

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

¹PRODUCTION BEFORE A MAGISTRATE AND THE TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR RULE

AUTHORED BY - BANUSINDHYA.I

Final-Year LL.B. Student,

Government Law College, Salem

Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

In India, the twenty-four-hour rule and the appearance of an arrested individual before a magistrate are crucial protections against arbitrary detention and arbitrary arrest. They provide Article 22(2) of the Indian Constitution's actual effect and link the police's ability to make arrests with judicial oversight. Sections 57 and 58 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) deal with the obligation to bring an arrested individual before a magistrate as well as the general restriction on imprisonment without a magistrate's special order. When an inquiry cannot be finished in twenty-four hours and a judge grants permission for additional detention, Section 187 rules the process. The aim and functioning of these laws, their constitutional basis, the statutory framework, the magistrate's role at first production, pertinent court rulings, the repercussions of non-compliance, and practical implementation issues are all examined in this article. Additionally, it contrasts the requirements of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC) with those of the BNSS. The essay makes the case that the twenty-four-hour norm is a substantive defense of individual liberty rather than merely a formal requirement. Accurate arrest records, timely legal support, thorough magistrate review, and responsibility for wrongful detention are all necessary for effective implementation. The article employs a doctrinal approach based on laws, court rulings, and constitutional clauses.

Keywords: Article 22(2); BNSS; Magistrate; arrest; remand; personal liberty; twenty-four-hour rule.

¹ Article 22(2). Sections 57 and 58

1.Introduction:

Although the ability to make an arrest is a crucial component of criminal investigations, it also has the potential to significantly impair someone's freedom. While in custody, an arrested individual may experience pressure or mistreatment and be cut off from their family, job, and everyday life. Because of this, the law forbids the police from controlling someone indefinitely once they have been arrested. Early on, judicial oversight is necessary.

Two key protections in Indian criminal procedure are the twenty-four-hour rule and the necessity that an arrested individual appear before a magistrate. They make sure that an arrest doesn't turn into a chance for covert or unjustified detention. As an impartial judge, the magistrate has the jurisdiction to determine whether prolonged detention is justified. The fundamental rule is established by the constitutional guaranty found in Article 22(2): all arrested and detained individuals must appear before the closest magistrate within twenty-four hours of their arrest, excluding travel time, and any detention that occurs after that time requires a magistrate's authority.

Subject to relevant savings and transitional regulations, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, replaced the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, on July 1, 2024, changing the criminal procedure system. The BNSS reorganizes the pertinent clauses while maintaining the fundamental protection. While Section 187 governs detention when an inquiry cannot be finished within the allotted twenty-four hours, Sections 57 and 58 deal with production before a magistrate. It is crucial for students, attorneys, police officers, and judges to comprehend how these provisions relate to one another.

2. Research Methodology and Scope:

A doctrinal approach to legal study is used in this essay. It examines the Indian Constitution, the BNSS, the previous CrPC, and important court rulings pertaining to arrest, production, remand, and individual freedom. Only the general legal framework pertaining to criminal arrest and detention is covered in this article. Additional requirements may be included in special statutes, and their relationship to the BNSS must be evaluated in accordance with the pertinent legislative text and legally binding precedent. Rather than offering guidance on any particular

instance, the goal is to clarify the legal concepts and their practical significance.

3. Constitutional Foundation: Article 22(2):

Article 21 of the Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. Article 22 adds specific protections for persons who are arrested. Article 22(1) generally requires that an arrested person be informed, as soon as may be, of the grounds of arrest and not be denied the right to consult and be defended by a legal practitioner of choice. Article 22(2) states that every person arrested and detained in custody must be produced before the nearest magistrate within twenty-four hours of arrest, excluding the time necessary for the journey from the place of arrest to the magistrate's court. It further prohibits detention beyond that period without the authority of a magistrate.

There are three related uses for the constitutional rule. First, it stops the police from making their own decisions about how long an apprehended individual can be detained. Second, it exposes the arrest to early court examination. Thirdly, it aids in preventing coercion, mistreatment, and false or protracted detention. The phrase "nearest Magistrate" is important because swift judicial control—rather than just production before the court that will ultimately try the case—is the constitutional issue.

The constitutional treatment of enemy aliens and those held under preventive-detention statutes are among the exclusions found in Article 22. The significance of the standard constitutional rule in criminal arrests is not diminished by these exceptions. Article 21 and the relevant procedural statute must be interpreted in conjunction with the twenty-four-hour requirement, which is an obligatory protection in the typical criminal process.

4. Statutory Framework under the BNSS, 2023

4.1 Section 57: An arrested person must appear before a magistrate or other responsible officer

According to Section 57 of the BNSS, a police officer who makes an arrest without a warrant must bring the apprehended individual before a magistrate with jurisdiction over the matter or the official in charge of a police station as soon as possible, subject to any applicable bail requirements. This clause emphasizes quick handling following

an arrest. Section 58 and Article 22(2) must also be adhered to; it should not be interpreted as permitting police custody beyond the bounds of the constitution.

4.2 Section 58: An apprehended person may not be held for longer than twenty-four hours

A police officer is not allowed to hold someone who has been arrested without a warrant for longer than is reasonable under the circumstances, according to Section 58. Detention cannot last longer than twenty-four hours unless a magistrate issues a special order under Section 187, omitting the time needed to travel from the scene of the arrest to the magistrate's court. Whether or not the magistrate has jurisdiction over the matter, the clause specifically refers to the magistrate's court. The purpose of this formulation is to guarantee that an arrested individual can be taken before the closest magistrate without having to wait to get to the court that would finally handle the case. The journey-time exclusion is not a general authorization to postpone output; rather, it is restricted to the time that is legitimately required for travel. The entire period must be computed from the actual time of arrest, and the police must act without needless delay.

4.3 Section 187: What to do if an inquiry cannot be finished in a day

When an inquiry cannot be finished in the allotted twenty-four hours and there are reasonable suspicions that the information or charge is true, Section 187 is applicable. The accused must be sent to the closest magistrate by the police officer together with the pertinent case-diary records. After determining whether additional custody is warranted, the magistrate may authorize detention in compliance with the guidelines and restrictions set forth by the section.²

Remand requests are not intended to be made automatically. The magistrate must use judicial discretion, take into account the arguments put forth, and confirm that detention is permitted by law. Any genuine remand decision must fully read Section 187, which contains comprehensive guidelines governing the duration and type of custody, including judicial and police custody. The twenty-four-hour rule's main tenet is that police cannot prolong detention on their own initiative just because an investigation is still ongoing.

² Section 57 Section 58
Section 187

5. What Does Production Before a Magistrate Mean?

Production is the process of bringing an arrested person before a judicial magistrate for the necessary judicial consideration, either in person or by a legally authorized procedure. It involves more than just putting someone's name in a police registry or delivering documents to a court. The magistrate should be able to confirm the circumstances and date of the arrest, take into account the legal justification for detention, and confirm that all statutory and constitutional rights have been upheld throughout the initial production. In compliance with the law, the arrested person should be made aware of the reasons for the arrest and provided a significant chance to speak with an attorney.

A magistrate's role is especially important because the person appearing before the court may be vulnerable, unfamiliar with legal procedure, or unable to challenge the police account without assistance. Judicial scrutiny should therefore be real and independent. A routine or mechanical remand order weakens the very protection that production is intended to provide.

6. How the Twenty-Four-Hour Rule Operates:

The moment the person is taken into custody is the beginning point, not the moment the police finish paperwork or make a subsequent entry. The standard computation, which does not account for the required travel time, permits twenty-four hours. For instance, if someone is arrested on Monday at 10 a.m., they must appear before a magistrate within the next 24 hours, except any time that is actually required for transportation. The precise computation depends on the circumstances and relevant legislation; the example is merely illustrative.

The rule does not provide the police the right to detain someone for the entire twenty-four hours in every situation. Section 58 states that detention cannot last longer than is fair under the circumstances, and Section 57 mandates production without needless delay. The police shouldn't postpone manufacturing without a valid reason if it can legally take place earlier.

Nor does the rule mean that every person must be released automatically at the twenty-four-hour point regardless of all subsequent events. If the investigation cannot be completed and the statutory conditions are met, the police may seek judicial authorization under Section 187. The decisive distinction is between detention based only on police authority and detention supported by a valid judicial order. The latter must comply with the statutory limits and

constitutional requirements.

The police should maintain reliable records of the arrest time, movement of the arrested person, medical examination where applicable, communication to relatives or nominated persons, and the time of production. Accurate records allow the magistrate and any later reviewing court to determine whether the constitutional limit was respected.

7. Judicial Decisions and Principles

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

The Supreme Court interpreted Article 21 to require a procedure that is fair, just, and reasonable rather than arbitrary, fanciful, or oppressive. Although the case did not directly decide the twenty-four-hour rule, its constitutional approach is important to arrest and detention. Procedures affecting liberty must be applied consistently with fairness and constitutional values.

7.2 D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 SCC 416

The Supreme Court laid down safeguards relating to arrest and detention in response to concerns about custodial abuse. These included requirements concerning arrest documentation, information to relatives or friends, and records of custody. The decision demonstrates that formal safeguards and documentation are important to prevent abuse and to make police action reviewable. The directions were developed under the law then in force and must be read alongside current statutory provisions.³

7.3 Joginder Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (1994) 4 SCC 260

The Court explained that the existence of legal power to arrest does not mean that arrest must be made in every case. Arrest should not be routine; the necessity and justification for it matter. The judgment supports a broader principle that personal liberty should not be restricted unnecessarily and that police discretion is subject to legal standards.

7.4 Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273

The Supreme Court emphasized that arrest should not be automatic, particularly in cases covered by Section 41 of the CrPC, and required police and magistrates to follow

³ (1978) 1 SCC 248; (1997) 1 SCC 416

statutory safeguards. The decision sought to reduce unnecessary arrests and mechanical remand. Although delivered under the CrPC, its reasoning remains relevant when applying corresponding safeguards under the BNSS, subject to the current statutory text and later decisions.

Taken together, these authorities show that lawful arrest, prompt production, and reasoned remand are connected protections. The twenty-four-hour limit is one part of a wider framework designed to ensure that deprivation of liberty is justified, documented, and open to judicial control.

8. Relationship between the CrPC and the BNSS:

Section 56 of the CrPC dealt with the obligation to bring an arrested person before a magistrate or the officer in charge of a police station; Section 57 set a twenty-four-hour detention limit; and Section 167 regulated what to do if an investigation could not be finished in twenty-four hours. Sections 57, 58, and 187 are the relevant BNSS provisions.

The BNSS provisions alter the language and structure of the statute while maintaining the fundamental constitutional protection. Rather than postponing production until the accused can be brought to the jurisdictional court, Section 58 specifically refers to the magistrate's court "whether having jurisdiction or not." It is important for practitioners and students to avoid citing the outdated CrPC section numbers as though they were the current BNSS regulations. When discussing earlier rulings, the CrPC is still pertinent, but when applicable, the BNSS should be used to analyze current procedural processes.⁴

9. Consequences of Non-Compliance:

Article 22(2) and the relevant procedural law may be violated if an arrested person is not produced within the allotted time without a valid reason. A competent court may hear a challenge to the legitimacy of ongoing detention, including using the proper constitutional remedies when the circumstances support them. Unlawful confinement may potentially result in disciplinary action or other legal repercussions, depending on the situation.

The exact outcome varies depending on the situation. The facts, the applicable statute, the type of infraction, and the potential legal remedies will all be considered by a court. A person should

⁴ (1994) 4 SCC 260; (2014) 8 SCC 273

not presume that all evidence or proceedings become null and void since an irregularity does not automatically resolve every question in the criminal prosecution. 'MThe basic idea is that an unjust restriction of liberty can be contested and that custody requires legal authority.

Judicial examination should also determine if the delay resulted from preventable administrative errors or was real and inevitable. Travel-related delays may be evaluated differently than intentional arrest concealment or inexplicable detention at a police station. If officials could evade accountability by inaccurately recording the moment of arrest, the constitutional guarantee would be useless.

10. Practical Challenges and Recommendations:

Even with a clear rule, there may be practical challenges in its application. Transport and court access may cause delays; arrest times may be recorded incorrectly; relatives may not be promptly notified; legal counsel may not be provided at the earliest stage; and remand applications may receive insufficient consideration due to excessive judge workloads. It may be especially challenging for those from underprivileged backgrounds to stand up for their rights.

First and foremost, police stations should keep accurate, timely, and auditable arrest records that include the precise time and location of the arrest as well as the transfer and production times. Second, officers should make sure that the arrested individual is made aware of the reasons for the arrest and that the legal obligation to notify a friend, relative, or designated individual is fulfilled. Thirdly, in cases when an individual cannot afford legal representation, rapid access to legal help should be made possible, including through legal services authorities. Fourth, magistrates should independently determine whether the legal requirements are met and document the reasons for granting additional custody. A remand order should show consideration for the circumstances and the need for detention. Fifth, dependable digital tools that guaranty accuracy, privacy, and auditability should be used by courts and police agencies to document arrest and production timeframes. Lastly, training should clarify the differences between judicially authorized remand under Section 187, the twenty-four-hour limit, and the exclusion of required journey time.

These steps would increase openness and lessen the possibility that a procedural hold-up would turn into an illegal detention. Technology can help with compliance, but it cannot take the place

of the magistrate's independent judgment or police officers' duty to uphold the law.

11.Critical analysis:

The twenty-four-hour rule strikes a compromise between the constitutional value of individual liberty and the requirements of criminal investigations. Questioning, gathering evidence, and information verification may all be necessary for investigations. However, detention without judicial authority cannot be justified only on the basis of investigative convenience. The need for timely production. guaranties that an impartial authority, rather than the investigating agency alone, determines whether custody is necessary. Both formal compliance and substantive evaluation are necessary for the rule to be successful. Even if a person is brought before a magistrate within twenty-four hours, they may still not be adequately protected if the arrest records are untrustworthy, the remand procedure is mechanical, or the prisoner has no meaningful opportunity to speak with counsel. On the other hand, just by being granted later, a reasoned remand order cannot remedy an earlier constitutional violation. Every step must abide by the relevant legislation.

Therefore, a rights-oriented understanding of the BNSS framework is necessary. In the absence of a magistrate's order, Section 58 establishes a maximum duration; it does not provide a regular right to be detained for twenty-four hours. A legitimate procedure for requesting additional detention is provided under Section 187, but it must be backed by the legislative requirements and sincere judicial consideration. The wording of the constitution continues to be the governing standard. Success is ultimately determined by whether or not a person's liberty is actually preserved, not only by whether or not documents have been filled out.

12.Conclusion:

Two essential protections in Indian criminal procedure are production before a magistrate and the twenty-four-hour rule. The Constitution's Article 22(2) mandates quick production and forbids detention for longer than the allotted time without a magistrate's approval. Section 58 of the BNSS governs the twenty-four-hour limit, Section 57 deals with the obligation to bring an arrested person before a magistrate or the officer in charge of a police station, and Section 187 governs the judicial authorization of additional detention when the investigation cannot be finished within that time frame.

The rule safeguards individual liberty, permits early court scrutiny, and restricts arbitrary police power. Accurate arrest records, timely legal support, open communication, rational remand orders, and responsibility for wrongful imprisonment are all necessary for its practical efficacy. The rulings in *Maneka Gandhi*, *D.K. Basu*, *Joginder Kumar*, and *Arnesh Kumar* uphold the more general constitutional requirement that detention and arrest be warranted and subject to protections. Never consider the twenty-four-hour rule to be a formality. It is a crucial constitutional check on the government's ability to deny someone their freedom.

13. References:

Articles 21 and 22(1)–(2) of the Indian Constitution.

Sections 57, 58, and 187 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita* 2023.

Sections 56, 57, and 167 of the *Code of Criminal Procedure* 1973 (for historical comparability and earlier rulings).

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

State of Uttar Pradesh v. Joginder Kumar (1994) 4 SCC 260.

State of West Bengal v. D.K. Basu (1997) 1 SCC 416.

State of Bihar v. Arnesh Kumar (2014) 8 SCC 273.

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Bureau of Police Research and Development, 2023 (official text and training materials).