

The Research Dialogue

An Online Quarterly Multi-Disciplinary
Peer-Reviewed / Refereed Research Journal

ISSN: 2583-438X

Volume-3, Issue-4, January-2025

www.theresearchdialogue.com



Mobocracy: Rule of the Rabble in the Age of Democracy

Dr. Nidhi Rani Singh

Associate Professor

Dept. of Political Science

E-mail : nidhisingh1402@gmail.com

Abstract

Mobocracy denotes “rule by the mob”, a condition in which collectives assume the roles of judge, jury, and executioner outside the formal legal process. It thereby subverts the rule of law, constitutional democracy, and individual dignity. In contemporary democracies, mobocracy manifests through mob lynching, vigilantism, rumour-driven violence, social boycott, digital intimidation, and politically motivated attacks on public institutions. Such acts are frequently enabled by misinformation, identity-based mobilization, institutional failure, weak policing, delayed justice, and perceived political protection.

*This paper examines mobocracy as a political, legal, and sociological phenomenon. It first explains the meaning and conceptual basis of mobocracy and distinguishes it from legitimate protest and democratic collective action. It then discusses the theoretical foundations of mob rule through the ideas of state monopoly over violence, due process, constitutional morality, group psychology, information disorder, and democratic backsliding. The paper analyzes important forms of mobocracy with examples and case studies, particularly from India, including WhatsApp-rumour lynchings, cow-vigilante violence, political mob attacks, social boycott, and online harassment. It further examines the causes and consequences of mobocracy, the constitutional and legal framework in India, judicial responses in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*, and the continuing need for effective implementation and legislative reform. The paper concludes that mobocracy is not merely a law-and-order problem; it is a serious challenge to constitutional morality, human rights, democratic institutions, and social harmony.*

Keywords: Mobocracy; Mob lynching; Rule of law; Vigilantism; Misinformation; Constitutional democracy; Due process; Social media; Cow vigilantism; India.

Introduction

Democracy is generally understood as government based on the will of the people. However, democracy is not merely majority rule or the exercise of popular opinion. A constitutional democracy is governed by law, institutional restraint, respect for fundamental rights, protection of minorities, and

procedures that ensure fairness and accountability. Popular sovereignty must operate through legislatures, courts, administrative institutions, and constitutional norms. The state is expected to protect life and liberty, maintain public order, investigate crime, and punish offenders through a lawful process.

Mobocracy is the opposite of this constitutional arrangement. The word “mobocracy” literally means “rule by the mob.” It refers to a situation in which a crowd or group of persons assumes the authority of the police, courts, and government and delivers its own form of punishment. In a mobocratic situation, accusation becomes proof, rumour becomes evidence, public anger becomes judgment, and violence becomes punishment. The victim is denied investigation, representation, hearing, legal defense, and fair trial.

Mobocracy has become a major concern in the contemporary era because technology has changed the speed and scale at which mobs can form. Rumours once travelled orally through local communities. Today, a false message, edited video, inflammatory speech, or communal allegation can circulate within minutes through WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, X, Telegram, or other digital platforms. Such messages can create fear, hatred, and panic, often leading people to act violently before authorities can verify facts or intervene.

India has witnessed several forms of mob violence in recent years. These include lynching on suspicion of child kidnapping, cow-vigilante attacks on cattle traders, communal violence, caste-based mob violence, attacks on migrants, moral policing, social boycotts, and digital harassment. In many of these cases, the victims have belonged to socially vulnerable groups, including religious minorities, Dalits, migrants, poor labourers, women, and persons perceived as outsiders. The violence is often justified in the name of religion, culture, morality, nationalism, community honour, or public safety.

The issue is not confined to India. Across the world, democracies have faced forms of mob rule in which crowds attack public institutions, intimidate political opponents, target minority groups, or use online platforms to harass individuals. Political polarization, economic insecurity, fake news, hate speech, and distrust of institutions have strengthened these tendencies. Mobocracy is therefore not only a criminal-law issue; it is also a challenge to political theory, sociology, public administration, human rights, media studies, and constitutional law.

This paper studies the causes, forms, consequences, and constitutional responses to mobocracy. It argues that mobocracy is a deeper crisis of constitutional morality and institutional capacity. A democratic state cannot allow citizens or organized groups to become parallel police, prosecutors, judges, and executioners. If the law is replaced by rumour and collective rage, democracy risks becoming majoritarian domination rather than constitutional governance.

Objectives

The paper has the following objectives:

1. To explain the conceptual foundations of mobocracy
2. To analyse the major causes and enabling conditions of mobocracy,
3. To examine the constitutional and legal framework in India, evaluate the impact of mobocracy on democracy

1. Meaning of Mobocracy

Mobocracy is derived from the terms “mob” and “cracy,” which means rule. It is commonly understood as “rule by the mob.” A mob is not merely a crowd or a gathering of people. A crowd becomes a mob when it acts with hostility, violence, coercion, or unlawful collective purpose. Mobocracy therefore refers to domination by an uncontrolled group that acts outside legal authority and imposes its will through force, intimidation, or collective pressure. Mobocracy occurs when a group of people decides that a person is guilty and proceeds to punish that person without investigation or judicial process. The mob may assault, torture, humiliate, lynch, socially boycott, destroy property, or threaten the victim. Such conduct is outside the constitutional framework because only competent institutions have the authority to investigate offences, determine guilt, and impose punishment.

Mobocracy does not always begin with planned violence. It may arise suddenly due to panic, false rumours, religious sentiment, communal tension, economic frustration, or political provocation. However, many instances of mob violence are not entirely spontaneous. They may be encouraged by organized groups, local leaders, political actors, vigilante organizations, social media networks, or those who benefit from creating fear and polarization.

2. Characteristics of Mobocracy

Mobocracy has several important features:

- It involves collective action by a group of persons.
- It bypasses lawful institutions such as police, courts, and administrative authorities.
- It denies the victim due process, fair hearing, and presumption of innocence.
- It is often based on rumours, prejudices, identity narratives, or public anger.
- It frequently targets vulnerable individuals or minority communities.
- It creates a climate of fear and impunity.
- It weakens the state’s authority and public confidence in the rule of law.

The key distinction is that mobocracy does not seek justice through law. It seeks instant punishment through collective force.

3. Mobocracy and Legitimate Protest

It is necessary to distinguish mobocracy from legitimate protest, dissent, civil disobedience, or public demonstration. Democracy protects the right of citizens to express disagreement with the government, demand reforms, organize peaceful gatherings, and criticize public policy. Peaceful protest is an essential component of democratic life.

A lawful protest generally focuses on public issues, policies, laws, or governmental decisions. It seeks change through persuasion, debate, representation, media, courts, elections, or non-violent pressure. Mobocracy, by contrast, targets particular individuals or communities for punishment. It replaces legal procedure with violence or intimidation. It is not a demand for justice through institutions; it is an attempt to impose private or collective “justice” outside the law.

For example, a peaceful demonstration demanding stricter action against crime is democratic protest. However, beating a person to death merely because the crowd suspects that person of theft, child kidnapping, cattle smuggling, or immoral conduct is mobocracy.

4. Mobocracy and the Rule of Law

The rule of law requires that everyone, including government officials and ordinary citizens, is subject to law. It includes equality before law, legal certainty, fairness, accountability, and respect for fundamental rights. It also requires that criminal liability must be established by competent courts according to prescribed legal procedure.

Mobocracy directly contradicts the rule of law. It is based on arbitrariness, suspicion, emotion, and majoritarian pressure. The mob does not distinguish between allegation and proof. It does not recognize legal safeguards. It does not offer the accused a chance to defend themselves. It often punishes people for imagined offences or for their social identity.

The rule of law protects every citizen from the possibility of becoming a victim of arbitrary power. Mobocracy destroys that protection. When mobs become powerful, no citizen is safe merely because they are innocent. Innocence becomes irrelevant if a rumour or prejudice is sufficient to trigger violence.

5. Mobocracy in the Digital Age

Digital communication has transformed the nature of mobocracy. Mobile phones and social media platforms have made it possible for information to travel instantly. Unfortunately, false information travels with the same speed, and often faster, than verified news.

Messaging platforms permit rapid forwarding of photographs, videos, voice notes, and rumours. A fake message may claim that a child-lifting gang is active in a locality. An edited video may depict an unrelated incident and present it as current evidence. A communal post may portray an entire religious

group as dangerous. Such content can spread fear and hostility, especially where digital literacy is low and trust in informal networks is high.

Digital-age mobocracy has several features:

- Rapid dissemination of rumours.
- Large-scale mobilization within a short period.
- Anonymity of those spreading false information.
- Difficulty in identifying original sources.
- Echo chambers that reinforce prejudice.
- Emotional content that discourages rational verification.
- Online harassment that may lead to offline violence.

The WhatsApp-rumour lynchings in India in 2018 remain one of the most important examples of how digital misinformation can produce deadly mob violence.

6. State Monopoly over Legitimate Violence

Political theorists, particularly Max Weber, argued that a modern state is distinguished by its monopoly over the legitimate use of physical force. This does not mean that the state can use force arbitrarily. Rather, it means that policing, investigation, punishment, and use of coercive power must operate through legal authority and constitutional limits.

Mobocracy represents a breakdown of this principle. When a mob punishes someone, private individuals assume powers that belong to the police and judiciary. They investigate without evidence, arrest without authority, punish without trial, and sometimes kill without accountability. This is a dangerous privatization of violence.

The failure may occur because the state is weak, absent, biased, slow, politically compromised, or unable to act quickly. It may also occur because people believe that the state will tolerate the violence. In both cases, the state's authority is undermined, and non-state actors begin to exercise coercive power.

7. Due Process and Constitutional Morality

Due process is a central component of legal justice. It requires that a person accused of wrongdoing must be investigated according to law, informed of allegations, given an opportunity to defend themselves, and tried before an impartial court. The presumption of innocence means that a person is treated as innocent until proven guilty.

Mobocracy rejects all these principles. In a mob attack, the accused may not even know why they are being targeted. The crowd may rely on rumours, appearance, identity, or hearsay. There is no investigation, no hearing, no legal representation, and no appeal.

Constitutional morality refers to the commitment to values such as liberty, equality, fraternity, dignity, pluralism, tolerance, and respect for institutions. It requires citizens as well as public authorities to act within constitutional limits. Mobocracy violates constitutional morality because it places passion above law, majoritarian sentiment above individual rights, and violence above dialogue.

8. Crowd Psychology and Deindividuation

Social psychology helps explain how ordinary individuals may participate in acts of collective violence. In a crowd, people may experience deindividuation: a reduced sense of personal responsibility because they feel anonymous or believe responsibility is shared by the group. A person who would not commit violence alone may participate when surrounded by others.

Peer pressure is another major factor. Individuals may join a mob because they fear being seen as disloyal, weak, or opposed to their community. The presence of aggressive leaders can further influence the crowd. Slogans, rumours, religious symbols, and emotional speeches can create a sense of moral justification for violence.

Mob actors may also engage in moral disengagement. They may convince themselves that the victim deserves punishment or represents a threat to society. Once the victim is dehumanized as a “criminal,” “outsider,” “traitor,” “child-lifter,” or “enemy,” violence becomes easier to justify.

9. Rumour, Misinformation, and Panic

Rumours thrive in situations of fear, uncertainty, and weak communication. When people do not have reliable information, they may rely on informal sources. Rumours are especially powerful when they concern children, religion, security, or community honour because these subjects generate strong emotional reactions.

Misinformation can create moral panic. A community may become convinced that it is under threat from outsiders or criminals. The fear may be completely baseless, but repeated sharing creates the appearance of truth. In such circumstances, the mob may view violence as preventive action.

The 2018 child-kidnap rumours in India show how misinformation can transform ordinary anxiety into collective violence. False messages did not merely misinform people; they created a perceived emergency in which violence seemed justified.

10. Identity Politics and Othering

Mobocracy is often connected with identity politics. Communities may be mobilized around religion, caste, ethnicity, language, region, gender, or nationalism. Political or social actors create an “us versus them” narrative in which one group is presented as the defender of society and another group is portrayed as a threat.

This process is called othering. The “other” may be represented as impure, dangerous, criminal, anti-national, immoral, or foreign. Once this image becomes socially accepted, violence against the other may be seen as protection of the community.

Cow-vigilante violence is an example of identity-based mobocracy. In some cases, accusations related to cattle transport or cow slaughter have been used to target Muslims, Dalits, and cattle traders. The issue moves beyond animal protection and becomes connected with social power, religious identity, and community control.

11. Political Economy of Mobocracy

Mobocracy can also serve political and economic interests. Political actors may use mobs to demonstrate strength, intimidate opponents, polarize voters, or divert attention from governance failures. A mob may become a tool of informal political control.

Economic motives may also be involved. Vigilante groups may extort money from traders, seize cattle, control local markets, or eliminate competitors. Violence may therefore be justified in moral language while serving material interests.

Mobocracy is more likely to persist when its perpetrators believe that they will not face serious consequences. Impunity lowers the cost of violence. If arrests are weak, investigations are delayed, witnesses are intimidated, or politicians defend the accused, the mob receives a message that such conduct is tolerated.

12. Mobocracy and Democratic Backsliding

Democratic backsliding refers to the gradual weakening of democratic institutions, norms, and rights. It may occur even where elections continue to be held. Democracies can decline when courts are weakened, media is intimidated, minorities are targeted, and public institutions become partisan.

Mobocracy can be both a symptom and a tool of democratic backsliding. It is a symptom because it indicates declining trust in institutions and increasing polarization. It is a tool because mobs can be used to silence critics, intimidate minorities, and enforce majoritarian agendas outside formal law.

A democracy cannot remain healthy if citizens fear that public opinion, social media outrage, or organized crowds can determine who is safe and who is punishable.

I. Forms of Mobocracy with Recent Examples and Case Studies

➤ Rumour-Driven Mob Lynching

Rumour-driven lynching is one of the most dangerous forms of mobocracy because it can arise suddenly and target completely innocent people. Rumours often concern child kidnapping, theft, organ trafficking, witchcraft, religious insult, or criminal activity. Such allegations spread fear and create a perceived need for immediate action.

➤ **WhatsApp Child-Kidnap Panic in India, 2018**

During 2018, several false messages circulated on WhatsApp claiming that child kidnappers were operating in different parts of India. Many messages included edited or unrelated videos. Some clips were wrongly presented as evidence of child abduction. The messages urged people to remain alert and to take action against suspicious outsiders.

These rumours triggered a series of lynchings in different states. Media reports indicated that at least 17 to 20 persons were killed over child-kidnapping rumours during a few months in 2018. Many victims were poor labourers, travellers, migrants, or persons who were unfamiliar to local residents.

❖ **Case Study: Dhule, Maharashtra**

In July 2018, five men were lynched by a mob in Dhule district of Maharashtra after they were suspected of being child abductors. The suspicion was linked to WhatsApp rumours. The victims were attacked by villagers and beaten to death. Police later arrested several persons in connection with the crime.

The incident illustrates the central feature of mobocracy: a rumour was treated as evidence, and the crowd acted as judge and executioner. The victims were denied any chance to explain their identity or seek protection.

❖ **Case Study: Karnataka Lynching**

In Karnataka, a 32-year-old man was lynched after false rumours spread that he was involved in child kidnapping. The man was reportedly attacked by a crowd that believed unverified WhatsApp messages. Police arrested more than two dozen persons in connection with the incident.

The case shows that mob violence is not restricted to a particular region or community. The combination of fear, misinformation, and crowd action can create similar outcomes across different locations.

❖ **Case Study: Karbi Anglong, Assam**

In June 2018, two young men were beaten to death by a mob in Karbi Anglong, Assam, after being suspected of child kidnapping. They were reportedly in the area for work and were mistaken for child-lifters. The incident was recorded and circulated online, further demonstrating the role of technology in both spreading panic and documenting violence.

The child-kidnap panic demonstrates how social media can turn local fear into a national phenomenon. It also shows the importance of rapid official communication, police intervention, and public awareness.

❖ **Cow-Vigilante Violence**

Cow-vigilante violence is another important form of mobocracy in India. It involves attacks by self-styled cow-protection groups against persons suspected of cattle theft, cow slaughter, or cattle

transportation. The violence is often justified as protection of religious sentiment, but it frequently targets vulnerable communities and operates outside legal procedure.

The Indian Constitution contains Article 48, a Directive Principle of State Policy that encourages the state to take steps for preserving and improving breeds and prohibiting slaughter of certain cattle. However, Article 48 does not authorize citizens or vigilante groups to take the law into their own hands. Enforcement of animal-protection laws is the responsibility of lawful authorities, not private mobs.

❖ **Case Study: Dadri Lynching, Uttar Pradesh, 2015**

In September 2015, Mohammed Akhlaq, a Muslim resident of Bisara village near Dadri in Uttar Pradesh, was attacked by a mob after rumours spread that his family had stored or consumed beef. The mob entered his home, assaulted him, and caused his death. His son was also seriously injured.

The Dadri incident became a major symbol of cow-vigilante violence in India. It raised questions about communal polarization, the spread of rumours, police response, and political reactions. It also illustrated how dietary practices and religious identity can become grounds for violent social control.

❖ **Case Study: Pehlu Khan, Alwar, Rajasthan, 2017**

In April 2017, Pehlu Khan, a dairy farmer, was attacked by a group of self-styled cow vigilantes in Alwar district, Rajasthan. He and others were transporting cattle when they were stopped and assaulted. Khan later died from his injuries.

The case attracted national attention because it involved a person engaged in cattle-related livelihood activity who was subjected to extra-legal violence. It highlighted the vulnerability of cattle traders and transporters, particularly those belonging to minority communities.

❖ **Case Study: Raipur, Chhattisgarh, 2024**

In June 2024, reports indicated that cattle transporters were attacked in Raipur, Chhattisgarh, by a group described as linked to cow-protection or Hindutva activism. The attack reportedly resulted in deaths and injuries. The incident demonstrated that cow-vigilante violence remains a continuing issue and that legal deterrence has not been fully effective.

Cow-vigilante violence damages both democratic values and economic livelihoods. It creates fear among cattle traders, dairy workers, transporters, butchers, and persons associated with leather-related occupations. It also strengthens communal mistrust and encourages private policing.

❖ **Political and Institutional Mobocracy**

Mobocracy also appears in attacks on public institutions, government offices, health facilities, educational institutions, and public officials. Such attacks are significant because they undermine state capacity and disrupt essential services.

❖ **Social Boycott and Moral Policing**

Mobocracy does not always take the form of physical lynching. It may also occur through social boycott, public humiliation, moral policing, or collective threats. In some communities, individuals or families may be ostracized for inter-caste marriage, inter-faith relationships, food habits, clothing, political opinions, or alleged violations of community norms.

Social boycott can include refusal to trade, denial of access to common facilities, exclusion from community events, threats, forced apologies, or economic isolation. Such acts are coercive because they force conformity through collective pressure.

Moral policing is another form of mobocracy. Groups may harass couples, women, students, artists, or members of minority communities in the name of culture, religion, or public morality. Such groups act as self-appointed guardians of society, often violating personal liberty, privacy, dignity, and freedom of expression.

❖ **Digital Mobbing and Online Harassment**

Digital mobbing occurs when large numbers of social media users collectively target a person with abuse, threats, misinformation, doxxing, public shaming, or coordinated complaints. Victims may include journalists, academics, activists, students, actors, public officials, and ordinary citizens.

Online harassment can have serious consequences. Victims may suffer mental trauma, fear, reputational damage, professional loss, and self-censorship. In some cases, online hate campaigns can translate into offline threats or physical violence.

Digital mobbing is particularly dangerous because it creates a permanent record and can reach a large audience quickly. It also allows perpetrators to remain anonymous or operate through fake accounts. The law must therefore address both offline and online forms of mobocracy while protecting legitimate freedom of expression.

13. Causes of Mobocracy

❖ **Institutional Failure and Delayed Justice**

One of the principal causes of mobocracy is lack of faith in formal institutions. Where police investigations are slow, courts take years to decide cases, and victims do not receive justice, people may begin to believe that legal processes are ineffective.

However, frustration with delayed justice cannot justify mob violence. The solution to weak institutions is institutional reform, not private punishment. When people take law into their own hands, innocent persons are likely to suffer, and the rule of law becomes weaker.

❖ **Weak Policing and Police Inaction**

Police are expected to prevent crime, protect citizens, and control violent crowds. However, mob violence may occur because police are understaffed, poorly equipped, delayed in responding, or influenced by local political pressures.

In some cases, police officers may fail to intervene due to fear of the crowd, lack of clear command, communal bias, or concern about political consequences. Such inaction encourages future violence. If mobs believe that police will not act, they become more confident and aggressive.

❖ **Misinformation and Fake News**

False information is a major trigger of mob violence. Rumours about child kidnappers, cow slaughter, religious insult, theft, or crime can spread quickly through messaging platforms. Individuals may forward such messages without verifying facts.

Misinformation becomes dangerous when it is emotional, repetitive, and linked to existing prejudices. False messages may create panic and lead people to assume that immediate violence is necessary for self-protection.

Digital literacy is therefore essential. Citizens must learn to verify information, check reliable sources, avoid forwarding unverified content, and report harmful material.

❖ **Identity Politics and Communal Polarization**

Mob violence often occurs in a context of religious, caste-based, ethnic, or political polarization. Identity-based narratives may portray one community as a threat to another. This can turn ordinary social tensions into violent conflict.

Majoritarian politics becomes dangerous when the majority believes that it has a right to punish minorities or dissenters outside legal procedure. Democracy cannot be reduced to numerical majority. Constitutional democracy requires that minorities enjoy equal protection and that every person is treated with dignity.

❖ **Political Patronage and Impunity**

Political patronage is a powerful factor in enabling mobocracy. If political leaders remain silent, defend the accused, celebrate vigilante actors, or fail to ensure prosecution, mobs may interpret this as support. Impunity creates a cycle of violence. Perpetrators act because they believe they will not be punished; future mobs learn from previous cases that violence carries few consequences. Strong and impartial prosecution is therefore crucial.

❖ **Economic Insecurity and Social Frustration**

Economic hardship, unemployment, inequality, and insecurity can contribute to mob violence. Individuals facing economic stress may be more vulnerable to scapegoating narratives. Migrants, minorities, and outsiders may be blamed for unemployment, crime, or social problems.

Economic insecurity does not automatically produce violence, but political and social actors can exploit such frustration. A fair and inclusive development policy can reduce the conditions in which hate and suspicion flourish.

❖ **Low Digital and Legal Awareness**

Many citizens may not fully understand how misinformation works or how legal procedures protect them. They may assume that messages forwarded by friends or relatives are reliable. They may also be unaware that sharing inflammatory content can contribute to crime.

Legal awareness is equally important. Citizens must understand that an accusation does not prove guilt and that only courts can punish offenders. Community-level awareness programmes can help prevent rumour-based violence.

❖ **Crowd Psychology and Peer Pressure**

Crowd psychology can transform individual behaviour. People may participate in violence because others are doing so. They may fear being excluded if they refuse. Leaders, slogans, religious symbols, and emotional speeches can intensify crowd behaviour.

The solution includes early police intervention, responsible leadership, community education, and legal accountability. The more quickly a dangerous crowd is dispersed or calmed, the less likely it is to become violent.

14. Constitutional and Legal Framework in India

❖ **Article 14: Equality before Law**

Article 14 guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws. Mobocracy violates this principle because it creates unequal vulnerability. People belonging to minorities, marginalized groups, migrants, and socially disadvantaged communities may be more likely to become targets.

The state must ensure that all citizens receive equal police protection and that law enforcement does not operate on the basis of religion, caste, class, or political affiliation.

❖ **Article 15: Prohibition of Discrimination**

Article 15 prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth. Many lynching incidents involve communal, caste-based, or identity-based targeting. When the state fails to prevent such violence, it risks allowing discriminatory social practices to continue.

❖ **Article 19: Freedom of Speech and Expression**

Article 19(1)(a) protects freedom of speech and expression. Mobocracy harms this freedom because fear of mob retaliation can silence journalists, academics, artists, activists, and ordinary citizens. People may avoid discussing sensitive issues because they fear harassment or violence.

The state has a duty to protect people who exercise their freedom of expression lawfully. At the same time, hate speech and direct incitement to violence may be restricted under the reasonable limitations provided by the Constitution.

❖ **Article 21: Right to Life and Personal Liberty**

Article 21 guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. Mob lynching is a direct and grave violation of Article 21. It deprives victims of life without any legal process.

The right to life has been interpreted broadly by the Supreme Court to include dignity, safety, and the right to live free from fear. The state therefore has a positive obligation to prevent mob violence, protect threatened individuals, investigate offences, prosecute perpetrators, and compensate victims.

❖ **Articles 25–28: Freedom of Religion**

Articles 25 to 28 protect freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practice, and propagate religion, subject to public order, morality, and health. Mob violence in the name of protecting religious sentiments often violates these provisions, especially when it imposes the beliefs of one group upon another.

No private group can enforce religious norms through violence. Religious freedom is protected by law, and alleged violations must be addressed through lawful procedure.

❖ **Article 48 and Cow Protection**

Article 48 directs the state to organize agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and to preserve and improve breeds and prohibit slaughter of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle. It is a Directive Principle of State Policy.

However, Article 48 does not authorize mob violence, vigilantism, or private enforcement. Even where state laws regulate cattle slaughter or transport, enforcement must be carried out by authorized officials according to law. Cow protection cannot become an excuse for assault, lynching, or communal targeting.

❖ **Judicial Response: *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India***

The most important judicial response to mob lynching in India is the Supreme Court decision in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India* (2018). The case arose in the context of growing incidents of lynching and cow-vigilante violence.

The Supreme Court made it clear that no person or group can be allowed to take the law into their own hands. The Court emphasized that mob violence cannot be tolerated in a constitutional democracy and that the state has a duty to prevent such acts.

The Court issued preventive, remedial, and punitive directions.

❖ Preventive Directions

The Supreme Court directed state governments to appoint a Nodal Officer in each district, not below the rank of Superintendent of Police, to prevent incidents of mob violence and lynching. The Nodal Officer was to be assisted by other senior officers and coordinate with local intelligence and police authorities.

States were also directed to identify districts, sub-divisions, and villages where mob violence had occurred or where there was a possibility of such violence. These areas were to receive special attention and preventive policing.

The Court further directed governments to take steps to prevent dissemination of irresponsible and explosive messages on social media that could incite mob violence.

❖ Remedial Directions

The Court stated that victims or their families must receive immediate relief and compensation. It emphasized that victims should be provided legal assistance and that the state must take responsibility for rehabilitation where necessary.

❖ Punitive Directions

The Supreme Court directed that police officers who fail to prevent, investigate, or respond appropriately to mob violence should face disciplinary action. It also emphasized prompt registration of First Information Reports, effective investigation, and speedy prosecution.

The Court recommended fast-track trials and urged states to ensure that mob lynching cases are dealt with seriously and without delay.

15. Implementation Challenges

Although the *Tehseen Poonawalla* judgment provided a strong framework, implementation has been uneven. Some states have taken steps to appoint nodal officers and issue guidelines, while others have shown limited progress. Problems remain in investigation quality, witness protection, victim compensation, and accountability of public officials.

❖ Legislative Gaps

India has general criminal laws dealing with murder, assault, rioting, unlawful assembly, criminal conspiracy, hate speech, and public order. These provisions can be used in mob-lynching cases. However, critics argue that existing laws do not adequately address the distinctive nature of mob violence.

A specific anti-lynching law could define mob lynching clearly, identify aggravated forms of collective violence, impose responsibility on organizers and instigators, provide for fast-track investigation, ensure witness protection, require victim compensation, and fix accountability for negligent officials.

Some states have considered or enacted measures relating to mob lynching. However, a fragmented state-level approach may lead to uneven protection. A comprehensive national framework, combined with strong state-level implementation, would provide a more effective response.

Impact of Mobocracy on Democracy

❖ Erosion of Rule of Law

Mobocracy weakens the rule of law by normalizing private punishment. When crowds can attack people without fear of legal consequences, citizens may begin to believe that law is optional. This encourages more vigilantism and reduces respect for courts and police.

The state's legitimacy depends on its ability to protect citizens. If the state cannot protect people from mobs, its constitutional authority becomes weak.

❖ Threat to Minority Rights

Mobocracy disproportionately affects vulnerable groups. Religious minorities, Dalits, migrants, cattle traders, women, inter-faith couples, activists, and persons perceived as outsiders may become targets. This creates fear and inequality.

Democracy cannot survive if certain groups live under permanent threat of collective violence. Equal citizenship requires that every person enjoys equal legal protection.

❖ Chilling Effect on Free Speech

When people fear public shaming, online abuse, threats, or physical violence, they may stop expressing opinions. Writers, teachers, journalists, artists, and students may avoid controversial subjects. This reduces the quality of public debate and weakens democratic culture.

Freedom of speech is meaningful only when individuals can exercise it without fear of violence.

❖ Social Fragmentation

Mob violence creates long-term mistrust among communities. It deepens religious, caste, ethnic, and political divisions. Families may migrate from areas where they feel unsafe. Economic and social relationships are damaged.

The harm is not limited to the immediate victim. Entire communities may experience insecurity, trauma, and alienation.

❖ Weakening of Public Institutions

Mob attacks on health centres, schools, courts, police stations, or public offices weaken service delivery. Government employees may hesitate to perform duties in sensitive areas. Citizens may lose access to health, education, and welfare services.

Institutional mobocracy can therefore affect development, governance, and social welfare.

❖ **Economic Consequences**

Mob violence disrupts trade, transport, markets, and employment. Cow-vigilante violence affects cattle traders, dairy workers, transporters, and leather-industry workers. Rumours and communal tension can also reduce tourism, business confidence, and local investment.

The economic cost of mobocracy is therefore substantial, even when it is not immediately visible.

❖ **Democratic Backsliding**

When violence becomes a tool of political expression or community control, democratic norms weaken. Majoritarian sentiments may overpower constitutional rights. Political actors may benefit from polarization and therefore avoid controlling violent groups.

Democracy then becomes procedural rather than substantive. Elections may continue, but liberty, equality, dignity, and institutional accountability decline.

16. **Recommendations**

❖ **Enact a Comprehensive Anti-Lynching Law**

India should enact a comprehensive anti-lynching law at the central level, with strong implementation by states. The law should:

- Define mob lynching and collective vigilante violence clearly.
- Provide enhanced punishment for perpetrators, organizers, and instigators.
- Punish persons who spread deliberate misinformation that directly incites violence.
- Establish fast-track investigation and trial procedures.
- Provide compensation, rehabilitation, and legal aid for victims and families.
- Ensure witness protection.
- Fix accountability for police and administrative officers who fail to act.

The purpose of the law should not be only punishment after violence occurs. It should also create strong prevention, protection, and accountability mechanisms.

❖ **Strengthen Implementation of the Tehseen Poonawalla Guidelines**

State governments should fully implement the directions of the Supreme Court. They should appoint and empower Nodal Officers in every district, map vulnerable areas, conduct regular intelligence reviews, and establish rapid-response systems.

The performance of Nodal Officers should be monitored through periodic reports. Their role should not remain merely formal or administrative.

❖ **Police Reform and Accountability**

Police forces need greater capacity to respond quickly to mob violence. This includes adequate staffing, modern communication systems, training in crowd management, and access to vehicles and protective equipment.

Police training should include constitutional values, minority rights, communal harmony, misinformation management, and human-rights principles. Officers who fail to act or show bias should face disciplinary and legal action.

Independent police complaint authorities should be strengthened to investigate allegations of police inaction or complicity.

❖ **Counter-Misinformation Measures**

Governments, technology companies, media organizations, educational institutions, and civil society must work together to address misinformation.

Important measures include:

- Public campaigns urging citizens not to forward unverified messages.
- Rapid fact-checking and official clarification during rumours or communal tension.
- Digital-literacy programmes in schools, colleges, and communities.
- Local-language awareness campaigns in rural and semi-urban areas.
- Effective reporting mechanisms for harmful online content.
- Cooperation between platforms and law-enforcement agencies where there is a credible threat of violence.

At the same time, measures against misinformation must respect freedom of expression and should not be misused to suppress legitimate criticism.

❖ **Community Policing and Local Peace Committees**

Community policing can reduce mistrust between citizens and law-enforcement agencies. Local police should maintain regular contact with community leaders, teachers, religious representatives, youth groups, and civil-society organizations.

Peace committees may be activated during periods of communal tension, elections, festivals, or circulation of dangerous rumours. Such committees should be inclusive and should represent different communities.

❖ **Promote Constitutional and Civic Education**

Educational institutions have an important role in preventing mobocracy. Schools and colleges should teach students about:

- Constitutional values.
- Fundamental rights and duties.
- Rule of law.
- Dangers of misinformation.
- Respect for diversity.
- Peaceful conflict resolution.

- Responsible use of social media.

Students should be encouraged to verify information, reject hate speech, and understand that no person can be punished without due process.

❖ **Responsible Political Leadership**

Political leaders have a special responsibility to prevent mob violence. They must condemn lynching, vigilantism, hate speech, and communal violence clearly and promptly. They should avoid inflammatory language and should not glorify or protect vigilante actors.

Political silence during mob violence can be interpreted as approval. Strong public condemnation can help prevent escalation and reinforce the authority of law.

❖ **Media Ethics and Responsible Reporting**

Media organizations should avoid sensational reporting that increases panic or communal tension. They must verify facts before broadcasting allegations and avoid identifying communities unnecessarily.

Journalists should report violence with sensitivity toward victims and should focus on accountability, not spectacle. The media can also play a positive role by spreading verified information and exposing false rumours.

❖ **Victim Support and Rehabilitation**

Victims of mob violence and their families require more than financial compensation. They may need medical treatment, psychological counselling, legal aid, education support, employment assistance, and protection from further threats.

A victim-centred approach will demonstrate that the state recognizes both the physical and social harm caused by mobocracy.

Conclusion

Mobocracy is one of the gravest challenges to constitutional democracy. It replaces the rule of law with the rule of rumour, prejudice, anger, and collective force. It transforms citizens into self-appointed police officers, judges, and executioners. In doing so, it violates the right to life, equality before law, freedom of expression, religious freedom, and human dignity.

The rise of mobocracy in the digital age has made the problem more urgent. False messages can spread quickly, create panic, and mobilize crowds. WhatsApp-rumour lynchings, cow-vigilante violence, political attacks on institutions, social boycott, and online harassment demonstrate that mobocracy can take many forms. Its targets are often vulnerable persons and communities, making it a serious threat to equality and pluralism.

The constitutional response must be strong and comprehensive. The Supreme Court's guidelines in *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India* provide an important framework, but judicial directions alone

cannot solve the problem. India requires effective legislation, accountable policing, speedy justice, victim protection, counter-misinformation mechanisms, civic education, and responsible political leadership.

The fundamental principle is clear: no person, group, organization, or community has the right to take the law into its own hands. Allegations must be investigated. Guilt must be established through evidence. Punishment must be imposed only by competent courts. Democracy can survive only when popular will is restrained by constitutional values and when the state protects every individual from arbitrary violence.

The struggle against mobocracy is ultimately a struggle to preserve the dignity of the individual and the authority of the Constitution. If the rule of law is not defended, democracy may remain only in name while actual power passes into the hands of the loudest, strongest, and most violent groups. Therefore, resisting mobocracy is not merely a matter of maintaining public order; it is a necessary condition for the survival of constitutional democracy.

References

- BBC News. (2018, July 18). *How WhatsApp helped turn an Indian village into a lynch mob*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-44856910>
- CBC News. (2018, July 8). *Lynchings sparked by WhatsApp child-kidnap rumours sweep India*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/india-child-kidnap-abduction-video-rumours-killings-1.4737041>
- CNET. (2018, July 3). *WhatsApp rumors reportedly led to lynchings in India*. <https://www.cnet.com/culture/internet/whatsapp-rumors-reportedly-led-to-lynchings-in-india/>
- Crisis Magazine. (2018, November 1). *A coming mobocracy?* <https://crisismagazine.com/opinion/a-coming-mobocracy>
- NDTV. (2018, July 3). *Mob lynchings fueled by WhatsApp sweep India*. <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/mob-lynching-after-whatsapp-rumours-mob-lynchings-fueled-by-whatsapp-sweep-india-foreign-media-1876929>
- Reuters. (2018, July 15). *Police arrest 25 in latest WhatsApp rumour-led lynching in Karnataka*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-whatsapp-india-fakenews/indian-police-arrest-25-in-latest-whatsapp-rumor-led-lynching-idUSKBN1K508I>
- Supreme Court of India. (2018). *Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India*, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 727 of 2016. https://www.scobserver.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/27263_2016_Judgement_17-Jul-2018.pdf
- Wikipedia. (n.d.). *Lynching in India*. Retrieved October 8, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lynching_in_India

- Wikipedia. (2023, November 22). *List of incidents of cow vigilante violence in India*. Retrieved October 8, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_incidents_of_cow_vigilante_violence_in_India
- Academia.edu. (2019). *Mobocracy and nationalism in India: A commentary on theoretical discourse*. https://www.academia.edu/38200819/Mobocracy_and_Nationalism_in_India_A_Commentary_on_theoretical_discourse
- Constitution of India. (1950). *Articles 14, 15, 19, 21, 25–28, and 48*. Government of India. <https://www.india.gov.in/constitution>
- Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. (2023). *The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*. <https://www.mha.gov.in>
- International Journal of Law and Management Research. (2019). *Social media: A new medium for horrendous acts*, 1(2), 2581–5369. <https://www.ijlmh.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Social-Media-A-New-Medium-for-Horrendous-Acts.pdf>
- Maryland Mensa. (2023). *Democracy or mobocracy* [DOC]. <https://maryland.us.mensa.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/democracy-or-mobocracy.docx>
- National Human Rights report 2018
- Studocu. (2024). *Analysis of mobocracy and its impact on democracy in India*. <https://www.studocu.com/in/document/guru-gobind-singh-indraprastha-university/ballb/mobocracy-in-india/111754089>
- Supremo Amicus. (2020). *Rule of rabble: Uprising mobocracy*. <https://supremoamicus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/A1-73.pdf>
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/udhr>
- United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>

THE RESEARCH DIALOGUE

An Online Quarterly Multi-Disciplinary
Peer-Reviewed / Refereed National Research Journal

ISSN: 2583-438X

Volume-3, Issue-4, January -2025

www.theresearchdialogue.com

Certificate Number Jan.-2025/36

Impact Factor (RPRI-4.73)



Certificate Of Publication

This Certificate is proudly presented to

Dr. Nidhi Rani Singh

for publication of research paper title

“Mobocracy: Rule of the Rabble in the Age of Democracy”

Published in ‘The Research Dialogue’ Peer-Reviewed / Refereed Research Journal and E-
ISSN: 2583-438X, Volume-03, Issue-04, Month January, Year-2025.


Dr. Neeraj Yadav
Executive Chief Editor


Dr. Lohans Kumar Kalyani
Editor-in-chief

Note: This E-Certificate is valid with published paper and the paper must
be available online at www.theresearchdialogue.com

INDEXED BY

