assembly in furtherance of the common

⁹ Upendra Baxi, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System* (Oxford University Press, 1982).

¹⁰ K.D. Gaur, *Textbook on the Indian Penal Code* (2016) (see now corresponding provisions on unlawful assembly under Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, §§ 189–193).

objective of the group,¹¹ every member of the assembly may be held liable for that offence. This rule is particularly important in cases of mob lynching because it eliminates the need to prove that each individual participant directly inflicted harm upon the victim. Instead, the prosecution must establish that the accused persons were members of the unlawful assembly and that the offence occurred in furtherance of its objective.

Constructive criminal liability further expands the scope of responsibility in cases involving collective violence. Under this principle, individuals who assist, encourage, or facilitate the commission of a crime may be held liable even if they did not directly perform the act causing harm. In the context of mob lynching, some individuals may physically attack the victim while others may incite the crowd, prevent intervention by bystanders, or otherwise contribute to the escalation of violence. Constructive liability ensures that all such participants can be held accountable.

The application of these doctrines demonstrates that criminal law possesses mechanisms capable of addressing group-based offences. However, the effectiveness of these mechanisms depends upon proper investigation, evidence collection, and prosecution.

VIII. JUDICIAL RESPONSE TO MOB LYNCHING

The Indian judiciary has increasingly recognised the seriousness of mob violence and has attempted to address the issue through judicial intervention. Courts have repeatedly emphasised that mob justice is incompatible with constitutional democracy and that the rule of law must be upheld at all times.

A significant development in this regard occurred in the case of *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*.¹² In this landmark judgment, the Supreme Court strongly condemned incidents of mob lynching and vigilantism. The Court observed that allowing mobs to take the law into their own hands would seriously undermine the rule of law and threaten the stability of constitutional governance.

Recognising the urgency of the issue, the Court issued a series of guidelines intended to prevent incidents of mob violence. These guidelines included the appointment of nodal

¹¹ Ratanlal & Dhirajlal, *The Indian Penal Code*, 34th ed. (2017) (see now corresponding provisions on common object and unlawful assembly under *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023, §§ 189–193).

¹² *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*, (2018) 9 SCC 501.

police officers responsible for monitoring potential incidents of mob violence within districts. Authorities were also instructed to identify areas where mob attacks were more likely to occur and to take preventive measures to maintain law and order.

The Court further emphasised the importance of prompt investigation and prosecution of offences related to mob violence. Victims and their families were to receive appropriate compensation, and steps were to be taken to ensure that witnesses could testify without fear of intimidation or retaliation.

Although the judiciary cannot by itself create comprehensive criminal legislation, the judgment played an important role in highlighting the seriousness of mob lynching and encouraging legislative action.

IX. MOB LYNCHING AND LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE BHARATIYA NYAYA SANHITA, 2023

Recent reforms in Indian criminal law have introduced provisions that partially address the issue of mob violence. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 replaced the Indian Penal Code and introduced new provisions dealing with murders committed by groups motivated by identity-based factors.¹³

Under Section 103(2) of the statute, enhanced punishment is prescribed when a group of five or more persons commits murder on grounds such as race, caste, community, sex, place of birth, language, or personal belief. The inclusion of this provision reflects legislative recognition that identity-based violence committed by groups poses a serious threat to social harmony and public order.

The introduction of such provisions represents an important step toward acknowledging the problem of collective violence. However, it has also been observed that the statute does not explicitly define mob lynching as a separate offence. While Section 103(2) addresses cases where group-based violence results in death, Section 117(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 specifically criminalises acts where a group of five or more persons, acting in concert on grounds such as race, caste, community, sex, place of birth, language, or personal belief, causes grievous hurt, and prescribes imprisonment up to seven years along with fine.

¹³ Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Nevertheless, despite covering both fatal and non-fatal forms of collective violence, the statutory framework does not yet provide a comprehensive and unified definition of mob lynching as a distinct offence.

In addition to central legislative developments, several Indian states have attempted to enact specific anti-lynching laws. For instance, the Manipur Protection from Mob Violence Ordinance, 2018, the Rajasthan Protection from Lynching Bill, 2019, and the Jharkhand (Mob Violence and Mob Lynching Prevention) Bill, 2021 seek to define mob lynching, prescribe punishments, and establish preventive and remedial mechanisms. However, many of these legislative measures have faced implementation challenges, including delays in obtaining Presidential assent and lack of uniform enforcement. The fragmented nature of these state-level initiatives highlights the limitations of a decentralised approach and underscores the need for a comprehensive central legislation to ensure consistency, enforceability, and effective nationwide response to mob lynching.

Despite these limitations, the legislative reforms indicate a growing awareness within the legal system regarding the need to address collective violence more effectively.

X. CHALLENGES IN THE PROSECUTION OF MOB LYNCHING CASES

Although criminal law contains provisions that can be applied to cases of mob violence, the prosecution of such cases often encounters significant practical difficulties. One of the most serious challenges is the identification of individual perpetrators within large crowds. When dozens of individuals participate in an attack, it may be extremely difficult for investigators to determine the specific actions performed by each participant.

Witness intimidation also presents a major obstacle. Individuals who provide testimony against members of their own community may face threats or social pressure not to cooperate with law enforcement authorities. In some cases, witnesses may refuse to testify due to fear of retaliation.

Institutional limitations within the criminal justice system further complicate the prosecution of mob lynching cases.¹⁴ Delays in investigation, inadequate evidence collection, and prolonged trial proceedings may weaken the effectiveness of criminal

¹⁴ Mohsin Alam Bhat, *supra* note 1.

prosecutions. When cases remain unresolved for long periods of time, the deterrent effect of criminal law is reduced.

These challenges highlight the importance of strengthening investigative procedures, ensuring witness protection, and improving coordination between law enforcement agencies and judicial institutions.

XI. COMPARATIVE LEGAL PERSPECTIVES

Comparative analysis of legal systems in other jurisdictions provides useful insights into how the phenomenon of mob violence may be addressed. In the United States, lynching historically emerged as a form of racial violence, particularly during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In response to this history, federal legislation has been enacted recognising lynching as a hate crime and providing enhanced penalties for acts of violence motivated by racial or identity-based hatred, most notably through the Emmett Till Antilynching Act of 2022.¹⁵

European legal systems similarly recognise that crimes motivated by prejudice or discrimination may require stronger legal responses. Many jurisdictions impose aggravated penalties when offences are committed with discriminatory motives relating to race, religion, or ethnicity.

These comparative approaches demonstrate that legal frameworks can be adapted to address the unique characteristics of collective violence. Studying such models may assist policymakers and legal scholars in evaluating the adequacy of existing laws and considering possible reforms.

XII. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the issues identified in this study, several measures may be considered to address the problem of mob lynching more effectively.

1. The legislature should consider enacting a comprehensive legal framework that specifically defines mob lynching as a distinct offence and prescribes appropriate

¹⁵ Emmett Till Antilynching Act, Pub. L. No. 117-107, 136 Stat. 1125 (2022).

penalties. Such legislation should also include preventive measures, including early warning systems and accountability mechanisms for law enforcement authorities.

2. Investigative agencies must be strengthened through better training, technological support, and improved coordination to ensure effective prosecution of offenders. Third, robust witness protection mechanisms must be implemented to safeguard individuals who testify in cases of mob violence.
3. Public awareness initiatives should be undertaken to counter misinformation and promote respect for constitutional values and the rule of law.

XIII. CONCLUSION

Mob lynching represents one of the most alarming manifestations of collective violence in contemporary society. Unlike ordinary criminal offences committed by individuals, mob lynching involves the participation of large groups acting outside the authority of law. Such incidents reflect a dangerous breakdown of social order where individuals assume the role of judge and executioner. The increasing occurrence of mob violence in recent years has raised serious concerns regarding the protection of fundamental rights and the effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

This research has examined mob lynching from multiple perspectives including sociological explanations, constitutional implications, criminal liability, judicial responses, and recent legislative developments. The analysis demonstrates that mob lynching is not merely a spontaneous act of violence, but a complex social phenomenon influenced by group psychology, misinformation, identity-based tensions, and structural inequalities within society. Understanding these underlying factors is essential for developing effective strategies to prevent such incidents.

From a constitutional perspective, mob lynching poses a direct threat to the principles of rule of law and protection of fundamental rights. The Constitution of India guarantees the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21, and the state bears a corresponding duty to ensure the safety and dignity of individuals. When mobs are allowed to inflict violence without legal consequences, this constitutional guarantee is severely undermined. The persistence of mob violence therefore challenges the ability of the state to uphold the rule of law and protect the rights of its citizens.

The study has also analysed the mechanisms through which criminal liability may be attributed to participants in mob violence. Legal doctrines such as unlawful assembly, common object, and constructive criminal liability provide important tools for addressing crimes committed by groups. These doctrines allow courts to impose responsibility upon individuals who participate in violent crowds even when their specific actions cannot be precisely identified. However, the effectiveness of these legal provisions depends upon proper investigation, evidence collection, and prosecution.

Judicial intervention has played a crucial role in highlighting the seriousness of mob lynching. In particular, the decision of the Supreme Court in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India* emphasised that vigilantism and mob justice cannot be permitted in a constitutional democracy. The guidelines issued in this case represent an important step toward preventing incidents of mob violence and ensuring accountability for those responsible.

Recent legislative reforms have also attempted to address aspects of mob violence. The introduction of provisions under the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* dealing with group-based murders motivated by identity factors reflects an acknowledgment of the seriousness of collective violence. Nevertheless, the law does not yet provide a comprehensive definition of mob lynching as a separate offence. As a result, many incidents continue to be prosecuted under general provisions relating to murder, assault, or rioting.

Despite the existence of legal mechanisms, the prosecution of mob lynching cases remains difficult in practice. Investigative challenges, witness intimidation, and delays within the criminal justice system often hinder the effective punishment of offenders. These difficulties highlight the need for stronger institutional mechanisms, improved investigative procedures, and effective witness protection programs.

In order to address the problem of mob lynching more effectively, several measures may be considered. First, the legislature may consider enacting a comprehensive legal framework specifically addressing mob lynching and hate crimes. Such legislation could clearly define the offence, establish enhanced penalties for collective violence, and create preventive mechanisms for law enforcement authorities. Second, law enforcement agencies must

strengthen their capacity to investigate incidents of mob violence and ensure prompt prosecution of offenders. Third, public awareness initiatives should be undertaken to combat misinformation and promote respect for the rule of law.

Ultimately, the prevention of mob lynching requires not only legal reforms but also broader societal commitment to constitutional values. A democratic society can function effectively only when individuals respect the authority of law and reject the temptation to resort to violence in pursuit of justice. Ensuring that justice remains the exclusive domain of lawful institutions is essential for preserving social order and protecting the rights and dignity of every individual.

XIV. REFERENCES

A. Primary Sources (Legislation & Cases)

1. *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023.
2. *Constitution of India*, 1950.
3. *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*, (2018) 9 SCC 501.

B. Statutes & Bills (State-Level Anti-Lynching Laws)

1. *The Manipur Protection from Mob Violence Ordinance*, 2018.
2. *The Rajasthan Protection from Lynching Bill*, 2019.
3. *The Jharkhand (Mob Violence and Mob Lynching Prevention) Bill*, 2021.

C. International / Comparative Legislation

1. *Emmett Till Antilynching Act*, 2022 (United States).

D. Books

1. K.D. Gaur, *Textbook on Indian Penal Code*, 6th edn (Universal Law Publishing, 2016).
2. Ratanlal & Dhirajlal, *The Indian Penal Code*, 36th edn (LexisNexis, 2020).
3. N.V. Paranjape, *Criminology and Penology*, 18th edn (Central Law Publications, 2019).

E. Journal Articles

1. Aparna Chandra, "Mob Lynching and the Rule of Law" (2019) *National Law School of India Review*.
2. Shreya Atrey, "Hate Crimes and Constitutional Protection in India" (2018) *Oxford Human Rights Hub Journal*.
3. Pratiksha Baxi, "Justice for Victims of Collective Violence" (2016) *Economic and Political Weekly*.

F. Reports & Institutional Publications

1. Law Commission of India, *Report No. 267: Hate Speech* (2017).
2. Human Rights Watch, *Violent Cow Protection in India: Vigilante Groups Attack Minorities* (2019).
3. Amnesty International India, *Halt the Hate: Ending Mob Violence in India* (2017).

G. Online Sources

1. Supreme Court Observer, "Tehseen S. Poonawalla Case Analysis" Available at: <https://www.scobserver.in>
2. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Reports on Public Order and Internal Security.

H. Theoretical / Sociological Sources

1. Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895).
2. Henri Tajfel & John Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Social Identity" in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (1979).
3. Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (Routledge, 1972).