



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, Lakshmanagarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmanagarh, 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.

PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, 2002 **(PMLA) CRITICAL REVIEW OF KEY PROVISIONS**

AUTHORED BY - AKSHAY G SUBRAMONIAM

Abstract

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA) stands as a pivotal legislation within India, aiming at combatting money laundering and associated financial wrongdoings. Its primary objective is to thwart money laundering activities and facilitate the confiscation of assets derived from or linked to such illicit acts.

Money laundering, broadly construed under the Act, encompasses processes or activities intended to legitimize unlawfully obtained proceeds, including those derived from criminal endeavors. Such conduct is strictly prohibited by the Act, with individuals found culpable of such offenses facing stringent penalties, including monetary fines and incarceration.

Exploring the intricate domain outlined by the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) leads us through a terrain where financial regulations, tenets of criminal justice, and ethical considerations intersect.

Despite being a vital tool in battling against money laundering, the PMLA has come under fire, particularly regarding certain provisions like the proceeds of crime and Burden of proof questioning the legislative intent of the Act." These provisions call for critical examination, especially in light of the most recent rulings from the Hon. Supreme Court of India. Pending the reconsideration of the contentious judgment in 2022, notably in the cases of ¹Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India¹, the Directorate of Enforcement (ED) appears to have gained substantial momentum.

The critical review of key provisions in the ²Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 employs

¹ Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India 2022 SCC ONLINE SC 929

² The Prevention of Money laundering act, 2002 50.

a methodology centered on librarian research. This approach entails the thorough exploration of pertinent books, articles, and recent case laws from the Honorable Supreme Court of India.

keywords:PMLA, Prevention of Money Laundering Act 2002, Critical analysis, Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), Section 3 of PMLA ,Section 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), Section 45 of PMLA

Introduction

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002 is a crucial piece of legislation in India aimed at combating the menace of money laundering, which has far-reaching consequences on the financial system and society as a whole. The interpretation of Section 3 of the PMLA, which defines the offence of money laundering, has been a subject of considerable debate and controversy. This paper contends that the broad interpretation of Section 3, encompassing indirect involvement without the need for specific knowledge, aligns with the legislative intent of the PMLA.

The text of Section 3 is expansive, covering not only direct involvement in money laundering activities but also indirect attempts or assistance knowingly provided in connection with the proceeds of crime. Critics argue that this broad language may inadvertently capture individuals who are indirectly linked to the predicate offence without having specific knowledge of their involvement. However, a comprehensive understanding of the legislative intent behind the PMLA supports the contention that such a broad interpretation is warranted.

The primary objective of the PMLA is to curb money laundering and disrupt the financial channels through which ill-gotten gains flow. Money launderers often employ sophisticated techniques to conceal the illicit origin of funds, and these techniques may involve a network of individuals playing diverse roles in the process. To effectively combat money laundering, it is imperative that the law covers not only those directly engaged in criminal activities but also those indirectly contributing to the laundering process.

Moreover, the PMLA is designed to be a deterrent, aiming not only to punish offenders but also to dissuade individuals from any form of involvement in money laundering activities. The inclusion of indirect involvement without the need for specific knowledge aligns with this deterrent objective. It sends a strong message that anyone, whether directly or indirectly connected to the proceeds of crime, will be held accountable under the law.

While critics may argue that the broad interpretation could lead to unintended consequences and unjust prosecutions, it is essential to recognize the flexibility inherent in legal systems to address such concerns through judicial review and interpretation. Courts can play a crucial role in ensuring that the application of Section 3 remains consistent with the principles of justice and fairness.

The challenges listed below are examined in this research paper:

1. Proceeds of Crime – Broad definition

There are disagreements over how to interpret "proceeds of crime" in relation to the PMLA. There are those who contend that the definition is overly expansive and could include legitimate financial transactions, which could result in abuse.

"Does the broad interpretation of PMLA Section 3 encompass indirect involvement without the requirement for specific knowledge, in line with legislative intent?"

The broad interpretation of PMLA Section 3 includes indirect involvement without the need for specific knowledge, aligning with the legislative intent. As per section 3 of the Act, "whosoever directly or indirectly attempts to indulge or knowingly assists or knowingly is a party or is actually involved in any process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime including its concealment, possession, acquisition or use and projecting or claiming it as untainted property shall be guilty of the offence of money laundering".

Section 3 of PMLA defines that the offence of money laundering in terms of who is punishable,

ie: the word used is whosoever so anybody who is involved directly or indirectly in the activity of dealing with the proceeds of the crime and projecting the proceeds as untainted property shall be guilty of the offence. The section may be interpreted with the orbit of the legislative intent, the Act may be interpreted by giving meaning to its legislative object this special act was enacted as the existing laws were found to be ineffective in handling the offence of money laundering using such proceeds for nefarious activities as defined in the IPC, NDPS Act etc. So, a wide interpretation can be given to the application of the act that means even indirect attempts or assistance with the knowledge is also sufficient enough to bring home any such activity within the mischief of this section.

Advocating for a broad interpretation of Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) is grounded in compelling arguments reflecting legislative intent and the dynamic nature of financial crimes. Section 3's expansive language, including terms like "directly or indirectly," indicates Parliament's intention to encompass a wide range of conduct, ensuring no loopholes in prosecuting money laundering. A narrow interpretation might miss evolving methods used by criminals. Moreover, aligning with the PMLA's objectives, a broad interpretation holds individuals accountable for any involvement in money laundering, regardless of their direct participation.

Indian courts have consistently upheld this interpretation

In ³**Anoop Barataria & ETC vs DY. Director enforcement directorate & anr**, The Court referenced Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), which employs the terms "directly or indirectly." This section stipulates that individuals who make an attempt, knowingly aid, become a party to, or are actively engaged in any process or activity linked to the proceeds of crime, encompassing actions like concealing, possessing, acquiring, or utilizing such illicit funds, are subject to prosecution for a money laundering offense. As a result, the Court concluded that it would be legally incorrect to require that the accused possess knowledge that they were dealing with the proceeds of a crime as a prerequisite for the prosecution to initiate a complaint under the provisions of the Act.

³ Anoop Barataria & ETC vs DY. Director enforcement directorate & anr – [2023] 3 S.C.R. 531

In the case of ⁴*Vijay Madanlal Chowdry v. Union of India*, the Court emphasized that Parliament holds the authority to determine what constitutes offenses under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA). They underscored that Courts should refrain from interfering in matters of legislative policy. Consequently, the Supreme Court dismissed challenges to various provisions and rules under the PMLA.

The judgment also ruled that statements given to Enforcement Directorate (ED) officers are admissible in court, even though these officers aren't officially classified as police officers. The Court supported provisions regarding the presumption of guilt, shifting the burden of proof, and strict bail conditions.

Additionally, the ruling expanded the definition of 'money laundering'. This means that ED officers can start investigating a case as soon as a related offense is reported, even before tracing any proceeds of crime.

In a parallel decision in the case of ⁵*Rohit Tandon v. Enforcement Directorate (2018)*, the Supreme Court emphasized the expansive scope of the term "directly or indirectly" in Section 3. The Court declared that this terminology should be given a broad interpretation, encompassing not only direct engagement in money laundering but also any form of indirect participation or facilitation of such activities. By adopting this inclusive interpretation, the judiciary acknowledges the evolving nature of financial crimes and the imperative to address various degrees of involvement to effectively combat money laundering. These judicial pronouncements provide legal clarity and robustly endorse the broad interpretation of Section 3, aligning with the legislative intent of the PMLA and fortifying the legal framework to combat the challenges posed by money laundering activities in contemporary times.

Critiques argue that the interpretation of section 3 of the PMLA is very expansive and The arguments against the Enforcement Directorate(ED) broad interpretation of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) raise valid concerns that touch upon

4

⁵ Rohit Tandon v. Enforcement Directorate(2018) 11 SCC 46

fundamental legal principles and individual rights.

Consistency with International Standards

The alignment of the broad interpretation of Section 3 with international standards and practices in the global fight against money laundering is a pivotal aspect of its justification. The international community, represented prominently by organizations like the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), recognizes the need for comprehensive legal frameworks that can effectively combat the increasingly sophisticated methods employed by money launderers.

The Financial Action Task Force, an intergovernmental body that sets international standards for combating money laundering and terrorist financing, advocates for member countries to have broad and inclusive definitions of money laundering offenses. The broad interpretation of Section 3 reflects a commitment by India to align its legal framework with these global standards. This alignment is essential not only for fostering international cooperation but also for ensuring that India's efforts are in harmony with the broader strategies employed by the global community to combat financial crimes.

By adopting a broad interpretation that encompasses indirect involvement without the need for specific knowledge, India positions itself as an active participant in the global effort to address money laundering comprehensively. This alignment facilitates collaboration with international counterparts, as it ensures that India's legal framework is conducive to information sharing, mutual legal assistance, and coordinated efforts to combat transnational financial crimes.

Conforming to international best practices is not merely a diplomatic consideration; it is a strategic imperative. In an era where financial transactions transcend national borders, money laundering often operates on a global scale. The broad interpretation of Section 3 ensures that India is well-equipped to respond to the transnational nature of money laundering activities, reinforcing the country's commitment to upholding the integrity of the international financial system.

Furthermore, aligning with international standards enhances India's standing in the global community as a responsible and proactive participant in the fight against money laundering. It signals to the international financial community that India is serious about implementing robust

anti-money laundering measures and is willing to collaborate with other nations to combat illicit financial activities.

2. Burden of Proof on Accused

The reverse burden of proof principle in the PMLA Act is designed to provide additional support to prosecutors in combating money laundering effectively. Given the intricate nature of financial crimes and the challenges in obtaining direct evidence, this principle helps bridge the gap by requiring the accused to demonstrate their innocence regarding specific aspects of the offense. Additionally, it serves as a deterrent to individuals engaging in money laundering activities, as they are aware of the heightened burden placed upon them to refute allegations effectively.

They are required to prove their innocence or disprove a specific element of the offence, rather than the prosecution having to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Under the reverse burden of proof, the legal burden shifts to the defendant to demonstrate their innocence or disprove a particular element of the alleged offence. This means that the accused must provide evidence or arguments to counter the accusations made against them.

The Reverse Burden of Proof Principle in the PMLA Act Ensures Prosecutorial Efficacy Without Infringing Upon the Fundamental Rights of the Accused.

The reverse burden of proof principle in the PMLA Act is structured in a way that does not inherently violate the fundamental rights of the accused. It is applied in a narrow and specific manner, targeting only certain elements of the offense where the accused is in the best position to provide relevant evidence. Furthermore, it does not absolve the prosecution from proving the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. Instead, it simply shifts the burden of proving specific aspects to the accused, ensuring a balanced approach to justice while also serving the overarching goal of combating money laundering effectively.

The RBPP in the PMLA Act represents a legal tool aimed at enhancing prosecutorial efficacy in combating money laundering. However, its implementation must be accompanied by robust safeguards to protect the fundamental rights of the accused. Through judicial scrutiny and

adherence to principles of fairness and due process, the RBPP can effectively serve its intended purpose while upholding the rights of the accused in the pursuit of justice.

In the case of ⁶*Smt. Janata Jha v. Assistant Director* [(2014) CrLJ 2556], the court held that the burden of proving that the proceeds of crime are untainted property shall be on the accused. This ruling underscores the application of the Reverse Burden of Proof Principle in the context of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), wherein the accused is required to demonstrate that the assets in question are not derived from criminal activities.

Conclusion

The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002 stands as a crucial legislative tool in India's efforts to combat the scourge of money laundering and related financial crimes. While the Act has faced criticism, particularly regarding the broad interpretation of key provisions, it is imperative to recognize the necessity of such broad interpretations in effectively addressing the evolving nature of financial crimes.

The broad interpretation of Section 3 of the PMLA, encompassing both direct and indirect involvement without the requirement for specific knowledge, aligns with the legislative intent of the Act. It is essential for ensuring that the law remains relevant and effective in capturing the diverse and intricate ways in which individuals may be involved in the money laundering process.

Moreover, the alignment of the broad interpretation with international standards, as advocated by organizations like the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), underscores India's commitment to combating money laundering on a global scale. By adhering to these standards, India not only enhances its credibility in the international community but also strengthens its ability to collaborate with other nations in addressing transnational financial crimes.

While criticisms regarding potential overreach by enforcement authorities and concerns about individual rights must be addressed through proper oversight mechanisms and judicial review, it

⁶ *Smt. Janata Jha v. Assistant Director* [(2014) CrLJ 2556]

is essential to recognize the broader objectives of the PMLA in safeguarding the integrity of the financial system and society at large.

In essence, a comprehensive approach to interpreting and implementing the key provisions of the PMLA is necessary to effectively combat money laundering and fulfill the Act's intended purpose of protecting the financial system and upholding the rule of law. Through continuous scrutiny, refinement, and adherence to constitutional principles, India can strike a balance between strengthening law enforcement and safeguarding individual rights in its fight against financial crimes.

