

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Megha Middha



Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC - NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR - Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CITIZENSHIP AMENDMENT ACT (CAA) AND NATIONAL REGISTER OF CITIZENS (NRC) IN INDIA: ANALYZING RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND JUDICIAL RESPONSES

AUTHORED BY - DR. C. USHA

ABSTRACT:-

India's citizenship, legal standards, and human rights are significantly impacted by the crucial new legislative initiatives of the CAA and NRC. Non-Muslim refugees from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan who have experienced religious persecution can gain Indian citizenship under the new CAA (enacted in December 2019). This particular measure has sparked intense discussion, raising doubts about its compatibility with India's secular values as enshrined in the Constitution. The CAA has been accused by critics of undermining the secular structure by explicitly excluding Muslims, which could result in discrimination and marginalization.

Meanwhile, the NRC is striving to establish a comprehensive list of Indians on - ostensibly to identify and deport illegal immigrants. Despite being introduced in Assam, the NRC process has been plagued by administrative issues and accusations of bias. Almost two million people were left homeless or at risk of being detained as a result of the exercise. CAA and NRC have far-reaching constitutional effects. The two measures have been challenged in courts and accused of violating Articles 14 and 15 of the Indian Constitution's right to equality, prohibition of discrimination based on religion, caste or gender. The Supreme Court of India has been instrumental in resolving these challenges by balancing legislative intent with fundamental rights.

The courts have responded with a mixed approach, acknowledging the challenges of reconciling national security and humanitarian concerns with constitutional values. While some judgments have

emphasized the need for inclusive and equitable procedures, others claim that citizenship policies are ultimately predetermined by the state. The research examines the socio-political and legal frameworks influenced by the CAA and NRC, providing insight into how these institutions shape India's democratic values. By examining the latest developments in India, including legal challenges and judicial responses, the paper seeks to provide a detailed understanding of the contentious issues surrounding these legislative measures.

KEYWORDS:- Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), National Register of Citizens (NRC), Constitutional implications, Secularism and equality, Judicial responses, Human rights and statelessness

INTRODUCTION:-

The National Register of Citizens (NRC) and the CAA, which was passed in December 2019, have triggered significant debates and demonstrations across India. Non-Muslim refugees from Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Afghanistan who arrived in India before December 31, 2014, will be eligible for Indian citizenship through the CAA. The selective strategy rests on the belief that such communities are persecuted for their religion in their native countries. On the other hand, the NRC is set to establish a comprehensive list of Indians for the purpose of identifying and deporting illegal immigrants. The NRC process has been carried out in Assam, but the government has proposed plans for it to be implemented across the country, causing much controversy.

The government bases these actions on national security and humanitarian concerns. According to them, the CAA is a way to correct past mistakes made by religious minorities in neighboring countries, and the NRC must ensure that illegal immigrants do not take advantage of India's resources. Advocates view these actions as essential for the preservation of national security and integrity. The CAA and NRC have been heavily criticized by opposition political parties, civil society groups, and international human rights organizations.

Critics maintain that the CAA's exclusion of Muslims is a form of religious discrimination, which goes against the secular nature of the Indian Constitution. This exclusion has raised concerns that

the CAA could be used as a tool for communal disunity, undermining secularism which is at its core in the Indian Constitution. Moreover, the implementation of the NRC process in Assam has been marred by significant administrative and legal hurdles. Almost two million people, many of whom have been living in India for decades, are excluded from the refuge, leading to concerns about widespread statelessness and detention, which impact most marginalized groups.

The CAA and NRC have a wide array of constitutional matters. Both measures have been challenged in the courts, with petitions alleging a violation of fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Article 14 on the right to equality, Article 15 on preventing discrimination based on religion, race, caste, gender, or origin and Article 21 on personal liberty. The judiciary's duty in this scenario is to maintain a balance between the legislative intent of the government and the protection of fundamental rights.

The Supreme Court of India has recently taken up the challenge posed by the CAA and NRC in legal proceedings. The legal responses have been diverse, highlighting the intricacy and fragility of the issues at hand. On one hand, courts have emphasized the need for inclusive and just procedures to ensure equal protection of individual rights. Nevertheless, certain verdicts have highlighted the state remit to establish citizenship policies, taking into account the government's worries about national security and territorial integrity.

This paper will analyze the CAA and NRC in terms of their socio-political and legal ramifications. The study aims to provide a more detailed account of the controversial issues surrounding these legislative initiatives by examining recent events, legal disputes, and court proceedings. It is essential to recognize the larger issues of human rights, constitutional integrity, and the democratic values in India. The study seeks to be integrated into the ongoing debate on India's citizenship and secularism, examining the potential long-term effects of these legislative initiatives on its diverse and multifaceted society.

To sum up, the CAA and NRC are crucial pieces of legislation that have far-reaching impacts. India's future course in citizenship and human rights is dependent on the impact of legal and judicial processes, which are already intertwined with other complex national security and humanitarian

issues. This paper is an attempt to make these important issues clearer and to provide a more comprehensive understanding and discussion of the matter.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

THE CITIZENSHIP AMENDMENT ACT (CAA)

The Citizenship Amendment (CAA) was a significant amendment to the Citizenship Act of 1955 that sought to enable certain groups of refugees in the United States to obtain Indian citizenship. Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jain, Parsi, and Christian refugees from Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, who arrived in India on or before December 31, 2014 are eligible for citizenship under the CAA. The Indian government defended this amendment by stating that religious minorities are persecuted in their predominantly Muslim countries of origin. The removal of Muslims from this list has sparked significant debate and controversy. Historical migrations and geopolitical tensions in South Asia are the starting points for the CAA. The partition of India in 1947 resulted in significant population exchanges between India and Pakistan (including present-day Bangladesh). Many have sought refuge in India due to political and religious conflicts that have occurred in the region for decades. Before the CAA, the Citizenship Act of 1955 granted citizenship through a range of options, including birth, descent, registration (parental, legal, and marital), and naturalization. The CAA's inclusion of religion as a basis for citizenship signifies alterations in India's secular legislative framework.

According to critics, the CAA contradicts Article 14 of Indian Constitution's guarantee of equality before the law. According to various Supreme Court judgments, the Preamble highlights the discriminatory impact of the Act on Muslims and may undermine the Indian state's secularism. However, the Indian government maintains that the CAA serves a humanitarian need by protecting persecuted minorities from neighboring countries. The Act's potential to create religious differences and undermine the secular values that underpin Indian democracy has not been quelled by this position.

The National Register of Citizens (NRC)

The National Register of Citizens (NRC) is an instrument designed to register and confirm the citizenship status of individuals living in India. The NRC was established in Assam during the 1951 Census of India to address the issue of illegal immigration. With a long-standing history of immigration from Bangladesh, Assam is particularly attuned to the challenges of citizenship and illegal migration. Assam's NRC process was updated and completed in 2019 as per the guidance of the Supreme Court of India. This exercise was about identifying and recording legal residents, as well as eliminating those identified as illegal immigrants. This was a difficult process, with almost two million people being removed from the final list. Many of those excluded were unable to prove their citizenship by providing the necessary documentation, which put them at risk of being stateless. Many of these were Muslims and raised concerns about the NRC's racially biased implementation.

The NRC's involvement in Assam can be traced back to the 1985 Assam Accord, which was an agreement reached between the Indian government and the Movement. This move prompted calls to address the issue of illegal immigration from Bangladesh. Under the Accord, anyone who came to Assam after 24 March 1971 would be considered an illegal immigrant. This agreement was deemed complete by using the NRC, but the implementation caused significant administrative and logistical problems, leading to widespread panic and protests.

Fears that Muslims will face discrimination and marginalization are heightened by the idea that the NRC could be expanded nationwide. Critics contend that the CAA and a national NRC could result in systematic disenfranchisement of Muslims. Individuals who do not have the required paperwork may be denied entry into the NRC and, in the absence of the CAA's religious protection, could be detained or expelled from the country. The government maintains that a national NRC is essential for national security and to effectively manage illegal immigration.

The CAA and NRC's legal challenges highlight the intricate relationship between legislative intent and fundamental rights. In the Supreme Court, there have been petitions to question whether the NRC's procedural fairness and constitutionality of the CAA were at issue. The litigation centers on the possibility of violating Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution, asserting that these actions are biased and infringe upon the fundamental rights of equality.

The CAA and NRC's future direction will be influenced by the way the judiciary handles these issues. The Supreme Court will have to balance the government's objectives and human rights with respect to constitutional values. These legal disputes will have a significant impact on India's democratic principles and its commitment to secularism and equality. In summary, the CAA and NRC are laws with historical origins and modern-day significance. They have triggered extensive debate and legal scrutiny, with particular attention to issues of Indian citizenship, secularism, and human rights. Despite the ongoing debate and judicial responses, the socio-political and legal landscape of India will be affected by these controversial issues.

CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS SECULARISM AND EQUALITY

The Constitution of India lays emphasis on the principles of secularism and equality, which are central to its democratic system. The Constitution's Article 14 states that all individuals are equal in the eyes of the law and have the right to receive equal protection under the laws. This article is the cornerstone of India's fight for equality, ensuring that no one will be discriminated against by the state. The CAA's inclusion of Muslims in citizenship requirements based on religious grounds raises doubts about its commitment to this fundamental right. Critics argue that the CAA's selective inclusion of Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists in its remit is inconsistent with Article 14, while explicitly barring Muslims from participating. The exclusion is deemed an arbitrarily placed inclusion that goes against the notion of equality before law.

Also, Article 15 of the Constitution prohibits state discrimination based on religion, race, caste/sex or place of birth. This constitutional mandate is in violation due to the CAA's selective nature, which creates a religion-based distinction. The CAA challenges the secular ethos of the Indian state, which is supposed to treat all religions equally by placing an emphasis on specific groups.

RIGHT TO LIFE AND LIBERTY

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution safeguards the right to life and personal liberty. According to the Supreme Court, this article encompasses a right to live with dignity, access to basic necessities, and the protection of personal freedoms. The CAA's exclusionary criteria, along with the National Register of Citizens (NRC) potential for statelessness could undermine these rights.

Many people, especially those from marginalized groups, are at risk of being excluded due to the NRC's attempt to create an official register of Indian citizens. In Assam, the NRC exercise left almost two million people off its final list, many of whom were unable to provide the required documentation. Those who are not included in the NRC may be declared stateless, leading to serious human rights abuses. Stateless individuals are frequently denied basic services like medical, educational, and employment opportunities, which can compromise their right to life and liberty.

The NRC's involvement with the CAA'S religious standards adds to these issues. The CAA's protective provisions are not applicable to Muslims who are exempt from the NRC, unlike those from other specified religious groups. The provision of this protection is a cause for concern as it could result in widespread marginalization and displacement of the Muslim community in India, endangering their fundamental human rights and subverting the constitutional guarantee of life and liberty.

FEDERALISM AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHALLENGES

The Federal Constitution's inception creates a new barrier to the enforcement of laws, such as the CAA and NRC. A significant number of states in the Indian Union possess considerable independence in internal governance. The federal structure mandates the coordination of national policies and laws between the central and state governments. A number of state governments have been vehemently against the CAA and the proposed national NRC. States such as West Bengal, Kerala, Punjab and others have passed resolutions opposing the CAA and NRC on the grounds that they are discriminatory and could lead to communal unrest. The resistance reveals

the administrative obstacles and political opposition that the central government faces in enforcing these measures. State governments are opposed due to their practical and ethical perspective. Many states argue that the administrative resources, logistical planning, and bureaucratic efficiency required for a nationwide NRC would be unsustainable. Assam's experiences, where the NRC process was filled with errors and exclusions, highlight the challenges faced. The risk of unrest and communal tension is also a significant concern. The CAA and NRC have already caused protests across the country, highlighting deep-seated concerns and resistance among various communities. In a society that is multifaceted like India, these measures could potentially worsen communal divisions and undermine social cohesion.

In India, the federal system prevents the central government from imposing strict laws without facing significant opposition from state governments. A more collaborative and consultative approach to policy-making is highlighted, particularly in areas like citizenship and human rights. To sum up, the CAA and NRC have a wide array of constitutional matters to discuss. The CAA's selective approach undermines secularism and equality, while the NRC raises important questions about life and liberty. India's federal system presents an additional challenge, with state governments displaying considerable resistance to the implementation of these measures due to administrative and political issues. India's constitutional principles and human rights will be influenced by the ongoing legal and social discussions concerning the CAA and NRC.

RECENT DEVELOPMENT :-

The implementation of the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) in December 2019 triggered protests and civil society reactions in India. A multitude of individuals, including students, academics, activists, and the general public, expressed strong opposition to these demonstrations. The protests' size and intensity emphasized the strong suspicions of the CAA'S potential to distort the country's social structure and its perceived unconstitutionality. Protests: The protests were largely peaceful and broad participation was notable. Shaheen Bagh and other iconic locations in Delhi became hubs of protest as hundreds of women, many of whom were Muslim, led a continuous sit-in protest. The CAA's exclusionary behavior and the harm it caused to India's secular identity were the focus of a larger national conversation. Protesters claimed that the Act discriminates against Muslims, in

violation of the constitutional principles of equality and secularism.

Student-led protests were of great importance, with universities across the nation becoming hubs of opposition. Jamia Millidium Islamist, Jawajinnehr University and Aligarh Muslim University were among the institutions where large crowds mobilized. The CAA and NRC's actions during the protests were met with intense crackdowns by law enforcement agencies, leading to clashes and police brutality that fueled public outcry.

Other forms of response from civil society included legal challenges, in addition to protests. The CAA's constitutionality was challenged in a series of petitions that were heard in the Supreme Court of India. The petitioners contended that the Act breaches fundamental rights in the Constitution, specifically Articles 14 and 15, which ensure fairness before the law and prohibit discrimination based on religion. The CAA and NRC were also criticized by international human rights organizations, including the United Nations. In an application for intervention filed by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the CAA was found to be discriminatory and in breach of India's obligations under international human rights law.

Throughout this period, the Indian government has strongly supported the CAA and the NRC's proposed nationwide implementation. According to Prime Minister Narendra Modi and Home Minister Amit Shah, the CAA is a humanitarian initiative that seeks to provide asylum to refugees from neighboring countries. They claim that these minorities have no alternative and deserve India's protection. The government asserts that the NRC's duty to locate and deport illegal immigrants is crucial for ensuring national security and safeguarding the rights of genuine individuals.

The CAA and NRC have been the subject of a heated political debate, despite the government's efforts to defend themselves. The Indian National Congress, Trinamool Congress and various regional parties have been vocal critics of these measures. According to them, the CAA and a national NRC could result in significant disenfranchisement, particularly for Muslims, and jeopardize the country's secularism. Opposition parties have taken up arms against the CAA and NRC, particularly among state governments. Resolutions were passed in legislative assemblies of states like West Bengal, Kerala, Punjab and Maharashtra saying that they do not want to implement the CAA and the

NRC. The states have voiced apprehension about the discriminatory effects of these measures and how they would be administered. Mamata Banerjee, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, has been a prominent critic, leading protests and vocally opposing "divisive policies." There has also been polarisation in politics through debates and public speaking. These steps, as argued by CAA and NRC supporters, are crucial for national security and historical justice. Opponents see them as instruments of political polarization, which could lead to communal conflict and undermine India's democratic ideal. To counteract widespread protests and political opposition, the government has made it clear that the CAA and NRC will not discriminate against any Indian citizen regardless of their religious beliefs. However, these assurances have not alleviated the anxieties and doubts of numerous individuals and advocates.

To sum up, the recent developments concerning the CAA and NRC reveal a country that is split on citizenship, secularism, and human rights. The broader protests and civil society reactions demonstrate a robust democratic engagement, but the divergent political responses highlight the controversial nature of these laws. The CAA and NRC's future in India hinges on the impact of ongoing legal challenges and the responses of state governments.

CONCLUSION:-

The CAA and NRC are significant milestones in India's legal and political history, influencing the country's commitment to secularism, equality, and human rights. The introduction of these measures and their proposed implementation has triggered a nationwide debate, sparking fundamental inquiries about the essence of Indian citizenship. The constitutional implications of the CAA and NRC require close examination and discussion. The values of secularism and equality are central to the Indian Constitution. Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws to all individuals, while Article 15 prohibits discrimination based on religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth. The CAA's inclusion of certain religious groups, while excluding Muslims, is in conflict with the fundamental principles of the constitution. Critics contend that this selective approach undermines the secular nature of the Indian state and sets a dangerous precedent for religious discrimination in citizenship laws.

The possibility of a national NRC only serves to increase concerns. Millions may be forced to leave

marginalized communities due to the risk of being unable to prove their citizenship through the NRC, especially given the CAA's exclusionary criteria. Furthermore, Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees personal liberty and the right to life, is in question. Muslims' fundamental rights, including access to healthcare, education and employment, are at risk due to the lack of protective measures under the CAA that prohibits their exclusion from the NRC.

The CAA and NRC's future is heavily reliant on the quality of their Judicial responses. A number of petitions challenging the constitutionality of the CAA have been heard by the Supreme Court of India. These claims are centered on possible violations of Articles 14, 15, and 21, alleging that the Act is biased and undermines fundamental human rights. How the judiciary construes and applies constitutional principles in these cases will have far-reaching consequences for the maintenance of secularism and equality in India.

The government's objectives and fundamental rights must be weighed against each other in the courts. The need for the judiciary to uphold secular principles and avoid discrimination is a recent development that can be supported by previous rulings. Not only will the CAA and NRC be affected by these cases, but they will also set precedents for future laws on citizenship and human rights.

The CAA and NRC have been impacted by the actions of civil society. Protests involving students, academics, activists, and common citizens have raised serious concerns about the potential social impact of these measures and their violation of constitutional values. The demonstrations demonstrate a strong democratic involvement and adherence to secularism and equality. The judiciary has been brought in by legal challenges from civil society groups and individuals, ensuring that the constitutional implications are thoroughly reviewed. The pressure on the Indian government to change its stance on international human rights organizations has contributed to calls for changes. The importance of preserving constitutional values is highlighted in this paper by examining recent developments and judicial responses. We must examine the CAA and NRC closely to ensure they align with India's commitment to justice, equality, and human rights. To uphold the democratic values of India, secularism and non-discrimination are crucially important constitutional provisions. To sum up, the CAA and NRC are not just initiatives but also a pivotal moment in India's quest for greater social equity. The involvement of civil society in the judicial review process will be essential to shaping the future of these measures. India's commitment to justice, equality, and

human rights can only be upheld through effective citizenship laws that reflect the country's constitutional values.

Reference:-

1. Basu, D. D. (2020). *Introduction to the Constitution of India*. LexisNexis.
2. Bhattacharya, S. (2020). *CAA-NRC and the Politics of Citizenship in India*. Routledge.
3. Chishti, M., & Hipsman, F. (2015). The Intersection of Immigration and National Security in the Post-9/11 Era. *Migration Policy Institute*.
4. Deshpande, S., & Ramakrishnan, V. (2020). Citizenship Amendment Act and the National Register of Citizens: A Critical Analysis. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55(10).
5. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). United Nations.
6. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). United Nations.
7. Supreme Court of India. (2020). Petitions Challenging the Constitutionality of the Citizenship Amendment Act.

IJLRA