

**The expert in anything
was once a beginner.**

- Helen Hayes -



Important Issues of the Day

- **Parliament's historic law – Page No.6 , GS 2**
- **Tariffs in trouble – Page No. 6, GS 2**
- **Lines in the sand – Page No. 6, GS 2,3**
- **Global Capability Centre – Page No. 6, Prelims**
- **Freedom of speech of MPs – Page No. 7, GS 2**
- **Cybercrime in India – Mains**

Parliament's historic law, an extended wait for women

Page No. 6, GS 2

When Parliament passed the Women's Reservation Act in September 2023, millions of Indian women believed that their moment had finally arrived. One-third of all Lok Sabha and State Assembly seats would be reserved for them. The legislation was hailed as a historic victory for gender justice, ending decades of parliamentary stalemate. But the Act contains a clause that changes everything: reservation will begin only "after the first Census taken after the year 2026" and the subsequent delimitation of constituencies. Thus, on the Act's own terms, implementation in 2029 is constitutionally impossible.

This is not a political prediction. It is a legal and logistical certainty. The next general election will be held in 2029 – before the constitutional prerequisites can be completed. Unless Parliament amends the Constitution again, Indian women cannot exercise their guaranteed representation until at least 2034.

The constitutional roadblock

The timeline is unforgiving. The Act mandates two sequential steps: first, a national Census; second, a delimitation exercise based on that Census data. Both are constitutionally required. Neither can be bypassed.

The next Census is scheduled for 2027. After enumeration, the data must be verified, compiled, and officially published – a process that, historically, has taken between 12 to 18 months. Only after official publication can the President of India constitute a Delimitation Commission under Article 82.

That Commission then faces an unprecedented task: redrawing 543 parliamentary constituencies and over 4,000 State Assembly constituencies. As this writer examined in these pages recently, the Commission must balance population distribution, administrative boundaries, geographic compactness, community representation, and the creation of reserved constituencies for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and now women.

India has constituted four Delimitation Commissions since Independence. Not one completed its work in fewer than three years. The most recent, established in 2002, took six years – and it was an exercise which only redrew internal boundaries without reallocating seats among States. The next Commission will be far more complex, reallocating seats among States for the first time since 1976 while implementing women's reservation simultaneously.

Even on the most optimistic timeline – Census completed in 2027, data published by early 2029, the Commission working with unusual speed – delimitation cannot conclude before 2032 or 2033. But these days, anything is possible. Without a new constitutional amendment removing the Census-delimitation linkage,



S.Y. Quraishi

is a former Chief Election Commissioner of India and the author of 'An Undocumented Wonder: The Making of the Great Indian Election'

To tie the Women's Reservation Act – a constitutional promise – to delimitation fails India's women

women's reservation cannot be implemented in 2029. Was this delay accidental or by design? The political arithmetic provides the answer. If reservation was implemented immediately within the existing 543-seat Lok Sabha, 181 constituencies would become women-only, displacing an equal number of male incumbents overnight. No political party wanted to bear that electoral cost.

The solution was elegant in its political logic: tie reservation to delimitation. After the 2027 Census, when constituencies are redrawn, the total number of Lok Sabha seats is expected to increase substantially – possibly to around 800, perhaps even 888. With an enlarged House, one-third of seats can be reserved for women without displacing current male Members of Parliament.

The political pain is absorbed by expansion rather than replacement. This explains the mechanism. It does not justify the consequence: another decade-long delay for half of India's population.

A history of waiting

Indian women have already waited several years for this legislation. The first Women's Reservation Bill was introduced in 1996. It was debated, amended, reintroduced, and blocked repeatedly. The Bill lapsed with successive Lok Sabhas. It passed the Rajya Sabha in 2010 but never came to a vote in the Lok Sabha.

The 2023 Act was supposed to end that wait. Instead, it has extended it. If delimitation is completed in 2032 or 2033, reservation will apply only from the 2034 general election. Women who celebrated the Act's passage in 2023 will wait through another full election cycle before they can contest a single reserved seat.

By tying women's representation to delimitation, the Act has entangled gender justice with India's most divisive demographic issue: the north-south seat distribution imbalance. When delimitation occurs, States with faster population growth will demand significantly more parliamentary seats. States that invested in population control will see their proportional representation decline. This tension is precisely why delimitation was frozen in 1976 and extended in 2001. By linking women's reservation to this unresolved federal arithmetic, Parliament has placed women's rights hostage to a debate that has paralysed consensus for half a century. This deadlock could further delay delimitation – and with it, women's reservation.

Why should half of India's citizens wait for an exercise that has nothing to do with gender equality? The constitutional timeline is not the only problem. The Act leaves critical design questions unanswered.

First, why does reservation exclude the Rajya Sabha and State Legislative Councils? The Act applies only to directly elected lower houses.

Second, the Act provides no sub-reservation for Other Backward Class (OBC) women, even though Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe women receive proportional sub-quotas. OBC women constitute nearly 40% of India's female population.

Third, the Act mandates that reserved constituencies will rotate after each general election but offers no operational clarity. Will women candidates shift constituencies every five years? How will rotation work when delimitation itself reshuffles boundaries?

These unanswered questions compound the implementation crisis. Without clear rules, political parties will exploit ambiguities, legal challenges will multiply, and women candidates will bear the costs.

A straightforward solution

The constitutional barrier is real, but not inevitable. Parliament created it; Parliament can remove it.

There is no constitutional necessity tying women's reservation to delimitation. Article 15(3) already empowers the State to make "special provisions" for women and children. Parliament can exercise that power again to enable immediate implementation.

The solution is straightforward: amend the Constitution to permit reservation before delimitation, either by modestly expanding the Lok Sabha immediately or by applying reservation within current constituencies for two election cycles.

Alternatively, Parliament could expand the House incrementally – adding 180 seats earmarked exclusively for women – before full delimitation concludes. This would deliver on the reservation promise while avoiding displacement of incumbents.

None of these approaches is technically impossible. What is required is political will.

The government must clarify its road map now. Will it delink reservation from delimitation through amendment? Will it expand the Lok Sabha preemptively? Will it freeze State-wise seat allocation to prevent the north-south debate from derailing women's representation?

Parliament must also address the design gaps: extend reservation to the Upper Houses, include OBC sub-reservation, and publish clear rotation rules developed in consultation with women's organisations and constitutional experts. Above all, Parliament must recognise one principle: representation delayed is representation denied.

India cannot afford another historic law that waits endlessly to take effect. If reservation is a constitutional promise – and the 2023 Act declares that it is – then it must now become a constitutional reality. Not in 2034. Not after another election cycle. Now.

India's women have waited long enough.

- **When Parliament passed the Women's Reservation Act in September 2023, millions of Indian women believed that their moment had finally arrived. One-third of all Lok Sabha and State Assembly seats would be reserved for them.**
- **The legislation was hailed as a historic victory for gender justice, ending decades of parliamentary stalemate.**
- **But the Act contains a clause that changes everything: reservation will begin only "after the first Census taken after the year 2026" and the subsequent delimitation of constituencies.**
- **Thus, on the Act's own terms, implementation in 2029 is constitutionally impossible.**

- **The Act mandates two sequential steps: first, a national Census; second, a delimitation exercise based on that Census data. Both are constitutionally required. Neither can be bypassed.**
- **The next Census is scheduled for 2027. After enumeration, the data must be verified, compiled, and officially published — a process that, historically, has taken between 12 to 18 months.**
- **Only after official publication can the President of India constitute a Delimitation Commission under Article 82.**
- **That Commission then faces an unprecedented task: redrawing 543 parliamentary constituencies and over 4,000 State Assembly constituencies.**

- **Even on the most optimistic timeline — Census completed in 2027, data published by early 2029, the Commission working with unusual speed — delimitation cannot conclude before 2032 or 2033.**
- **The first Women’s Reservation Bill was introduced in 1996. It was debated, amended, reintroduced, and blocked repeatedly. The Bill lapsed with successive Lok Sabhas. It passed the Rajya Sabha in 2010 but never came to a vote in the Lok Sabha.**
- **Above all, Parliament must recognise one principle: representation delayed is representation denied.**
- **India cannot afford another historic law that waits endlessly to take effect. If reservation is a constitutional promise — and the 2023 Act declares that it is — then it must now become a constitutional reality. Not in 2034.**

Mains Question

“Political empowerment of women is the key to inclusive governance and sustainable development.”

Examine this statement in the context of India’s parliamentary democracy.

“महिलाओं का राजनीतिक सशक्तिकरण समावेशी शासन और सतत विकास की कुंजी है।”
भारतीय संसदीय लोकतंत्र के संदर्भ में इस कथन की परीक्षा कीजिए।

India's leap, from back office to global brain trust

Page No. 6, Prelims

The narrative of India as the 'world's back office' has been officially retired. By early 2026, a profound transformation had occurred. India has become a strategic-nerve-centre for the global corporate elite. What were once known as captive centres are now Global Capability Centres (GCCs), which are sophisticated hubs that do not merely support the parent company but also define its future. This transition from cost-cutting centres to global growth engines marks a watershed moment in India's economic history.

The evolution of Indian GCCs has progressed through four distinct waves, culminating in the current GCC 4.0 era. Initially, centres were established to exploit labour arbitrage and handle routine IT and business process tasks. However, in the last few years, there has been a decisive move toward end-to-end product ownership.

Today, nearly 58% of GCCs in India are investing heavily in Agentic AI, which are autonomous Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems that can reason and execute complex tasks, thereby moving beyond mere experimentation to enterprise-scale deployment. These centres now manage global strategy leadership, high-end research and development (R&D), and proprietary intellectual property (IP) creation, making them indispensable nodes in the global value chain.

Benefits for companies and the nation

For multinational corporations (MNCs), the Indian GCC offers a unique competitive advantage: access to a multi-dimensional talent pool at a scale found nowhere else. With India housing over 1,800 GCCs and employing nearly two million professionals, companies can now drive faster innovation cycles through a follow-the-sun model. Beyond technology, these centres have become global "Centres of Excellence" (CoEs) for finance, legal, and human resources, allowing parent companies to centralise their most critical functions in a high-skill, high-efficiency environment.

Today, Indian GCCs act as global CoEs that



P. Saravanan

is a Professor of finance and accounting at the Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli



A. Paul Williams

is the Head of India at Sernova Financial

India's Global Capability Centre revolution is drawing eyeballs, but there are challenges as talent gaps, cyber threats and fiscal pressures

drive high-end R&D in fields such as quantum computing, semiconductor design, and Agentic AI. These centres no longer support the parent company. They have end-to-end product lifecycles, from initial conceptualisation and architecture to global deployment and customer feedback loops. This evolution means that the shadow leadership housed in Indian GCCs often possesses greater technical depth and execution power than the traditional headquarters.

For the Indian population, the GCC boom has catalysed high-value employment and regional development. These roles are intellectually stimulating and offer compensation far above that of traditional service-sector jobs, creating a new class of global professionals. Perhaps, most significantly, growth is finally trickling down into Tier-II and Tier-III cities such as Coimbatore (Tamil Nadu), Indore (Madhya Pradesh), and Kochi (Kerala). This geographic diversification reduces the strain on saturated metros such as Bengaluru and Hyderabad while stimulating local real estate, infrastructure, and retail economies across India.

Steering through challenges

Despite the record growth, the GCC ecosystem faces challenges that could threaten its momentum. The primary risk is the widening of the talent gap. Although India produces millions of engineers, the demand for niche skills in AI security, cloud architecture and quantum-resistant cryptography vastly outstrips the supply. This has triggered a fierce war for talent, leading to wage inflation that could eventually erode the value proposition of multinational corporations (MNC).

Furthermore, GCCs hold more critical global data and have become prime targets for state-sponsored cyber-attacks. With the implementation of the Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act, the pressure on GCCs to maintain flawless cybersecurity governance has reached unprecedented levels. Simultaneously, the introduction of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's

Global Minimum Tax (Pillar Two) fundamentally alters the tax arbitrage benefit that many MNCs previously enjoyed. With a global floor of 15% tax and the continued bone of contention regarding India's 24% markup for software R&D under Safe Harbour rules, fiscal predictability has become a top-tier board concern.

Finally, geopolitical volatility and protectionism pose long-term risks to investment. As of early 2026, global trade professionals are increasingly wary of United States tariff volatility and reshoring policies that encourage MNCs to return critical data operations to their home markets.

While India remains an attractive destination, owing to its scale, any shift toward digital sovereignty in western nations could slow the pace of new GCC setups. Additionally, as India-based centres now handle 13.7% of global cyber-attack incidents (Cyfirma Report, 2023), the threat of state-sponsored espionage and intellectual property theft has made cybersecurity the most expensive operational mandate for modern GCCs.

Need for proactive policymaking

To secure India's position as the world's innovation capital, policymakers must transition from regulators to active facilitators. The National GCC Policy Framework, proposed in the 2026-27 Budget cycle, is a step in the right direction, but execution is the key. The government should introduce a "Single-Window Clearance" system specifically for GCCs to streamline the establishment of legal entities. Additionally, rationalising transfer pricing norms and providing tax safe harbours for R&D-intensive operations will provide the fiscal certainty that global boards demand. By fostering deeper industry-academia collaborations to upskill the workforce in deep tech and offering capital subsidies for Tier-II expansion, India can ensure that its GCC revolution remains sustainable for the next decade.

The views expressed are personal

- **What were once known as captive centres are now Global Capability Centres (GCCs), which are sophisticated hubs that do not merely support the parent company but also define its future.**
- **This transition from cost-cutting centres to global growth engines marks a watershed moment in India's economic history.**
- **For multinational corporations (MNCs), the Indian GCC offers a unique competitive advantage: access to a multi-dimensional talent pool at a scale found nowhere else.**
- **With India housing over 1,800 GCCs and employing nearly two million professionals, companies can now drive faster innovation cycles through a follow-the-sun model.**
- **Beyond technology, these centres have become global "Centres of Excellence" (CoEs) for finance, legal, and human resources, allowing parent companies to centralise their most critical functions in a high-skill, high-efficiency environment.**

- **Global Capability Centers (GCCs), also known as Global In-House Centers (GICs), are strategic outposts established by multinational corporations (MNCs) in countries around the world.**
- **Operating as internal entities within the global corporate framework, these centres offer specialised capabilities including IT services, research and development, customer support, and various other business functions.**
- **General Electric (GE) has a large GCC in Bangalore, focused on R&D and engineering for its aviation and healthcare businesses.**
- **Nestle has established a GCC in Lausanne, Switzerland, dedicated to product development and innovation for its food and beverage brands.**

Protecting the freedom of speech of MPs

Page No. 7, GS 2

Recent happenings in Parliament have brought into sharp focus the issue of freedom of speech in the Houses, guaranteed by Article 105 of the Constitution. Of course, this is subject to other provisions of the Constitution and the rules of the Houses. That the freedom of speech of MPs is subject to the rules of the Houses seems to have created the wrong impression that the provisions of the rules can in a way override constitutional rights. The root of the problem which the leaders of the Opposition face in Parliament lies in this erroneous impression. The Supreme Court has clarified on many occasions that the restrictions on the rights of citizens should not be such that they eclipse those very rights. This principle would apply to the freedom of speech of MPs in the Houses as well. The rules of the Houses are meant to regulate the conduct of the proceedings in accordance with the Constitution.

Expunging words

The question which has arisen in the first part of the Budget Session of Parliament is whether there were too many restrictions imposed on the freedom of speech of the members of the Houses, in particular, the leaders of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha, Mallikarjun Kharge, reportedly wrote to the Chairman about the expunction of many portions of his speech and requested him to restore what was cut. His complaint is that after these cuts, his speeches made little sense.

An MP has the right to speak freely in the House and to have their remarks entered into the official records of the House. If the speech is not recorded, is partially recorded, or if many portions are arbitrarily deleted, the MP's right under Article 105 is infringed. Of course, Rule 380 permits the Speaker to expunge words if they are unparliamentary, defamatory, indecent, or undignified. But it permits the Speaker to expunge only the offending word and not



P.D.T. Achary

Former Secretary
General of the Lok
Sabha

The freedom of speech of MPs is subject to the rules of the Houses. This seems to have created the wrong impression that the provisions of the rules can override constitutional rights

sentences or paragraphs from the speech. Naturally, in a civilised debate in the Legislature, there should be no place for offending words which destroy the sanctity of debates and lower the dignity of the House. That is why rules confer the right on the presiding officers of the Houses to remove them from the records. But while exercising this right, the officers are duty-bound to ensure that the freedom of speech of MPs in the Houses is not diminished.

The Constitution adopted freedom of speech as the main privilege of MPs. As Erskine May, an authority on parliamentary system, says, these are special rights which are indispensable for members, for the smooth functioning of the legislature. Only the free, frank, and fearless expression of members' views enables the Legislature to perform its role effectively. If the rule on expunction is applied mindlessly to speeches made in the House, it will stifle the freedom of speech.

What are the constitutional provisions and the rules of the House to which the freedom of speech in the House is subject? Article 121 says no discussion can be held in Parliament on the conduct of a judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court except when the House considers a motion for the removal of that judge. As regards the rules of the House, they impose certain restrictions on the freedom of speech, such as sub judice matters, personal allegations, questioning the bona fides of fellow members, reflecting on the conduct of persons in high authority, and defamatory or incriminatory allegations against any person without giving prior notice to the Speaker. These rules in no way stifle the freedom to speak in the House. The problem arises when these rules are sought to be weaponised. A mindless application of the expunction rule will make a speech incoherent. It must be kept in mind that speeches made in Parliament are preserved for posterity.

Parliamentary conduct and

practices have a firm normative base. After independence, when India was transitioning to the post-colonial system, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru reset the relationship between the government and Parliament and the government and the Opposition in Parliament. He would do two things in this context. First, he would be present during the question hour every day and supplement or even correct the answers given by ministers because he believed that Parliament should be given the correct and full information. Second, he would come to the House to listen to the speeches of the Opposition leaders because he believed that he would get to know the reality only from their speeches and not from the adulatory paeans from his own party members. There cannot be a democratic Parliament without an Opposition. As the constitutional lawyer Ivor Jennings said, "Attacks upon the government and upon individual ministers are the function of the Opposition. The duty of the Opposition is to oppose."

A tragic development

The Parliament of the day seems to be losing this perspective. Ours is perhaps the only Parliament in the democratic world where a leader of the Opposition is effectively prevented from speaking in the House and against whom a motion is brought to have him disqualified for life. It is tragic that such an attempt is being made by a senior member of the House when it should be clear that Parliament has no power to disqualify a member. But this move is a pointer to the irretrievable breakdown of the relationship between the government and the Opposition. Jennings' words are prophetic: "The minority agrees that the majority must govern and the majority agrees that the minority should criticise. The process of parliamentary government would breakdown if there were no mutual forbearance."

- **Article 105 of the Constitution.**
- **Of the voters whose names were deleted, almost 4.79 lakh are dead, over 5.23 lakh have shifted, and 53,619 were found to have duplicate entries.**
- **An MP has the right to speak freely in the House and to have their remarks entered into the official records of the House.**
- **If the speech is not recorded, is partially recorded, or if many portions are arbitrarily deleted, the MP's right under Article 105 is infringed.**
- **Of course, Rule 380 permits the Speaker to expunge words if they are unparliamentary, defamatory, indecent, or undignified. But it permits the Speaker to expunge only the offending word and not sentences or paragraphs from the speech.**

- **The Constitution adopted freedom of speech as the main privilege of MPs.**
- **Only the free, frank, and fearless expression of members' views enables the Legislature to perform its role effectively. If the rule on expunction is applied mindlessly to speeches made in the House, it will stifle the freedom of speech.**
- **Article 121 says no discussion can be held in Parliament on the conduct of a judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court except when the House considers a motion for the removal of that judge.**
- **The Parliament of the day seems to be losing this perspective. Ours is perhaps the only Parliament in the democratic world where a leader of the Opposition is effectively prevented from speaking in the House and against whom a motion is brought to have him disqualified for life.**

With reference to the Constitution of India, prohibitions or limitations or provisions contained in ordinary laws cannot act as prohibitions or limitations on the constitutional powers under Article 142. It could mean which one of the following?

(a) The decisions taken by the Election Commission of India while discharging its duties cannot be challenged in any court of law.

(b) The Supreme Court of India is not constrained in the exercise of its powers by the laws made by Parliament.

(c) In the event of grave financial crisis in the country, the President of India can declare Financial Emergency without the counsel from the Cabinet.

(d) State Legislatures cannot make laws on certain matters without the concurrence of Union Legislature.

With reference to the Parliament of India, consider the following statements:

- 1. A private member's bill is a bill presented by a Member of Parliament who is not elected but only nominated by the President of India.**
- 2. Recently, a private member's bill has been passed in the Parliament of India for the first time in its history**

Which of the statements given above is/are correct?

(a) 1 only

(b) 2 only

(c) Both 1 and 2

(d) Neither 1 nor 2

Lines in the sand

The Pax Silica alliance holds benefits,
but could also tie India down

India's entry into the Pax Silica alliance represents a strategic manoeuvre to secure its technological future by aligning with a U.S.-led coalition focused on the infrastructure for Artificial Intelligence (AI) and critical minerals. Its membership could boost domestic industrial goals by complementing initiatives such as India Semiconductor, IndiaAI, and National Critical Mineral Missions. By joining this ecosystem, India will aim to secure raw materials supply and advanced equipment, attract investment, and influence global tech and security standards. India does not currently possess significant capacity in processing critical minerals nor does it extract them in large quantities. That said, for the rest of the world, including the Pax Silica group, the more important implication is in India's potential to shift the centre of gravity for global manufacturing and consumption. India's massive demand can be useful to financially justify new supply chains, especially ones not pegged to China; the country can also provide the engineering talent and assembly capacity required to diversify the global technology supply chain. India's participation could also add significant geopolitical weight to the bloc's efforts to establish democratic governance for critical technologies, rendering the coalition's standards more viable.

Of course, there is no such thing as a free lunch. The implications for India include potential economic retaliation from China, such as trade friction, slower market access, or pressure on upstream inputs such as minerals and active pharmaceutical ingredients. The Pax Silica partnership's focus on "trusted ecosystems" could also translate into rigid expectations regarding export controls and technology-transfer guardrails, which could clash with India's preference for not locking itself into alliances but, instead, pursuing what External Affairs Minister S. Jaishankar has called "issue-based alignments". The government could open itself up to more criticism at home particularly if the U.S.-led bloc also begins to shape India's domestic AI rules in ways that look externally driven. Smaller Indian firms attempting to join global value chains could also face significant financial burdens and longer timelines due to stricter security audit requirements. In the end, the success of Pax Silica will depend on whether its partners go beyond talks to build a real-world supply chain where raw minerals are mined, refined, turned into chips, and used to power AI systems, all among the pact's members, creating a secure technology network that drives India's economic growth while protecting the alliance from disruptions.

- **India's entry into the Pax Silica alliance represents a strategic manoeuvre to secure its technological future by aligning with a U.S.-led coalition focused on the infrastructure for Artificial Intelligence (AI) and critical minerals.**
- **Its membership could boost domestic industrial goals by complementing initiatives such as India Semiconductor, IndiaAI, and National Critical Mineral Missions.**
- **By joining this ecosystem, India will aim to secure raw materials supply and advanced equipment, attract investment, and influence global tech and security standards.**
- **India does not currently possess significant capacity in processing critical minerals nor does it extract them in large quantities.**

Aim:

- **To create resilient and diversified global supply chains for critical minerals, semiconductors and AI-related technologies.**
- **To deepen economic partnerships among like-minded countries and reduce risks from coercive or monopolistic supply**

Participants:

- **Signatories include: Australia, Greece, Israel, Japan, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Singapore, UAE, United Kingdom, India (new entrant).**
- **Non-signatory participants: Canada, European Union, Netherlands, OECD, Taiwan.**

Key Features:

- **Supply chain security focus:** Promotes diversification of electronics and critical mineral supply chains to reduce excessive concentration risks.
- **AI and technology collaboration:** Encourages cooperation across AI systems, semiconductors, data infrastructure and advanced manufacturing ecosystems.
- **Critical minerals partnership:** Supports coordinated refining, processing and access to rare-earth and strategic minerals needed for future technologies.
- **Investment and infrastructure cooperation:** Promotes shared investments and incentives to strengthen trusted industrial and technology networks.
- **Trusted innovation ecosystem:** Builds collaboration among governments, industries and innovators to create secure and reliable technology stacks.

Tariffs in trouble

The U.S. Supreme Court has done well to limit Trump's presidential powers

In a major blow to a central pillar of U.S. President Donald Trump's foreign policy, the country's Supreme Court (SCOTUS) has ruled by a 6-3 margin that his use of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) to impose tariffs on numerous countries is not in accordance with law and must be struck down. With Chief Justice John Roberts and two other conservative justices appointed by Mr. Trump siding with the three liberal justices on the subject, the Court ruled that Mr. Trump's assertion of "extraordinary power to unilaterally impose tariffs of unlimited amount, duration, and scope", is contravened by the absence of "clear congressional authorization" to exercise it. It also observed that the IEEPA contained no reference to tariffs or duties and that the executive had not identified any statute that used the word "regulate" to authorise taxation. Arguing that until now no President has read IEEPA to confer such power, the SCOTUS concluded that all the evidence available and its reading of the statutes implied that the Court believed that "IEEPA does not authorize the President to impose tariffs." Unsurprisingly, Mr. Trump reacted angrily on social media, posting that he would be raising his global tariff rate to 15%, after initially suggesting that it would be imposed at 10%, under the authority conferred to the White House for 150 days

imposed under laws other than the IEEPA, including those on aluminium and steel under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, are unaffected by this ruling although Mr. Trump would face challenges in bringing fresh tariff rounds under this umbrella.

While multiple countries were slapped with tariffs earlier, including India at a whopping overall rate of 50% owing to Washington's objections to New Delhi purchasing oil from Russia, the impact of the SCOTUS ruling will vary based on the specifics of trade agreements struck, if any. Indian negotiators seeking to conclude the terms of a free trade agreement would not be blamed for feeling like they were suspended in limbo after the ruling has changed the terms of debate on which sectors to open up to concessionary rates in bilateral trade, especially after the American side's punitive potential has now been defanged to an extent. At a broader level, the ruling is to be welcomed by anyone valuing robust democratic checks and balances. The two administrations of Mr. Trump have stretched, and in some cases exceeded, the scope of permissible policy actions under domestic and international law. Until this ruling by the court, there has been a deafening silence on containing such actions by institutions rooted in constitutional authority that are capable of imposing a countervailing force.

- **In a major blow to a central pillar of U.S. President Donald Trump's foreign policy, the country's Supreme Court (SCOTUS) has ruled by a 6-3 margin that his use of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) to impose tariffs on numerous countries is not in accordance with law and must be struck down.**
- **Mr. Trump reacted angrily on social media, posting that he would be raising his global tariff rate to 15%, after initially suggesting that it would be imposed at 10%, under the authority conferred to the White House for 150 days under Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974.**
- **Tariffs imposed under laws other than the IEEPA, including those on aluminium and steel under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, are unaffected by this ruling although Mr. Trump would face challenges in bringing fresh tariff rounds under this umbrella.**

Cybercrime in India



- **Data from the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) revealed a 24% spike in cybercrime cases during 2025, with Indians losing ₹22,495 crore.**
- **The report highlights a shift toward highly organized investment scams, which accounted for over 75% of total financial losses.**
- **Cybercrime refers to criminal activities carried out using computers, networks, or digital devices.**
- **In the Indian context, it has evolved from simple phishing to sophisticated digital arrests, sextortion, and AI-driven fraud.**
- **It targets individuals, businesses, and critical infrastructure, threatening both economic stability and personal privacy.**

Reasons for the Rise in Cybercrime:

- **Increased Internet Penetration:** With over 86% of households connected by 2025, the attack surface for criminals has expanded into rural India.
- **E.g. Fraudsters are now targeting first-time digital users in Tier-2 and Tier-3 cities who are less familiar with digital hygiene.**
- **Desire for Easy Money:** High inflation and the allure of quick wealth drive people toward fraudulent high-return schemes.
- **E.g. The massive rise in fake stock market trading scams in 2025 was fueled by citizens seeking to replicate legitimate market gains through unverified expert apps.**
- **Adoption of AI and Deepfakes:** Criminals are using Generative AI to create hyper-realistic voices and videos for impersonation.

Challenges Associated with Cybercrime:

- **Low FIR Conversion:** Many victims report to portals, but very few cases translate into formal police investigations.
- **E.g. In 2025, while 28 lakh cases were reported, only 55,484 FIRs were filed, often due to the jurisdictional complexity of the crimes.**
- **Anonymity and Technical Sophistication:** Cybercriminals use VPNs and encrypted layers, making it difficult for local police to trace them.
- **E.g. Investigating ransomware attacks on Indian hospitals in 2025 was stalled because the attackers operated through decentralised Ransomware-as-a-Service models.**
- **Jurisdictional Hurdles:** Crime committed in one state often uses bank accounts in a second state and mobile numbers from a third.

Mains Question

Cybercrime has emerged as a serious threat to national security and individual privacy. Examine the major types of cybercrimes in India and suggest preventive measures.

साइबर अपराध राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा और व्यक्तिगत गोपनीयता के लिए गंभीर खतरा बन चुका है। भारत में साइबर अपराधों के प्रमुख प्रकारों का उल्लेख कीजिए तथा उनके निवारण के उपाय सुझाइए।

Thank You!

