



TATHASTU
Institute Of Civil Services

DAILY CURRENT AFFAIRS

20th DECEMBER, 2024



TATHASTU
Institute Of Civil Services

9560300770  www.tathastuics.com  support@tathastuics.com

HEAD OFFICE: 53/1, UPPER GROUND FLOOR, BADA BAZAR ROAD,
OLD RAJINDER NAGAR, NEW DELHI-110060



S.NO.	TOPIC
	MAINS ORIENTED NEWS:
1.	POSITIVE DIRECTION : INDIA MUST ENSURE GREATER TRANSPARENCY IN TALKS WITH CHINA
2.	CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND AN OBTUSE INDIAN STANCE
3.	SHOULD LEGISLATURES IN INDIA HAVE FIXED TENURES?
	PRELIMS ORIENTED NEWS:
4.	RS DEPUTY CHAIRMAN REJECTS NO-TRUST NOTICE
5.	SC ORDERS TREE CENSUS, PRUNES TREE OFFICERS' POWER TO OKAY FELLING
	Other News to go through:
6.	The political crisis in South Korea
7.	Eklavya schools struggle to meet 5% PVTG sub-quota; dropouts on the rise
8.	'India is highest tariff major economy'

POSITIVE DIRECTION : INDIA MUST ENSURE GREATER TRANSPARENCY IN TALKS WITH CHINA



Positive direction

India must ensure greater transparency in talks with China

The 23rd meeting of the “Special Representatives” (SRs) of India and China – National Security Adviser Ajit Doval and Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister and Senior Politburo member Wang Yi – was a milestone in the restoration of ties since October this year. Although the meeting of SRs is a stand-alone process, meant to look at the broader boundary dispute and resolve differences over the 3,500 kilometre-long Line of Actual Control (LAC), it had been paused since the military standoff in 2020. There were a few firsts too: the two men meeting in their capacities as SRs since 2019, although they have held talks in the interim; such a high-level visit to China and also Mr. Doval travelling to Beijing since 2020. This indicates that the decision to hold the SR talks, as mandated by Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Xi Jinping during talks in Kazan in October, is a signal that with only LAC disengagement completed, New Delhi is willing to move ahead on other mechanisms for talks with Beijing, without waiting for the next processes of de-escalation and de-induction. The two sides have agreed to restart the Kailash-Manasarovar Yatra from India, border trade in Sikkim, and data sharing for trans-boundary rivers. Other suspended ties, including direct flights, business and student visa liberalisation, and journalist exchanges, are also understood to be under discussion. On the boundary question, the Doval-Wang talks yielded what the Chinese Ministry of Fo-

reign Affairs termed as “six consensus”, and the Ministry of External Affairs referred to as “positive directions” in its release. These involve continuing to implement the LAC de-escalation process; revert to the SR process on resolving the boundary issue according to the Eleven-articles set out in a 2005 agreement; strengthen Confidence Building Measures at the border and cross-border exchanges; enhance coordination of the SR process, and the Working Mechanism for Consultation and Coordination on India-China Border Affairs to follow up agreements and to hold the next Doval-Wang talks in 2025 in India.

The optics and the messaging of the SR meeting indicate a certain momentum in re-engagement after four years of serious military tensions, and the suspension of regular contact, although bilateral trade continued to thrive. The meeting comes just ahead of 2025, that marks 75 years of diplomatic relations, and a likely visit to China by Mr. Modi as it hosts the next SCO summit. While restoring the links is important, it is necessary to strike a note of caution so that the situation caused by the amassing of troops and LAC transgressions by the PLA in 2020 is not repeated. The government must also ensure more transparency in its conversations with Beijing over the future steps in normalising ties, the dismantling of buffer zones, restoration of *status quo ante* to 2020, and mechanisms for future deterrence against aggression at the India-China boundary.





- ❖ National Security Adviser Ajit Doval and China's Wang Yi **resumed talks after a four-year pause**, signaling willingness to engage beyond Line of Actual Control (LAC) disengagement.
- ❖ India's **23rd "Special Representatives" meeting with China** marked **progress in restoring ties strained since the 2020 border standoff**.
- ❖ National Security Adviser Ajit Doval and China's Wang Yi **resumed talks after a four-year pause**, signaling willingness to engage beyond Line of Actual Control (LAC) disengagement.
- ❖ **Key outcomes included:**
 - Agreements to **restart the Kailash-Mansarovar Yatra**,
 - **Border trade in Sikkim**, and
 - **Data-sharing for rivers, alongside**
 - Discussions on **visa and journalist exchanges**.
- ❖ Both sides reaffirmed commitments to LAC de-escalation, confidence-building, and **resolving boundary issues based on a 2005 agreement**.

India must ensure greater transparency in talks with China

- ❖ The meeting indicate a certain momentum in re-engagement after four years of serious military
- ❖ tensions, and the suspension of regular contact, although bilateral trade continued to thrive.
- ❖ The meeting comes **just ahead of 2025**, that marks **75 years of diplomatic relations**, and a **likely visit to China by Mr. Modi** as it hosts the next SCO summit.
- ❖ Restoring ties is important, but **India must be cautious to prevent a repeat of the 2020** troop buildup and border violations by China.
- ❖ The government **must also ensure more transparency in its conversations with Beijing** over the future steps in normalising ties, the dismantling of buffer zones, restoration of *status quo ante* to 2020, and mechanisms for future deterrence against aggression at the India-China boundary.





CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND AN OBTUSE INDIAN STANCE



Adoption of CAH Treaty Proposal

- ❖ On **December 4, 2024**, the **UN General Assembly (UNGA)** adopted a resolution approving the draft text for a treaty on the prevention and punishment of crimes against humanity (CAH).
- ❖ The resolution comes five years after the International Law Commission submitted the draft to the Sixth Committee, highlighting the international community's commitment to strengthening justice.
- ❖ The **Sixth Committee** is the primary forum for the consideration of legal questions in the General Assembly.
- ❖ **Crimes Against Humanity (CAH)** are a category of international crimes that involve widespread or systematic acts committed against civilians on a large scale.
- ❖ **Extermination**: The deliberate killing of large numbers of civilians, often involving mass killings.
- ❖ **Enslavement**: Forcibly making people work without consent, often under inhumane conditions.
- ❖ **Sexual Violence**: Sexual crimes against civilians, often as part of a broader campaign to terrorize or control a population.

Key Characteristics of Crimes Against Humanity:

1. **Widespread or Systematic**: It is not limited to isolated acts but involves a coordinated effort or policy directed against civilians.
2. **Intentional Acts**: The acts must be committed with **knowledge** of the attack and are usually carried out with intent to harm, control, or eliminate a certain group of people.

Existing Legal Framework:

- ❖ CAH, alongside genocide and war crimes, are among the most severe international crimes addressed under the Rome Statute by the International Criminal Court (ICC).
- ❖ However, while genocide and war crimes have dedicated treaties (the *Genocide Convention of 1948* and the *Geneva Conventions of 1949*),





CAH lack a specific treaty, leading to accountability gaps.

❖ Challenges:

1. **Limited Jurisdiction:** The ICC covers only member states, making it difficult to prosecute CAH in non-member states.
2. **State Responsibility:** Rome Statute focuses solely on individual criminal responsibility, holds states accountable for failing to prevent genocide
3. **Broadening CAH Scope:** A dedicated CAH treaty could expand the definition to include acts like starvation, gender apartheid, forced pregnancy, and crimes against indigenous populations, as suggested by various states.

India's Position on CAH

❖ Reservations with ICC: India is not a party to the Rome Statute and has raised concerns about its provisions, including:

- Powers of the ICC prosecutor.
- The UN Security Council's role under the Rome Statute.
- Exclusion of nuclear weapons use and terrorism from the definition of war crimes.

❖ Specific Stance on CAH:

- Advocates for considering only crimes committed during armed conflicts, not peacetime, as CAH.
- Opposes the inclusion of 'enforced disappearance' but supports the inclusion of 'terrorism' as CAH.
- Prefers national legislation and courts for addressing CAH, viewing the treaty as duplicating the Rome Statute.

The Need for Domestic Legislation

❖ India lacks specific laws addressing international crimes, including CAH. In 2018, Justice S. Muralidhar highlighted this gap, urging its resolution. Despite opportunities, recent criminal law amendments failed to include provisions for CAH.

❖ A Call for Leadership: India, even as a non-signatory to the Rome Statute, can demonstrate leadership by:

- Incorporating CAH into domestic law.
- Strengthening national and territorial jurisdiction to address grave human rights violations.

❖ Taking these steps would align with India's global aspirations and reinforce its commitment to justice and accountability as a "Vishwaguru."





SHOULD LEGISLATURES IN INDIA HAVE FIXED TENURES?

Should legislatures in India have fixed tenures?



P.D.T. Achary

Former Secretary General of the Lok Sabha



M.R. Madhavan

Co-founder and president of the PRS Legislative Research

PARLEY

The Constitution (One Hundred and Twenty-Ninth Amendment) Bill, 2024, introduced in the Lok Sabha on December 17, 2024, mandates a fixed five-year term for the Lok Sabha, with State Legislature elections aligned to this cycle. If the Lok Sabha or any State Assembly is dissolved before completing its full term, mid-term elections will be held only for the remainder of the five-year term. Should legislatures in India have fixed tenures? P.D.T. Achary and M.R. Madhavan discuss the question in a conversation moderated by Aaratrika Bhaumik. Edited excerpts:

Do fixed legislative tenures promote better governance by reducing the disruptions of frequent elections?

P.D.T. Achary: It is worth questioning whether this Bill and the proposal for simultaneous polls are necessary at all. The claim that such a system will reduce electoral expenditure lacks credibility. A portion of the expenditure is allocated by the Election Commission and State governments through budgetary provisions from the Centre and the States. However, the majority of election spending is incurred by political parties. Even if some costs are saved, it is improbable that political parties would redirect these funds towards development or infrastructure projects. More importantly, frequent elections enhance political accountability, compelling representatives to regularly engage with the electorate.

M.R. Madhavan: This Bill does not propose a fixed term for legislatures, as it allows for mid-term elections. It ensures accountability to the legislature, in line with the core tenet of the parliamentary system. By permitting mid-term elections, the Bill is also in conformity with the basic structure of the Constitution. The key change, however, is that in the event of a mid-term election, the term of the newly elected legislature will be shorter than five years. Whether this improves governance is uncertain. However, it does not provide the same stability as the U.S. presidential system, for instance, where the incumbent President can only be removed through impeachment.

Does aligning the tenure of State Assemblies with that of the Lok Sabha compromise federalism and pose a threat to political plurality?

MRM: I find the Bill symmetrical since it also aligns the tenure of Parliament with that of



The winter session of the Parliament, in New Delhi. ANI

State Assemblies. For instance, if the Central government collapses after three years, fresh elections will be conducted for the Lok Sabha, and the newly elected legislative body will serve only a reduced term of two years. Therefore, I don't think State Assemblies are being aligned with Parliament. Rather, the Bill standardises the timing of all elections to a common date. I do not see any threat to federalism in this approach.

The argument that simultaneous polls would drive voters to select the same party for both the Centre and the State Assembly is flawed, as it underestimates the electorate's intelligence. Historical examples, such as the 2014 elections in Delhi, demonstrate that voters can and do make distinct choices. Despite the BJP's overwhelming victory at the Centre, voters elected the AAP in the State Assembly, despite both polls being held within six months of each other.

PDTA: For the first time, this Bill seeks to make the tenure of State Assemblies contingent upon that of Parliament. For instance, if Parliament completes its full term while a State Assembly is only in its second year, the Assembly would be prematurely dissolved, with elections held concurrently with Parliament. This approach undermines the principles of federalism. Under the existing constitutional framework, State Assemblies function as autonomous legislative bodies. This Bill seeks to alter their independent tenure, a crucial attribute of the federal structure.

Could such a system discourage attempts to destabilise governments and curb practices like horse-trading?

PDTA: This is a novel proposal, and it is difficult to predict whether such a system can



Under the existing constitutional framework, State Assemblies function as autonomous legislative bodies. This Bill seeks to alter their independent tenure, a crucial attribute of the federal structure

P.D.T. AGHARY

effectively deter these practices at this stage. However, a greater concern lies in the potential erosion of India's identity as a federal republic, which is rooted in the autonomy of its legislative bodies.

MRM: My understanding of the Bill is that it aligns the tenure of State Assemblies with Parliament for the first time. However, after a few electoral cycles, if a mid-term election occurs for Parliament, State Assemblies will continue and will not be dissolved.

Recent large-scale defections in Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka, where MLAs resigned or were disqualified, triggered by-elections. However, I doubt the Bill will curb such practices. A more significant concern is the dissolution of the House. If a government falls after three and a half years, mid-term elections will be necessary, taking an additional 4-6 months. This would result in a Lok Sabha with a tenure of one year or less, which I believe is undesirable.

Does the Bill adequately account for political exigencies? For instance, if the ruling party splits but the breakaway faction refuses to side with the Opposition.

MRM: I believe the Bill effectively addresses such contingencies. For instance, the 2013 Delhi and 2005 Bihar legislative Assembly elections resulted in hung Assemblies. In Delhi, the Congress, AAP, and BJP were unable to arrive at a consensus and form the government. The Bill resolves such deadlocks by allowing fresh elections to take place. The only difference is that the newly elected legislature will serve a reduced tenure rather than the full five years.

PDTA: The Constitution prescribes a five-year term for State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha but allows for their dissolution to address political exigencies. This flexibility reflects a pragmatic approach to governance. While fixed legislative tenures provide stability, the option to dissolve legislatures is crucial for addressing political instability. For instance, State governments have often dissolved Assemblies

to seek a fresh and decisive mandate through mid-term elections – a contingency the Bill fails to adequately address.

Could the German model of a constructive vote of no-confidence help resolve political stalemates?

PDTA: Such a proposal was rejected by the high-level committee led by former President Ram Nath Kovind. It has also been deliberated upon previously, but I doubt its adoption is feasible in India.

MRM: I don't think it is a viable option given our system. In most instances, when a ruling government loses a no-confidence motion, no alternative government commands a majority in the House. This could lead to a situation where the incumbent government remains in power but lacks the majority needed to pass essential bills or the budget.

The U.K.'s Fixed-term Parliaments Act of 2011, repealed in 2022, was criticised for triggering constitutional crises and policy paralysis. Are there lessons for India?

MRM: The Bill is being misunderstood as proposing fixed legislative tenures when it only introduces a "maximum term". This is different from the system that existed in the U.K., where a newly elected legislature would complete its full five-year term, even if mid-term elections were to be held. In contrast, under the system proposed by the Bill, if the government loses the confidence of the legislative majority, mid-term elections will be called, and the newly elected legislature will then serve a truncated tenure.

PDTA: In a country like ours, political instability is a real possibility, especially at the State level. While Parliament will continue to have its five-year tenure, States may encounter situations that necessitate mid-term elections, resulting in shorter tenures for State legislatures. I firmly believe that, despite its flaws, the current system should be preserved. The proposal for simultaneous elections risks creating unnecessary turmoil, and there is no compelling reason to pursue it at this juncture. The government should instead focus on tackling more pressing challenges that affect the people.



To listen to the full interview
Scan the code or go to the link
www.thehindu.com

- ❖ The debate revolves around whether fixed tenures and simultaneous elections would streamline governance or create new challenges, particularly in terms of federalism, political stability, and electoral accountability.
- ❖ The Bill's approach is seen by some as undermining federal principles, while others see it as a way to standardize election timelines without compromising democratic processes.
- ❖ Discussion on the Constitution (One Hundred and Twenty-Ninth Amendment) Bill, 2024:
- ❖ Proposed Changes:





- The Bill introduced in the Lok Sabha on December 17, 2024, **mandates a fixed five-year term for the Lok Sabha, with State Legislative Assemblies' elections aligned to this cycle.** If a legislature is dissolved before completing its term, mid-term elections will only be held for the remainder of the term.

Key Arguments for and Against Fixed Tenure:

1. Governance and Electoral Disruptions:



- ❖ **P.D.T. Achary:**
- ❖ **Questioned the necessity of the Bill,** arguing that frequent elections enhance political accountability and that claims of reduced electoral spending are misleading.
- ❖ The real issue lies in the electoral spending by political parties, which would not likely be redirected towards public welfare.



- ❖ **M.R. Madhavan:** Emphasized that the Bill doesn't provide a fixed tenure but ensures accountability by permitting mid-term elections.

2. Impact on Federalism and Political Plurality:

- ❖ **P.D.T. Achary:** Criticized the Bill for potentially undermining federalism by aligning State Assemblies' tenures with the Lok Sabha, altering their independent role.

- ❖ **M.R. Madhavan:** Argued that the Bill does not harm federalism and cited historical examples to show that voters can distinguish between state and national elections.

3. Handling Political Exigencies:

- ❖ **P.D.T. Achary:** Argued that the flexibility to dissolve Assemblies in response to political exigencies is essential, which the **Bill doesn't fully accommodate.**

- ❖ **M.R. Madhavan:** Defended the Bill, stating it addresses contingencies like hung Assemblies by allowing mid-term elections and shorter tenures.
- ❖ **M.R. Madhavan:** **Cautioned against viewing the Bill as proposing fixed tenures** and highlighted that it introduces a maximum term with provisions for mid-term elections.



RS DEPUTY CHAIRMAN REJECTS NO-TRUST NOTICE

RS Deputy Chairman rejects no-trust notice against Dhankhar by Opposition

The Hindu Bureau
NEW DELHI

The Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, Harivansh, rejected on Thursday the Opposition's no-confidence motion against Chairman Jagdeep Dhankhar. He said in his ruling that the notice was an act of impropriety to mar the reputation of the Vice-President. The reasons for rejection included a wrong spelling of Mr. Dhankhar's name in the notice. Mr. Harivansh said he would issue a detailed order soon.

In his ruling tabled on Thursday afternoon, the Deputy Chairman said the matter came to him as the Chairman recused himself from considering the Opposition's notice signed by



Harivansh

60 members. He said the no-confidence notice under Article 67(b) of the Constitution was not addressed to any specific authority but publicised by the main Opposition party, the Congress. "Invoked Article 67(b) peremptorily mandates at least 14 days' prior notice for any resolution contemplating the Vice-President's removal. Thus, December 10, 2024 notice of intention could

permit such a resolution only after December 24," he said, noting that the Winter Session was scheduled till December 20. "In full know of the situation that the resolution cannot be brought during this session, this was initiated only to set a narrative against second highest Constitutional office and the Vice-President," he said.

'Casual and cavalier'

Mr. Harivansh said the notice was replete with assertions to malign Mr. Dhankhar by listing events from the time he assumed office in August 2022. "A look at the notice reveals it couldn't be more casual and cavalier, wanting on every conceivable aspect and severally flawed – ab-

sence of addressee, absence of resolution text, incumbent Vice-President's name not correctly spelt in the entire petition, documents and videos asserted not made part, premised on links of disjointed media reports without authentication and many more," the ruling said.

The Deputy Chairman said the notice's lack of bona fides, and subsequent events revealed it being "a calculated unwholesome attempt to garnish publicity; run down the constitutional institution; insinuate the personal image of the incumbent Vice-President – notably, the first from the agricultural community to hold this office in the history of Independent India".

- ❖ The Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha **rejected the Opposition's no-confidence motion against Chairman Jagdeep Dhankhar, citing procedural flaws and lack of bona fides.**
- ❖ He stated the notice was improper, aimed at tarnishing the Vice-President's reputation, and was not in accordance with Article 67(b) of the Constitution, which requires a 14-day prior notice.

Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha

Article 67 in Constitution of India

67. Term of office of Vice-President

The Vice-President shall hold office for a term of five years from the date on which he enters upon his office:

Provided that-

- (a) a Vice-President may, by writing under his hand addressed to the President, resign his office;
- (b) a Vice-President may be removed from his office by a resolution of the Council of States passed by a majority of all the then members of the Council and agreed to by the House of the People; but no resolution for the purpose of this clause shall be moved unless at least fourteen days' notice has been given of the intention to move the resolution;
- (c) a Vice-President shall, notwithstanding the expiration of his term, continue to hold office until his successor enters upon his office.

About Chairman of Rajya Sabha

- ❖ The Chairman of the Rajya Sabha is the **Presiding Officer of the Upper House of the Parliament of India.**
- ❖ **Tenure of Chairman of Rajya Sabha**



- The usual term is **5 years**.
- The Vice President can be **re-elected to the post** and therefore **can serve multiple terms as the Chairman** of the Rajya Sabha.
- ❖ **The Vice-President of India is the Ex-Officio Chairman of the Rajya Sabha.**
 - Unlike the Speaker of the Lok Sabha, who is a member of the House, the **Chairman of the Rajya Sabha is not a member of the House.**

Removal of Chairman of Rajya Sabha

- ❖ **Only if he is removed from the office of the Vice-President of India.**
- ❖ The **process** for the removal:
 - **A resolution** for the removal can be **introduced only in the Rajya Sabha**, and not in the Lok Sabha.
 - Such a **resolution can be moved only after giving 14 days' advance notice.**
 - The removal resolution should be **passed in the Rajya Sabha** by an **Effective Majority** (i.e. a majority of the then members of Rajya Sabha excluding vacant seats) and **agreed to by Lok Sabha by a Simple Majority.**
- ❖ When such **resolution** is under consideration, **he/she cannot preside over a sitting of the House.**
 - *However, he/she can be present, speak in the House, and take part in its proceedings, but **cannot vote even in the first instance.***
 - *It is to be noted that, unlike in the case of the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, the **Speaker of Lok Sabha can vote in the first instance**, though not in the case of an equality of votes, when a resolution for his/her removal is under consideration of the House.*





SC ORDERS TREE CENSUS, PRUNES TREE OFFICERS' POWER TO OKAY FELLING

SC orders tree census, prunes Tree Officers' power to okay felling

Court mandates prior approval by Central Empowered Committee for cutting over 50 trees, says felling will only be allowed in exceptional cases

Krishnadas Rajagopal

NEW DELHI

The Supreme Court on Thursday directed the Tree Authority to conduct a census of the existing trees in the national capital and pruned the authority of Tree Officers to grant permission for felling trees, noting that cutting them in Delhi will only be allowed in exceptional cases or in times of utmost necessity.

A Bench of Justices A.S. Oka and Augustine George Masih directed the Tree Authority to appoint the Forest Research Institute to carry out the census under Section 7(b) of the 1994 Act. Both the Tree Authority and the Institute would be guided by an expert committee of retired Indian Forest Service officers Ishwar Singh and Sunil Limaye and naturalist Pradip Krishen.

The Union government would fund the census from the funds managed by the Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority. The Tree Authority was ordered to file an affidavit with details about the census exercise, including the manner and mode and timelines, etc., by February 10 next year.

"Unless data on trees is available, it is impossible to know about illegal felling," Justice Oka observed.

In a separate part of the court order, the Bench directed that every permission granted by a Tree Officer un-



City's lungs: The Supreme Court reminded the Tree Authority that laws are for preserving trees, not to permit their felling. FILE PHOTO

der the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994, to cut 50 or more trees in the national capital would be first vetted and cleared by the Central Empowered Committee (CEC).

The apex court said Tree Officers may have forgotten that the actual intent of the 1994 Act was to preserve trees and not be another avenue to permit their felling. "The 1994 Act is 30 years old. Yet this important duty [of preserving trees] is not performed by the Tree Authority... Only in cases of necessities and in exceptional cases, permission can be granted for felling of trees. Tree Officers cannot grant permissions mechanically," the court laid down in a detailed order.

In case a Tree Officer orders the cutting of 50 or more trees, the application seeking permission and his order must immediately be forwarded to the CEC. No trees would be cut until the CEC gave the final go-ahead. The CEC is empowered to reject the Tree Of-

ficer's permission or modify the order for cutting the trees, the Bench held.

"The CEC would consider the application for felling trees and the Tree Officer's order threadbare before allowing it or modifying it, as required," the court directed.

'Afforestation must'

Except in exceptional cases, the actual cutting of trees would not be undertaken until the condition of compensatory afforestation was complied with by the applicants.

However, the court underscored that Tree Officers cannot pass mechanical orders for compensatory afforestation. They have to personally visit the sites proposed for compensatory afforestation by the applicants and decide on the most suitable species of trees to be planted in them. Tree Officers could even consider whether translocation of trees were really necessary and if pruning would be a better option than cutting, it observed.





- ❖ The **Supreme Court** has curtailed the authority of **Tree Officers in Delhi**, allowing tree felling only in **exceptional cases or times of utmost necessity**.
- ❖ The court **directed the Tree Authority to conduct a tree census**, appointing the **Forest Research Institute for the task under the guidance of an expert committee**.
- ❖ The **Union government will fund this census**.
- ❖ For cases involving the felling of 50 or more trees, permissions must first be approved by the **Central Empowered Committee (CEC)**, which can reject, modify, or approve such orders.
- ❖ **Compensatory afforestation** is mandatory before tree cutting, and Tree Officers must inspect sites and ensure proper species selection. Alternatives like tree translocation should also be considered.

PYQ's

Q.1 The process for the removal of the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha involves which of the following procedures?

1. A resolution for his/her removal can be introduced in both the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha.
2. The resolution for removal can only be introduced in the Rajya Sabha, and a 14-day advance notice is required.
3. The resolution must be passed by a simple majority in the Rajya Sabha and agreed upon by a two-thirds majority in the Lok Sabha.
4. During the consideration of the removal resolution, the Chairman can preside over the sitting of the Rajya Sabha.

Select the correct answer using the codes below:

- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| (a) 1 and 3 | (c) 2 only |
| (b) 2 and 4 | (d) 1 and 4 |

Q.2 Which of the following statements regarding the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) is/are correct?

1. The Rome Statute is the treaty that established the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 1998.
2. The Rome Statute empowers the ICC to prosecute individuals for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.
3. The Rome Statute allows the ICC to prosecute state actors for crimes committed by their countries during peacetime.
4. India is a signatory to the Rome Statute and has ratified it.

Select the correct answer using the codes below:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| (a) 1 and 2 only | (c) 2 and 3 only |
| (b) 1, 2, and 3 only | (d) 1, 2, 3, and 4 |





OTHER NEWS TO GO THROUGH

- 1. The political crisis in South Korea:** Yoon Suk Yeol, a former Prosecutor General, became South Korea's President in 2022 despite limited political experience. His tenure was marked by controversial policies, strained foreign relations, and deepened public dissatisfaction.
- 2. Eklavya schools struggle to meet 5% PVTG sub-quota;** dropouts on the rise The implementation of a 5% sub-quota for Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups (PVTGs) in admissions to Eklavya Model Residential Schools (EMRS) has faced challenges, with government data showing that only 3.4% of students in these schools belong to PVTG communities.
- 3. 'India is highest tariff major economy'** U.S. Ambassador to India, Eric Garcetti, recently highlighted that India has the highest tariffs among major economies globally, urging both nations to work together to lower tariffs and promote fair and equal trade.

