

**RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR SUITABLE AMENDMENTS  
IN THE GUJARAT PROHIBITION ACT, 1949**

**—:OBJECTS AND REASONS:—**

Objects and reasons of this report are to introduce the procedure of imposing spot punishment/penalty in case of consumption of liquor as well as driving vehicle after consumption of liquor. Spot punishment/penalty would reduce number of criminal cases pending under the Prohibition Act before the various Courts in the State of Gujarat. It would also reduce the work of investigating agencies. During the trial, in number of cases, it is difficult to serve the summons to the accused or the witnesses after few years which results in acquittal. Further, in addition to breath analyzer, use of advanced scientific breathe testing instruments, such as, Intoximeter EC/IR, the Camic Datamaster or the Lion Intoxylizer 6000UK which are used in U.K. would be of immense help in deciding whether the person has consumed liquor or not. In the alternative, the latest miniature devices (like JK-GC-100 Jingke, manufactured in China) can be obtained. Such instruments would be of utmost use for spot trial. This may also reduce human intervention.

**CHAPTER: I**

**INTRODUCTION**

- (i) It is known fact that various interested parties are opposing implementation of Prohibition Act vigorously by all sorts of propaganda. Despite this strong opposition, the Prohibition Act survived in this State because number of persons believed that consumption of liquor, particularly by poor persons, adversely affects their health which invariably damages liver and there is premature death of number of victims who consumed liquor.
- (ii) It is also known fact that rash driving by person who has consumed liquor results into accidents and in number of cases, fatal to the pedestrians or to the other vehicle drivers. Thus, it is one of the reasons for vehicular accidents in the State. On number of occasions, after causing injury, the drivers who have consumed liquor do not stop their vehicles and run away from the spot before they could be caught. That adds to hit and run cases.

- (iii) Now-a-days, trend of some States is to impose Prohibition Act in one way or other, despite the fact that large amount of annual revenue to the State would suffer. It is reported that virtually, all political parties from left, right and centre have raised their peach calling for prohibition.
- (iv) In addition, womenfolk are the worst sufferers because of consumption of liquor by their husbands. It is reported that whatever they earn by their hard work, is snatched away by their husbands, who consume liquor for the day. In many cases, in the process, they are mercilessly beaten by their husbands. This position prevails much more in hilly, tribal and lower strata of the population.
- (v) Apart from the aforesaid aspects, the Prohibition Act which is in force in the State requires to be strictly implemented, more so for drivers who drive the vehicles on the highways and State roads.
- (vi) **It should be kept in mind that there should not be any gap between the law and its execution/implementation. For this, a watch is required to be kept so that the law enforcing agency should not be party for its non implementation for various reasons.**
- (vii) **In addition, it is to be stated that there is unusual delay in disposal of cases filed under the Prohibition Act. The result is – there is increase in the backlog in the Court and finally, there is acquittal of the accused.**
- (viii) The paradox of abundance of liquor in the face of restriction has failed to wake up the Government to the obvious reality. May be, they have tried hard not to wake up. It should be borne in mind that because of prohibition, a number of persons, particularly poor, have been benefited, as they have stopped consuming liquor and harassing the family members. **That social benefit is so important that it cannot be ignored by considering the loss of revenue to the State.**

**(ix) Consumption of liquor increases lawlessness:—**

On 04.03.2016, news article namely “drunk teens stab to death police constable” was published in the Times of India (Ahmedabad Edition) wherein it is *inter-alia* reported that,

*“Rajkot: In another example of increasing lawlessness in the city, four teenagers brutally stabbed to death a police constable near Ranuja temple on Kothariya Road late on Wednesday night. At around 1.45 am, constable Bharat Gadhvi, posted at B-division police station, was going home after duty. When he reached Gokul Park, he noticed a group of youngsters creating a ruckus and asked them to leave. Some seven-eight of them, who were drunk, got into an argument with him. .... On Wednesday, the youngsters had come for a wedding in Velnathpara. Sources said they consumed liquor there and were creating ruckus on the road. Gadhvi’s uncle has lodged a complaint against the four. Gadhvi had joined the police department in 2008. He got married last year and his wife is pregnant.”*

Many such incidents are taking place, due to consumption of liquor. Hence, for controlling—

- (a) harassment to the family;
- (b) driving the family to penury;
- (c) quarrels which may lead to fatal injuries;
- (d) accidents, and
- (e) general health of the poor (rich can avoid its adverse effect by taking nutritious food);

it would be necessary to see that the Act is implemented effectively and in a speedy manner so that persons may be deterred before consumption of liquor or celebrating wet parties.

**(x) Driving vehicle after consumption of liquor:—**

It is also known fact that in many cases where vehicular accidents take place, drivers of both the vehicles or driver of one vehicle would be under influence of liquor. In such cases, there should be harsh and deterrent punishment so that persons may not think of driving vehicles after consumption of liquor.

## CHAPTER: II

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROHIBITION ACT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

In other countries, the laws relating to the prohibition are implemented on the spot and the laws as they stand today are as under:—

In various States of United States, the penal provision for drunk driving is imprisonment of one year and fine upto \$ 5000 along with license suspension. Some States of United States are having tough penal provisions, such as, Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, etc. (upto 30 months imprisonment and fine upto \$ 5000 and one year license suspension in some States).

Australia is having a provision of fine and has an alcohol interlock for a minimum of six months (an alcohol interlock stops a person from starting his vehicle, if he has been drinking).

**Annexure: A would reveal to what extent, various States of various countries are imposing penalty for driving vehicle, after consumption of liquor.**

The main test for imposing penalty for drunkenness driving depends upon the quantity of **Blood Alcohol Content (BAC)**. In United States, most of the State Laws require to take a breath, blood or urine test, if a person is arrested for **Driving Under the Influence (DUI)**. If any person is lawfully arrested by a police officer who has reasonable grounds to believe that the person was driving under the influence at the time of arrest, the officer informs the person that if he refuses to take the test, his license would be suspended.

**CHAPTER: III****PENDENCY OF PROHIBITION CASES**

It is known fact that because of delay in prosecution, witnesses including Panchas would not be available for giving their evidence and if they are available, they would be won over and turned hostile before the Court which is the usual practice in criminal cases. This is the easiest way found out for getting acquittal. The result would be – after long lapse of time, may be four to five years, accused is acquitted.

- (i) As per the information received, as on 30.11.2015, about 2,78,000 prohibition cases are pending before various Courts of Judicial Magistrates in the State, since the year 1979. The break-up position of pendency of such cases, for the period from 2015–1979, is attached herewith at **Annexure: B-Colly**.
- (ii) As per the information received, as on 29.02.2016, total cases filed u/s. 66(1)(b) of the Act are 1,96,118, pending before various Courts of Judicial Magistrates in the State. The said information is attached herewith at **Annexure: C**.
- (iii) As per the information received, as on 01.01.2016, about 2,68,500 prohibition cases are pending before various Courts of Judicial Magistrates in the State. Out of this, 165 cases are pending for the offence punishable u/s. 84 and 47,602 cases are pending for the offence punishable u/s. 85 of the Act. The said information is attached herewith at **Annexure: D**.
- (iv) As per the information regarding H.Q. & taluka-wise pendency of prohibition cases, received as on 31.01.2016, 2,71,261 cases are pending. As against this, the total present strength of Courts of Judicial Magistrate First Class is only 571. The said information is attached herewith at **Annexure: E**.

This would reveal that most of the cases pending before the Trial Courts are under Sections 66(1)(b) [1,96,118 cases]; 84 [165 cases] and 85 [47,602 cases]. These cases could be disposed of scientifically by using breath analyzer and by taking blood sample on the spot with a specific direction that the report of blood sample be given within forty eight hours. This can be done by the Government easily. In addition to blood sample, urine sample should also be collected and sent to forensic laboratory within twenty four hours and for the effective scientific evidence collection, investigation mobile forensic vehicle can be used.

In U.K., further advanced scientific breathe testing instruments are utilized. It is stated that, “*the first generation of Evidential Breath Testing Instruments (EBTIs) were replaced in 1999. All forces are now equipped with the Intoximeter EC/IR, the Camic Datamaster or the Lion Intoxylizer 6000UK. They detect and record a wider range of information when analysing breath samples. These three makes of instrument are a type approved by the Secretary of State for the purposes of the Road Traffic Act.*”

Further, in addition to breath analyzer, use of advanced scientific breathe testing instruments, such as, Intoximeter EC/IR, the Camic Datamaster or the Lion Intoxylizer 6000UK which are used in U.K. would be of immense help in deciding whether the person has consumed liquor or not. In the alternative, the latest miniature devices (like JK-GC-100 Jingke, manufactured in China) can be obtained. Such instruments would be of utmost use for spot trial. This may also reduce human intervention.

In the aforesaid set of circumstances, it is suggested that Sections 66(1)(b), 84 and 85 of the Act be suitably amended so that person who has consumed liquor and as per the breath analyzer report, if it is established that he has consumed liquor, then he must be produced before the Magistrate within one hour of his arrest. **Before producing the person before the Magistrate, his blood sample should be taken for finding out Blood Alcohol Content (BAC).** In addition to blood sample, urine sample should also be collected and sent to forensic laboratory within twenty four hours. The Magistrate may inform him that if he pleads guilty, the punishment would be minimum as per the Act. If he refuses to admit his guilt, immediate steps should be taken so that reports of the blood and urine samples are received. The provision should be made that the reports of blood and urine samples should be made available within forty eight hours and if the reports are positive, then proper punishment should be imposed without delay. For this, appropriate procedure should be provided in the Act/Rules.

**CHAPTER: IV****COMPOUNDING OF OFFENCE**

- (i) For the aforesaid objects and reasons, it would be necessary to impose penalty on the spot by producing the person accused of consumption of liquor before the Magistrate at the earliest on the basis of breath analyzer report.

For this purpose, concerned police officers must be given breath analyzer so that the Act can be implemented speedily and on the spot.

In addition, the magistrate should be empowered to compound the offences, if the person pleads guilty of the offence under Sections 66(1)(b), 84 and 85 of the Act.

For compounding of offences punishable under the Act, there is the provision under Section 104. Hence, for empowering of compounding of offences, Section 104 is required to be suitably amended so as to include Sections 66(1)(b), 84 & 85. Section 104 reads:—

**“104. Compounding of offences**

- (1) *The State Government may sanction the acceptance from any person whose license, permit, pass or authorization is liable to be cancelled or, suspended under the provisions of this Act or who is reasonably suspected of having committed an offence under Sections 69, 70, 77, 82 or 108, of a sum of money in lieu of such cancellation or suspension or by way of composition for the offence which may have been committed, as the case may be and in all cases in which the property other than the intoxicant, hemp, mhowra flowers or molasses have been seized as liable to confiscation under this act may release the same on payment of the value thereof as estimated by the State Government or such officer as the State Government may authorize in this behalf:*

*Provided that where a person who is reasonably suspected of having committed as offence under Sections 69, 70 or 108, is not the holder of a licence, permit, pass or authorization granted under this Act or a person in the employ of such holder or a person acting with his express or implied permission on his behalf, the sum of money which may be accepted from such person by way of composition shall not exceed five hundred rupees:*

*Provided further that, in the case of a person who is reasonably suspected of having committed an offence under Section 108, the sum of money which may be accepted from him by way of composition for the offence shall be in addition to the duty or fee required to be paid by him under this Act.*

- (2) *On the payment by such person of such sum of money, or such value or both, as the case may be, such person, if in custody, shall be set at liberty and the property seized may be released and if any proceedings shall have been instituted against such person in any criminal court, the composition shall be held to amount to an acquittal and in no case shall any further proceedings be taken against such person or property with reference to the same facts.”*

**(ii) For compounding of offence, suitable amendment in Section 66 of the Act is required:—**

Section 66 of the Act provides for “Penalty for illegal cultivation and collection of hemp and other matters.” Relevant part of sub-Section (1) reads:—

*“Whoever in contravention of the provisions of this Act, or of any rule, regulation or order made or of any licence, permit, pass or authorization issued, thereunder—*

... ..

(b) *consumes, uses, possesses or transports any intoxicant (other than opium) or hemp,*

... ..

*shall, on conviction, be punished—*

- (i) *for a first offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months and with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees;*
- (ii) *for a second offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years and with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees;*
- (iii) *for a third or subsequent offences, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years and with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees.”*

**Plead guilty:—**

Instead of the aforesaid provisions, if a person **pleads guilty** for the consumption of liquor, imprisonment should be waived and for the first offence, fine should be imposed which shall not be less than rupees five hundred and may be extended upto rupees one thousand.

For the second offence, fine should be imposed which shall not be less than rupees one thousand and may be extended upto rupees two thousand.

For the third offence, fine should be imposed which shall not be less than rupees two thousand and may be extended upto rupees five thousand.

If the accused pleads guilty, then the aforesaid suggested punishment should be imposed otherwise regular punishment as provided under the Act shall be imposed.

In case the person is not in a position to pay fine or in any other appropriate case, the Magistrate may issue direction u/s. 92 of the Act for rendering of community services.

**For this purpose, Section 66(1)(b) requires to be suitably amended.**

**(iii) For compounding of offence, suitable amendment in Sections 84 & 85 of the Act is required:—**

In addition to Section 66(1)(b), there are provisions for punishing a person found drunk and for disorderly behaviour. For this purpose, Sections 84 and 85 provide “punishment”. Those Sections are required to be suitably amended so that the persons can be dealt with on the spot. Said Sections read:—

**“84. Penalty for being found drunk in any drinking house**

*Whoever is found drunk or drinking in a common drinking house or is found there present for the purpose of drinking shall, on conviction, be punished with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees. Any person found in a common drinking house during any drinking therein shall be presumed, until the contrary is proved, to have been there for the purpose of drinking.*

**85. Penalty for being drunk and for disorderly behaviour**

(1) *Whoever, in any street or throughfare or public place or in any place to which the public have or are permitted to have access—*

- (1) *is drunk and incapable of taking care of himself, or*
- (2) *behaves in a disorderly manner under the influence of drink,*
- (3) *is found drunk but who is not the holder of permit granted under the provisions of this Act or is not eligible to hold a permit under Sections 40, 41, 46 or 46A,*

*shall, on conviction, be punished—*

- (i) *for an offence under clause (1) or clause (3)*

- (a) *for a first offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month and with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees,*

- (b) *for subsequent offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months and with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees, and*

- (ii) *for an offence under clause (2)*

- (a) *for a first offence, with imprisonment of a term which may extend to three months and with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees,*

(b) *for subsequent offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to one year and with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees.*

(2) *In prosecution for an offence under subsection (1), it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved that the person accused of the said offence has drunk liquor or consumed any other intoxicant for the purpose of being intoxicated and not for a medicinal purpose.”*

The afore-quoted Sections may be amended so that on the basis of plea-guilty, penalty can be imposed on the spot.

Further, the person who does not plead guilty be tried within fifteen days from the date of receipt of the Blood Alcohol Content (BAC).

There should be specific direction to the laboratory where the blood sample is sent, to submit the report within forty-eight hours from receipt of blood sample. Similarly, there should be specific direction to the forensic laboratory where the urine sample is sent, to submit the report within forty-eight hours from receipt of urine sample.

## CHAPTER: V

### DRINK AND DRIVING

- (i) In the previous report (27.08.2014) with regard to recommendations for taking immediate actions to amend the Notification for levying composite fees under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the Rules framed thereunder and for controlling vehicular road accidents in the State, it was reported and suggested as under:—

**“DRUNKEN DRIVING:—**

*This is also well-known fact that many accidents take place because the driver is under influence of alcohol. The Gujarat Prohibition Act is in force. Yet, the same is not properly implemented and a number of persons are driving vehicles after consumption of alcohol. For this purpose, Prohibition Act is required to be strictly implemented.*

*Now-a-days, a new trend of consumption of alcohol to celebrate any occasion has been common even in cities of Gujarat. It is established that driving after consumption of alcohol, turns celebration into a misfortune of the person using the vehicle or passerby and in many cases, persons sleeping on footpath or in their huts. The reason is that alcohol reduces concentration. It decreases reaction time of a human body. Limbs take more to react to the instructions of brain. It hampers vision due to dizziness. Alcohol dampens fear and incites human-beings to take risks. For every increase of 0.05 blood alcohol concentration, the risk of accident doubles.*

**All the above factors, while driving, cause accidents and many a times, they prove to be fatal.**

**Suggestion:—**

**For appropriately dealing with such cases, blood examination of the driver should be on the spot.**

*Rule 21(16) of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 empowers the licensing authority to disqualify holder of a driving license, if he is driving a vehicle under the influence of drink or drugs. This violation constitutes nuisance or danger to the public.*

Section 19(f), *inter-alia*, provides that if a licensing authority is satisfied, after giving the holder of a driving license an opportunity of being heard, that he has committed any such act which is likely to cause nuisance or danger to the public having regard to the objects of the Motor Vehicles Act, then his license can be cancelled/revoked.

**The aforesaid provisions require strict implementation because such accidents are increasing.”**

- (ii) In addition, Section 185 of the Motor Vehicles Act provides for punishment to a driver who is under influence of alcohol. The said Section reads:—

**“185. Driving by a drunken person or by a person under the influence of drugs**

*Whoever, while driving, or attempting to drive, a motor vehicle,*

- (a) *has, in his blood, alcohol exceeding 30 mg. per 100 ml. of blood detected in a test by a breath analyser, or*
- (b) *is under this influence of a drug to such an extent as to be incapable of exercising proper control over the vehicle,*

*shall be punishable for the first offence with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, or with both; and for a second or subsequent offence, if committed within three years of the commission of the previous similar offence, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine which may extend to three thousand rupees, or with both.*

*Explanation—*

*For the purposes of this section, the drug or drugs specified by the Central Government in this behalf, by notification in the Official Gazette, shall be deemed to render a person incapable of exercising proper control over a motor vehicle.”*

**(iii) Publicly shame the drunk-driver:—**

In the State of Maharashtra and State of Karnataka, the names of the drunk drivers are publicized on website to curb drunk-driving cases and to create some sort of fear among road users so that they will not dare repeat the offence.

In the news article (28.03.2016) published in Deccan Herald (for the State of Karnataka), it is mentioned that,

*“According to a list prepared by the Bangalore Police, drunk driving in El Salvador is punishable with execution by firing squad, whereas second conviction for the offence leads to execution in Bulgaria. Poland has jail, fine and attending political lectures! Malaya jails the offender. If married, the spouse is also jailed.*

*Turkey takes the offender 10 miles out of town and makes them walk back under escort. South Africa has 10 year imprisonment or fine up to \$10,000. In Norway, the offender is jailed for three weeks with hard labour, whereas loss of driving licence attracts one year jail. Second offence ensures revoking of licence for life.*

*In India, a case is booked under Section 185 of the MV Act. It has a provision for imprisonment of up to six months or fine up to Rs.2,000 for the first offence. The second offence attracts imprisonment up to two years and fine up to Rs.3,000. Judiciary decides the quantum of punishment.”*

The copies of the news article published for State of Maharashtra and State of Karnataka, are attached herewith at **Annexure: F-Colly**.

**Further, Annexure: G would reveal to what extent, various countries are imposing heavy penalty / punishment for driving vehicle, after consumption of liquor.**

(iv) In United States and other countries, on the spot penalty measure for drunk driving is imprisonment as well as fine and suspension of license. The reason is driving by such person is dangerous to life and properties of others. (Re. Annexure: A).

(v) **Hence, it is suggested that:—**

If a person is driving a vehicle after consumption of liquor, his license to drive a vehicle should be suspended.

- (a) For the first offence, it should be suspended at least for six months with a fine which may be extended upto rupees two thousand but shall not be less than rupees one thousand;
- (b) For the second offence, it should be suspended for one year with a fine which may be extended upto rupees five thousand but shall not be less than rupees two thousand; and
- (c) For the third offence, it should be suspended for five years with a fine which may be extended upto rupees ten thousand but shall not be less than rupees five thousand.

## CHAPTER: VI

### RENDERING OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

In addition, there is other provision which requires implementation. Section 92 of the Prohibition Act requires to be implemented. It provides for “Rendering community service in lieu of imprisonment” which reads:—

**“92. Rendering community service in lieu of imprisonment**

- (1) *Where the Court, on conviction for the first offence under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 66 for consumption of an intoxicant, or sub-section (1) of Section 85 or both sentences a person to simple imprisonment for certain term, it may, in lieu of such imprisonment, require such person to execute a bond with sureties containing such conditions in such form as may be prescribed, for rendering such community service and subjecting himself to such medical treatment for getting freed from addiction of intoxicant as may be prescribed for the term of such imprisonment.*
- (2) *On execution of the bond under sub-section (1), the sentence shall stand suspended and the person shall be released:*

*Provided that if the person commits breach of any condition of the bond, the suspension of sentence shall stand cancelled and the sentence shall revive and the person shall be arrested by any police officer without warrant and remanded to undergo the unexpired portion of the sentence.*

*Explanation— Nothing in this Section shall be deemed as granting of probation to the offender.”*

Similar to the afore-quoted provision, in the State of Mizoram, instead of imposing punishment, it is *inter-alia* provided that, ***“the trying magistrate may, after convicting the accused and in lieu of imprisonment and fine, pass order by which the convict is released and is compelled to do social work for not more than five working days under the supervision of the Excise & Narcotics officer or Police officer as per the terms and conditions as may be passed by the trial court in the order or prescribed in the rules.”***

The afore-quoted Section 92 should be effectively enforced and the attention of the magistrates all over the State should be drawn so that the provision is implemented.

**Such direction of rendering social services would be more deterrent to the middle class and upper class persons.**

**CHAPTER: VII****RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (A)** In case where on the basis of plea-guilty, penalty is levied or the person is directed to render community service, the said punishment shall not be considered for externment under Bombay Police Act or for the purpose of Prevention of Anti-Social Activities (PASA). For this, suitable amendment is required to be made under the Bombay Police Act as well as PASA.
- (B)** As stated above that as per the information as on 31.01.2016, 2,71,261 prohibition cases are pending before the Courts of Judicial Magistrates. The cases are pending since years, as discussed above. In most of the cases, it would be difficult to produce evidence for establishing the offence. Hence, it is recommended that:—
- (i)** Provision should be made so that penalty on the spot can be imposed for the offences punishable under Sections 66(1)(b), 84 and 85 of the Act. The practice of imposing on the spot penalty is prevailing in various States of U.S.A. and in various countries (Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, etc.), as mentioned in Annexure: A.
  - (ii)** For this purpose, mobile Courts are required to be established which may take round at evening time, particularly, after 08 p.m. to 10 p.m. or in the early morning or as directed.
  - (iii)** In addition, power may be conferred upon Special Executive Magistrate (as provided u/s. 21 of The Criminal Procedure Code), if it is found that the existing strength of Judicial Magistrate First Class is not in a position to cop-up with the work.

- (iv) (a) For the offences punishable under the Gujarat Prohibition Act, appropriate provision be made for encouraging informants so that immediate action can be taken before consumption of illicit liquor by persons gathered together at particular place/places.
- (b) Suitable provision for punishment of persons who intentionally suppress giving of information regarding probable place of consumption or distribution of liquor or the place where it is sold, be made. (This would include persons from the police force allotted in the area). This will provide deterrence to occurrence of the offences under the Prohibition Act.
- (v) For this purpose, Section 116 of the Gujarat Prohibition Act, 1949 be suitably amended. It provides for the procedure to be followed by the Trial Court. The said Section reads:—

*“116. Procedure to be followed by Magistrate*

*In all trials for offences under this Act, the Magistrate shall follow the procedure prescribed in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (V of 1898), for the trial of summary cases in which in appeal lies.”*

**To the aforesaid Section, sub-section may be added by providing for spot trial by the Magistrate.**

**Date :**        <sup>th</sup> April, 2016

**Place :** Ahmedabad

**JUSTICE M. B. SHAH**

**Former Judge, Supreme Court of India**

**AND**

**Chairman, Gujarat State Law Commission**