
JUSTICE ON TRIAL: ANALYSING THE KANGAROO COURTS AND PROCEDURAL UNFAIRNESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Abhinav Mishra¹, Neha Berma² & Rohit Mehmi³

ABSTRACT:

In the 21st century, public judgment can be instantaneous. Social media platforms let millions of people see, react to and amplify a claim in minutes. India has experienced many instances where viral stories, political claims and sensational reporting shaped public judgment. Politicians public allegations, whether about corruption, vote irregularities, or other misconduct. This is the instances where kangaroo court come into the picture. The term kangaroo court refers to mock court in which the principles of law and justice are disregarded or perverted, informal, unauthorized, and often illegal courts. Kangaroo courts are seemingly everywhere and nowhere. In the contemporary democratic framework, the integrity of judicial and quasi-judicial processes is central to maintaining public trust in governance. This paper examines the phenomenon of “kangaroo courts” in the modern political landscape, and explores how media trials, public perception, and institutional opacity can undermine procedural fairness. This article is divided into three parts; first part offers a brief description of kangaroo courts in an effort to tee up the comparisons to municipal courts and secondly, deals with international and Indian context, thirdly deals with the role of social and online media in the context of kangaroo court.

Keywords: Kangaroo Court, Justice, Bias, Legitimacy, and Procedure.

¹ Assistant Professor, Manu Law College, Nichlaul, Maharajganj Affiliated from Siddharth University, Kapilvastu, Siddharth Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, India.

² Ph.D Scholar (Law), School of Law and Governance, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya, Bihar India.

³ Ph.D. Scholar (Law), School of Legal Studies, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, Punjab India.

1. Introduction

“This is wholly illegal and has to be ruthlessly stamped out. There is nothing honourable in honour killing or other atrocities and, in fact, it is nothing but barbaric and shameful murder. Other atrocities in respect of the personal lives of the people committed by brutal, feudal minded persons deserve harsh punishments. Only this way can we stamp out such acts of barbarism and feudal mentality. Moreover, these acts take the law into their own hands, and amount to kangaroo courts which are wholly illegal.”

-Supreme Court's statement, Bench of Justices Markandey Katju and Gyan Sudha Mishra.⁴ The term "kangaroo court" evokes images of flawed proceedings, biased judgments, and a⁴subversion of the fundamental principles of justice. These unofficial or illegitimate courts operate outside the bounds of established law, often disregarding due process and favouring predetermined outcomes. Kangaroo courts can manifest in diverse settings, from prisons to social media platforms, and throughout history. Their impact is severe eroding trust in legal systems, perpetuating injustice against individuals and groups, and undermining the very foundations of a fair society.⁵ Kangaroo court commonly have three features are impartial, informal, inequitable. It derives from the jumps of the kangaroo, and conveys the idea of a pre-ordained arbitrary rush to judgment by an irregular tribunal that makes a mockery of justice.⁶ In the contemporary world, social media at its highest peak where a single post can be shared millions of times before verification is possible. Algorithms reward content that provokes emotion, not nuance. This speed and reach can be powerful for accountability, but they also make it easy to convict someone in the court of public opinion long before facts, due process or investigations are complete. In India this dynamic has become a pressing concern from sensational news cycles to political accusations and viral rumours raising the question: when does public debate become a “kangaroo court” that undermines justice?

1.1 Research objective

- I. To define and contextualize the concept of kangaroo courts and distinguish them

⁴ Arumugam Servai vs. State of Tamil Nadu, Criminal Appeal No. 958 and 959 of 2011 (Arising out of SLP (Criminal) No. 8084 and 8428 of 2009).

⁵ Manderson, D. (2012). Kangaroo Courts and the Rule of Law: The Legacy of Modernism (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203123638>.

⁶ Ibid.

from legitimate judicial or quasi-judicial bodies.

- II. To assess the role of media trials and public opinion in shaping perceptions of guilt or innocence without formal adjudication

1.2 Research Methodology

The study relied on the doctrinal research method to understand the legal and institutional framework concerning about Kangaroo Court and procedure fairness. In doctrinal study, the material will be collected from primary source as well as secondary source. Primary sources included legislation, case law, and reports, while secondary sources encompassed legal commentaries, textbooks, law journal articles, and scholarly publications.

1.3 What is Kangaroo Court?

A “kangaroo court” is an informal or illegitimate process that delivers judgment without fair procedures. Khap panchayat is an example of kangaroo court, which means clan, is a group of persons from the same or various community represent many villages. Khap panchayats and Khap founded mostly in north eastern side of India, especially in Haryana and western Uttar Pradesh and a portion of Rajasthan.⁷ A khap is a traditional sociopolitical institution. It symbolizes a confederation of multiple villages typically populated by members of the same caste (gotra). Khaps historically arose in the Middle Ages to defend the rights of their society, control social behaviour and settle conflicts amicably. In contrast to the officially recognized gram panchayat, the khap panchayat is the decision-making body of a khap. Khap panchayat are unofficial, caste-based meeting presided over by elders and powerful men, in contrast to elected body. Khaps are frequently attacked for behaving as extra constitutional authority, despite their claims to uphold cultural values.⁸

Their rulings enforce social norms and penalties despite having no legal basis. Some of the illegal public trials by khaps are mentioned below⁹

⁷ Ajay Kumar. (28 January,2012). Khap Panchayats: A Socio-Historical Overview Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 47, No. 4 pp. 59-64.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Charusheel Tripathi (2017) “Women and Community: A Case Study of Khap Panchayats In Haryana”, Ijrssh, Vol. No. 7, Issue No. Ii, Apr-Jun E-Issn: 2249-4642, P-Issn: 2454-467143.

- Khap setting rules for marriage frequently opposing intercaste marriage.
- Social boycotts, penalties and even gangraped have been ordered by the Tewatiya Khap in 2004 in Haryana.
- Khap panchayat interfere with women's freedom of choice, education and rights. Such activity amounts to illegal panchayats, since they ignore established courts and enforce their own awards often through threats and violence.

Media trials or public trials, in which decisions are rendered outside of the court, are comparable to this practice. Similar to how khaps render decisions before judges consider the evidences, the media and public frequently make snap judgement about people before court cases are over. Both ignore article 21 of the Indian constitution's guarantee of a fair trial and the rule of law.

Legal system whether entertained by old customs or conventional authorities or media, can jeopardize democracy or individual liberties.

In year 2004 there was a couple from the different community runout from the village to marry, and after this incident there a Tewatiya Khap¹⁰ panchayat was established by the community and the judgment this panchayat was rendered was to gangraped the boy's mother. This shows how the khap threatens and breach the legal rules in the name of traditions. Khap punishes the accused and tries them in public and from this it can certain as public trials. Khap awards include public humiliations as shaving the heads, blackening the face and body and parading with the garland of shoes on donkey without cloths in the public. There have been many instances when SC aptly remarked and pushed the guidelines to stop these practices by the khap panchayats and said this unlawful.

"Bulldozer justice" refers to the practice of using property demolitions as a form of extrajudicial punishment, typically carried out by government authorities without proper legal process. This phenomenon has gained particular prominence in certain regions where

¹⁰ 10 Supra note 9 at 3.

demolitions are conducted against properties belonging to individuals accused of crimes, often before conviction or due process has been completed.¹¹

The practice raises several fundamental legal issues that prejudice the administration of justice. The rushed nature of these demolitions often denies property owners basic procedural rights, including adequate notice, opportunity to be heard, and time to seek legal remedies. Without Fair trial and investigations, punishing individuals before conviction, bulldozer justice undermines the foundational legal principle that individuals are innocent until proven guilty. When administrative authority practicing this act, it circulates a type of messages which go in the public and after seeing the action by the state public believed that the person is guilty and these actions became issues of national importance.

Applied to online life, it refers to mobs, commentators and influencers forming a virtual tribunal that announces guilt or innocence without proper evidence or legal process. “Trial by media” and “trial by social media” are related, media narratives, viral posts or trending hashtags can create a presumption of guilt and shape public opinion. Sometimes regardless of what courts or official investigations later find. It has happened because People often rely on snippets, screenshots or pundit takes rather than primary sources or complete reports. Partisan narratives exploit social platforms to mobilize supporters and discredit opponents, sometimes by repeating unverified claims. When prominent leaders or media outlets make strong claims without evidence or before investigations conclude, online mobs sometimes mobilize and pass judgment. At the same time, courts in India have repeatedly cautioned against trial by media and emphasized the need to protect fair trial rights and the presumption of innocence. So, it can be said that the practice of bulldozer justice is indirectly influence with media trials or public trials.

2. Historical and Origin of Kangaroo Court

The term "kangaroo court" originated in the United States during the mid-19th century, specifically during the California Gold Rush in the 1840s and 1850s. At that time, as people rushed to California in search of gold, makeshift mining camps and settlements sprang up quickly. These communities often lacked formal legal systems and proper law enforcement. In the absence of established courts and authorities, disputes and conflicts among the miners and

¹¹ Joy Makhal (2023), “Bulldozer Justice’: An Analysis Into The Rule Of Law In India”, IJLLR, Vol. V Issue I, ISSN: 2582-8878.

settlers were resolved through informal gatherings or impromptu trials. These ad hoc proceedings were often characterized by their lack of fairness, due process, and impartiality. The term "kangaroo court" was used to describe these makeshift judicial forums, drawing an analogy to the kangaroo's erratic and unpredictable movements, which symbolized the hasty and arbitrary nature of the decisions made in these courts.¹²

In ancient China, for example, "justice mobs" were formed by local communities to punish individuals deemed a threat to the community. Similarly, "village courts" were established in mediaeval Europe to settle disputes between villagers. Kangaroo courts have different cultural contexts depending on when and where they are found. They have been used as a form of social control in some cases, allowing those in power to maintain their authority over a specific community.¹³ In other cases, marginalised or oppressed groups have used them to seek justice when the official legal system fails to protect them. In India, these makeshift courts emerged in various rural areas and sometimes urban slums, particularly where the formal judicial system was perceived to be slow, inaccessible, or corrupt. These courts are often run by self-proclaimed leaders or influential individuals who impose arbitrary decisions, often resulting in unfair and unjust outcomes. They might handle disputes ranging from property matters to social issues, with no adherence to established legal procedures. Today, it is commonly used to describe mock or pseudo-legal proceedings conducted in a prejudiced and unfair manner¹⁴. When people are denied their right to a fair trial and justice is not carried out, it is referred to as a "kangaroo court" in a metaphorical sense. The concept of a non-official court or tribunal operating outside of the legal system, on the other hand, has existed for centuries in many different cultures. The term kangaroo court springs to mind.

3. International Perspectives on Kangaroo Court

Throughout history, kangaroo courts have been reported in a number of different places and nations. These cases demonstrate situations in which judicial proceedings were unfair and compromised. Here are some noteworthy historical instances:

¹² Potter, Parker B. Jr. (2006) "Antipodal Invektive: A Field Guide to Kangaroos in American Courtrooms," Akron Law Review: Vol. 39: Iss. 1, Article 4. <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/akronlawreview/vol39/iss1/4>.

¹³ Shao-Chuan Leng. (1977). The Role of Law in the People's Republic of China as Reflecting Mao Tse-Tung's Influence. Vol. 68, No. 3, The Journal of Criminal law and Criminology, pp.356-373.

¹⁴ Reuter, P., & Truman, E. M, Chasing Dirty Money: The Fight Against Money Laundering. Peterson Institute for International Economics. pp.118(2004).

International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), "Fair Trial Manual" (2002), The "Fair Trial Manual" of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) highlights the significance of fair trials in maintaining public trust in the legal system. It talks about how unjust trials and kangaroo courts can make people doubt the judicial system and cause them to lose faith in it.¹⁵ **International Bar Association, "Justice versus the Rule of Law" (2009):** The impact of undermining the rule of law on public confidence in the legal system is discussed in this paper by the International Bar Association. It demonstrates how kangaroo courts undermine the fundamentals of justice, leaving the general public disillusioned.¹⁶

United Nations Human Rights, "Combating Impunity and Strengthening

Accountability and the Rule of Law" (2016): The United Nations publication highlights the value of transparency and the application of the law in preserving public confidence in the legal system. It talks about how kangaroo courts and continued impunity for human rights abuses erode public trust. The following sources address how kangaroo courts have eroded public confidence in the legal system.¹⁷

Salem Witch Trials (1692-1693) - Massachusetts, USA:¹⁸ People, mostly women, were accused of practicing witchcraft during the Salem witch trials, which took place in colonial Massachusetts. Hysteria, a lack of due process, and biased decisions characterized the procedures, which resulted in the execution of 20 persons as well as the deaths of a number of others in custody.

Great Purge (1936-1938) - Soviet Union¹⁹: Show trials were held in which well-known political leaders were accused of treason and anti-Soviet actions during the Great Purge, a political repression campaign in the Soviet Union. Due process was not followed, the trials were excessively staged, and many people were wrongfully convicted and put to death.

¹⁵ International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), "Fair Trial Manual" (2002) .
https://www.icj.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/03/trial_observation_manual_1_28_06_2002.pdf.

¹⁶ International Bar Association, "Justice versus the Rule of Law" (2009): IBA guides and reports | International Bar Association. <https://www.ibanet.org/resources>.

¹⁷ Clarkson, Mark. (2020). Reflections on Appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States: Applying the Lessons learned in Australian 'Kangaroo Courts'.

¹⁸ Wallenfelt, Jeff. "Salem witch trials". Encyclopedia Britannica,(31 Jul. 2025).
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Salem-witch-trials>.

¹⁹ The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. "Great Purge". Encyclopedia Britannica, 7 Aug. 2025,
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Great-Purge>.

Nuremberg Trials (1945-1946) - Germany:²⁰ Following World War II, the Nuremberg Trials were held to try prominent Nazi war criminals. Even though the goal of these trials was to hold the guilty accountable, there were doubts about their fairness, particularly in some of the subsequent trials held by the Allied forces.

People's Courts under Mao Zedong (1966-1976) - China:²¹ The People's Courts were utilized in China during the Cultural Revolution to put down perceived political rivals and counterrevolutionaries. Due process was not followed by these tribunals, which resulted in numerous violations of human rights and unfair sentences.

Pinochet's Regime (1973-1990) - Chile:²² Numerous opponents and dissidents were tried by military tribunals under General Augusto Pinochet's military dictatorship, which lacked impartiality and respect for due process. These tribunals have a reputation for rendering unjust verdicts and violating human rights.

These historical instances show how kangaroo courts have been employed throughout history in various areas and times to suppress political dissent and deny justice. To secure the protection of human rights and the rule of law in the present and the future, it is crucial to learn from these historical occurrences.

Well-known cases of kangaroo court where justice was compromised:

My Lai Massacre Trial (1971):²³ Only one soldier, Lt. William Calley, was charged following the My Lai Massacre during the Vietnam War, in which American soldiers slaughtered hundreds of defenceless people. Many people said that Calley's trial was a show trial and that higher-ranking authorities should have been held accountable instead. **The Gujarat Riots Cases (2002):**²⁴ India: Following the 2002 riots in Gujarat, which resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Muslims, many claims of biased investigations and unfair prosecutions surfaced.

²⁰ The Nuremberg Trial and the Tokyo War Crimes Trials (1945–1948)

²¹ Shao-Chuan Leng. (1977). The Role of Law in the People's Republic of China as Reflecting Mao Tse-Tung's Influence. Vol. 68, No. 3, The Journal of Criminal law and Criminology, pp.356-373.

²² Patricio Navia. (2008). Pinochet: The Father of Contemporary Chile, Vol.43, No.3, Latin America Research Review, pp.250-258.

²³ Charles I. Lugini. (2004). Mocking the Rule of Law: A Kangaroo court for Australian David Hicks, Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev. 14, 335.

²⁴ Kalindi Kokal. (13 December, 2014). To Lead or To Follow? Supreme Court and Community 'Justice'. Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 49, No. 50 pp. 19-21.

Local officials were accused of interfering and of failing to hold those responsible for the violence accountable.

Azerbaijani Crackdown on Opposition (2020):²⁵ Following the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict in 2020, Azerbaijani authorities detained opposition leaders, journalists, and activists. Critics said that these trials lacked adequate legal procedures and were politically motivated.

4. Discussion and Analysis

This section elaborates the reasons underlying the issue and presents an analysis of their consequences. The first reason emerges from inadequate access to justice: In some regions, especially in rural areas, people might face challenges in accessing formal legal systems due to factors such as distance to courts, high costs, and lengthy legal procedures. As a result, they might turn to informal systems for quicker resolutions. Alongside this perceived inefficiency of the formal legal system is also a reason because a lack of trust in the formal legal system, delays in justice delivery, and concerns about corruption can push people to seek alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Legal complexities add another reason as social and cultural factor: Traditional and patriarchal norms, caste-based systems, and community norms may influence the prevalence of kangaroo courts, especially in regions where they hold significant influence. Lack of awareness and education is also a big reason in some cases, individuals may not be aware of their legal rights or the formal legal processes, leading them to opt for informal dispute resolution mechanisms. Local power dynamics is also an influential reason, as kangaroo courts might be established and operated by powerful individuals or groups within a community who seek to maintain control and impose their decisions on others. Lack of law enforcement is currently a debated reasons as it shows, weak law enforcement in certain areas can contribute to the proliferation of informal dispute resolution systems. The traditions or cultural practices affect certain cultural and traditional methods of resolving disputes or seeking justice as preferred over the official legal system. To preserve and uphold their cultural values and practices, kangaroo courts may be set up as a way to handle such matters. In some situations, people in positions of authority may create kangaroo courts to exert control over a

²⁵ “Azerbaijan: Relentless Crackdown on Opposition Halt Abuses, Ensure Due Process, Investigate Ill Treatment”(2020), Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/08/19/azerbaijan-relentlesscrackdown-opposition>.

specific group or community. These courts might be used to suppress political opposition or punish individuals who challenge the existing government.

And in the end of this discussion of reasons the economic motivation reason is a vulnerable reason. In some cases, criminal organizations or groups seeking economic control in a specific area might create kangaroo courts. These courts can be used to extort money or resources from local businesses or individuals.

4.1. Consequences and Impact of Kangaroo Court

The negative effects of kangaroo courts are severe and have a long-lasting effect on people, communities, and society as a whole. These informal and illegal judicial systems' lack of fairness and justice has a number of negative effects. The analysis highlighted snap as well as long term results of the issue. The most immediate consequence of kangaroo courts is the denial of justice. Defendants are deprived of their right to a fair trial, and the outcomes are often predetermined, leading to unjust convictions or acquittals. After that erosion of trust in the legal system seems as an issue as, Kangaroo courts undermine public trust in the legal system. When people witness or experience unfair trials, they lose faith in the judiciary and may hesitate to seek justice through legitimate channels in the future.²⁶ Impunity and Human Rights Violations massively affects the individual as In many instances, kangaroo courts are used as tools of repression by oppressive regimes to suppress dissent and opposition. This can lead to human rights violations, including torture, forced confessions, and extrajudicial killings.²⁷ Social Division and Polarization leads Unfair trials and biased judgments can exacerbate existing social divisions and polarization. It can further alienate marginalized groups and lead to heightened tensions within society. Reinforcement of inequality is also a cause as, kangaroo courts often favour the powerful and well-connected, reinforcing existing inequalities and social hierarchies. This can perpetuate a cycle of injustice and hinder efforts to achieve a more equitable society. kangaroo courts dramatically erode the public's confidence in the legal system. People and communities lose faith in the legal system's ability to uphold justice and protect their rights when they witness or experience biased and illegitimate court processes.

²⁶ Kaufman, L. (1982). MAKING THE MOST OF KANGAROO COURT. ETC: A Review of General Semantics, 39(4), 377–382. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42575642>.

²⁷ Ajay Kumar. (28 January,2012). Khap Panchayats: A Socio-Historical Overview Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 47, No. 4 pp. 59-64.

5. Kangaroo Court and Municipal Court

Kangaroo Court and Municipal Court in India are two distinct systems with notable differences:

- **Legitimacy and Authority:** Kangaroo courts are informal and illegal assemblies lacking any legal authority. They are not recognized or sanctioned by the government or judiciary. Municipal courts are formal legal institutions established by local governments or municipalities to handle specific local issues, such as traffic violations, municipal code violations, and certain civil matters. They operate within the bounds of the law and have the authority to adjudicate cases.
- **Structure and Jurisdiction:** Kangaroo courts typically operate in a decentralized and ad-hoc manner, often in rural or marginalized areas. Their jurisdiction is not defined by law and varies depending on the individuals running the court. Municipal courts have a structured setup with designated judges and court personnel. They have specific jurisdiction over matters related to the municipality's ordinances and laws.
- **Legal Procedures:** Kangaroo courts lack formal legal procedures and due process. Decisions are often arbitrary and not based on established legal principles. Municipal courts follow prescribed legal procedures, ensuring fair hearings, the right to legal representation, and an opportunity to present evidence and witnesses.
- **Adherence to the Rule of Law:** Kangaroo courts operate outside the framework of the rule of law, leading to potential abuse of power and miscarriage of justice. Municipal courts operate within the framework of the rule of law, promoting fairness, impartiality, and accountability.

In summary, while kangaroo courts are informal, illegal, and lack legitimacy, municipal courts are formal legal institutions with jurisdiction over specific local matters.

6. The Rising Threat of Kangaroo Court in Contemporary Society

The term "trial by media," which became popular in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, refers to how television and newspaper coverage affects a person's reputation by spreading

ideas of guilt or innocence before or after a court of law judgment.²⁸ There have been many occasions in recent years where the media has presided over an accused person's trial and rendered a verdict before the court does.²⁹

Constitutionality: Despite the fact that the term "media trial" has no clear definition. However, Article 19 of the Indian Constitution indirectly grants this authority to the media.

Everyone has the right to free speech under Article 19 of the Indian Constitution. India is heavily influenced by kangaroo court through online media platform.³⁰ Kangaroo court is running by social and online media nowadays. Kangaroo courts are commonly known as mock courts or sham courts. The term "kangaroo court" is used to explain a judicial system that disregards the principles of due process, where the outcome of the trial is predetermined or influenced by biased individuals or groups. They are being used to create opinion on any issue and to judge people and give verdicts. Such Verdict of Kangaroo court usually based on biasness, disinformation, ethnicity, agenda driven and being hugely politicized and communalized by the communal forces in the name of Religion and gender of the person. It highlights the persistent issue of kangaroo courts, which detriment the rule of law and viability of Indian Democracy.³¹ It undermines the legitimacy of administration of Justice. It is creating hurdles in the actual proceedings and in fact prejudices the court of law/judges as well. Online media outlets, when functioning within legal and ethical boundaries, are not kangaroo courts. However, there are certain ways in which online media can play a role in perpetuating misinformation, promoting mob justice, and undermining the principles of a fair trial. These factors might have implications similar to those of a kangaroo court. Some of the ways in which online media can contribute to such effects include:

- a) **Spreading unverified information:** Online media platforms, including social media, blogs, and online news websites, can disseminate unverified or false information

²⁸ Reuter, P., & Truman, E. M, Chasing Dirty Money: The Fight Against Money Laundering. Peterson Institute for International Economics. pp.118(2004).

²⁹ Mehmet, M., & Simmons, P. (2016). Kangaroo Court? An Analysis of Social Media Justifications for Attitudes to Culling. Environmental Communication, 12(3), 370–386.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2016.1220966>.

³⁰ The Constitution of India, 1950.

³¹ Mehmet, M., & Simmons, P. (2016). Kangaroo Court? An Analysis of Social Media Justifications for Attitudes to Culling. Environmental Communication, 12(3), 370–386.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2016.1220966>.

quickly. This can lead to the formation of public opinions and judgments based on incomplete or inaccurate data.

- b) **Trial by social media:** In some cases, high-profile incidents or criminal cases become the subject of intense public scrutiny on social media. People, without proper understanding of the legal system or evidence, may engage in a "trial by social media" where individuals or groups publicly pronounce judgments and seek punishment for the accused, regardless of whether the legal process has been completed.
- c) **Vigilantism and mob justice:** Misinformation or biased reporting can incite public outrage and provoke vigilantism. This can lead to incidents of mob justice, where individuals or groups take the law into their own hands to deliver punishment to those they believe are guilty.
- d) **Character assassination and online shaming:** Online media can be used to defame and shame individuals without proper evidence or a fair trial, causing significant harm to their reputation and life.
- e) **Influence on judicial proceedings:** Sometimes, intense media coverage and public pressure can impact ongoing legal cases, potentially influencing the direction of investigations or court decisions.
- f) **Incite Hatred and Violence:** Paid news and false news have the power to sway public opinion and to sow discord among the numerous social groups that make up society. In the lack of impartial reporting, the truth is falsely presented in society, influencing people's perceptions and attitudes.

It is essential for media organizations and individual users to exercise responsible journalism and critical thinking when reporting or sharing information online. Journalists must adhere to professional standards, verify facts, and avoid sensationalizing or prejudicing ongoing legal cases. As the media landscape is constantly evolving, these issues may continue to be relevant. The media lacks independence due to two main factors: government control through censorship and the influence of major business entities. Funding for the media involves significant expenses for personnel and advanced technology, which necessitates generating revenue. Consequently, advertising is employed as a means to achieve this financial goal. As

a result, the media has become a purveyor of disinformation, raising ethical concerns. Both the legal and ethical dimensions of this issue are equally critical.³²

The democratic way of life relies on the presence of unrestricted mass media agencies. News reporting must be factual and unbiased, while programs discussing controversial public issues should provide equitable representation to both sides. Respecting people's privacy is a fundamental freedom, essential for preserving liberty and human dignity. While the government can aid in the reform process by enacting laws to penalize violations, the media requires both robust self-regulation and independent oversight.

Conclusion

Being a pro democrat, it is never believed in the concept of existence of any parallel undemocratic organization in a democratic society. And also what are the needs of those illegal organizations if already such organizations exist in a democratic framework?

May be in the eyes of cultures and traditions the existence of kangaroo courts could be considered viable, but it is also true that as like bad smell starts to come out of water which stay at the same place for a long time in same way traditions have also to be changed according to time otherwise, they also start to create awful environment. For carrying the judicial work, Indian democratic system has an independent judicial system which is quite efficient in its domain; there is not any need of such organizations which try to safe misogynistic diktats. Online media in India, when operating within legal and ethical boundaries, is not a kangaroo court. However, it can contribute to outcomes similar to a kangaroo court by spreading unverified information, promoting trial by social media, inciting vigilantism and mob justice, engaging in character assassination and online shaming, and potentially influencing judicial proceedings through intense media coverage and public pressure. Responsible journalism and critical thinking are crucial for media organizations and individuals to avoid these pitfalls and ensure a fair and just reporting environment. As the media landscape evolves, staying updated on the role of online media in the Indian legal system is essential.

³² Kaufman, L. (1982). Making The Most Of Kangaroo Court. Etc: A Review of General Semantics, 39(4), 377–382. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42575642>.

References

1. Ajay Kumar. (28 January, 2012). Khap Panchayats: A Socio-Historical Overview. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 59–64.
2. Arumugam Servai vs. State of Tamil Nadu, Criminal Appeal No. 958 and 959 of 2011 (Arising out of SLP (Criminal) No. 8084 and 8428 of 2009).
3. Azerbaijan: Relentless Crackdown on Opposition Halt Abuses, Ensure Due Process, Investigate Ill-Treatment” (2020). Human Rights Watch.
<https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/08/19/azerbaijan-relentless-crackdown-opposition>.
4. Charles I. Lugosi. (2004). Mocking the Rule of Law: A Kangaroo Court for Australian David Hicks. *Temp. Pol. & Civ. Rts. L. Rev.*, 14, 335.
5. Charusheel Tripathi. (2017). Women and Community: A Case Study of Khap Panchayats In Haryana, *IJRSSH*, Vol. 7, Issue II, Apr–Jun. E-ISSN: 2249-4642, P-ISSN: 2454-4671.
6. Clarkson, Mark. (2020). Reflections on Appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States: Applying the Lessons learned in Australian 'Kangaroo Courts'.
7. The Constitution of India, 1950.
8. International Bar Association. (2009). Justice versus the Rule of Law. IBA guides and reports. <https://www.ibanet.org/resources>.
9. International Commission of Jurists (ICJ). (2002). Fair Trial Manual. https://www.icj.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/03/trial_observation_manual_1_28_06_2002.pdf
10. Jeff Wallenfeldt. "Salem witch trials". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, (31 Jul. 2025).
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Salem-witch-trials>.
11. Joy Makhal. (2023). ‘Bulldozer Justice’: An Analysis Into The Rule Of Law In India, *IJLLR*, Vol. V, Issue I, ISSN: 2582-8878.

12. Kalindi Kokal. (13 December, 2014). To Lead or To Follow? Supreme Court and Community 'Justice'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 49, No. 50, pp. 19–21.
13. Kaufman, L. (1982). Making the Most of Kangaroo Court. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 39(4), 377–382. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42575642>.
14. Manderson, D. (2012). *Kangaroo Courts and the Rule of Law: The Legacy of Modernism* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203123638>.
15. Mehmet, M., & Simmons, P. (2016). Kangaroo Court? An Analysis of Social Media Justifications for Attitudes to Culling. *Environmental Communication*, 12(3), 370–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2016.1220966>.
16. Patricio Navia. (2008). Pinochet: The Father of Contemporary Chile. *Latin America Research Review*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 250–258.
17. Potter, Parker B. Jr. (2006). Antipodal Invective: A Field Guide to Kangaroos in American Courtrooms. *Akron Law Review*, Vol. 39, Iss. 1, Article 4. <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/akronlawreview/vol39/iss1/4>.
18. Reuter, P., & Truman, E. M. (2004). Chasing Dirty Money: The Fight Against Money Laundering. *Peterson Institute for International Economics*, p. 118.
19. Shao-Chuan Leng. (1977). The Role of Law in the People's Republic of China as Reflecting Mao Tse-Tung's Influence. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 356–373.
20. The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. "Great Purge". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 7 Aug. 2025. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Great-Purge>.
21. The Nuremberg Trial and the Tokyo War Crimes Trials (1945–1948).