BLOGS

Detailed Notes on Sovereign Immunity and the Tortious Liability of State

Ruchika Mohapatra · 17 Sep 2024

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction What is Sovereign Immunity? Absolute vs. Qualified Sovereign Immunity Tortious Liability of the State Types of Tortious Liability Landmark Cases on Tortious Liability of State Conclusion

Introduction

Tortious liability of the state refers to the legal responsibility of the government or state entities for wrongful acts that cause harm to individuals or their property. Unlike criminal liability, which involves offenses against the state, tortious liability focuses on civil wrongs and the compensation of victims.

In many legal systems, the state enjoys certain immunities, but exceptions exist where citizens can seek redress for injuries caused by the state's actions. In this post, we will discuss Tortious Liability of the state and the immunity of the state in certain situations.

What is Sovereign Immunity?

Sovereign immunity is a legal doctrine that historically shielded the government or sovereign entity from being sued without its consent. This principle originated from the notion that the king

or sovereign authority should not be subjected to the jurisdiction of its own courts. While sovereign immunity has ancient roots, its application has evolved over time, and many legal systems have modified or waived it to a certain extent.

Absolute vs. Qualified Sovereign Immunity:

- Absolute Immunity: Historically, sovereign immunity was absolute, providing broad protection against lawsuits. This meant that the state could not be sued without its consent, regardless of the nature of the claim.
- Qualified Immunity: In contemporary legal systems, many jurisdictions have moved towards qualified immunity. This means that while the state retains a level of protection, it can be sued in specific circumstances or for certain types of claims. Qualified immunity is often subject to statutory provisions and limitations.

Tortious Liability of the State

The concept of state tort liability has evolved over time. Traditionally, the state enjoyed sovereign immunity, which shielded it from civil suits. However, as societies developed and notions of accountability and justice advanced, exceptions to sovereign immunity were introduced, allowing citizens to hold the state accountable for certain wrongful acts.

Tortious liability of the state refers to the legal responsibility of the government or state entities for civil wrongs, or torts, committed by their agents or representatives. This liability allows individuals to seek compensation when they suffer harm, injury, or property damage due to the negligent or intentional actions of the state or its employees.

Historically, India adhered to the doctrine of sovereign immunity, but this has been significantly modified. The government can be sued for its actions in areas where it has expressly waived immunity, such as contract disputes or certain tortious claims.

Article 300 of the Indian Constitution provides that the Government of India and the governments of the states may sue or be sued by the name of the Union of India and the States, respectively. This lays the foundation for the state's liability in civil cases.

Types of Tortious Liability

Tortious liability encompasses a variety of civil wrongs, or torts, for which an individual or entity can be held legally responsible. Here are some common types of tortious liability of state

1. Negligence:

Definition: The state can be held liable for negligence when its actions or inactions fall below the standard of care, resulting in harm to individuals or property.

Example: Failure to maintain public infrastructure leading to accidents.

2. Nuisance:

Definition: State activities that cause unreasonable interference with an individual's use and enjoyment of their property may lead to liability for nuisance.

Example: Government construction projects causing excessive noise or pollution.

3. Defamation:

Definition: The state can be held liable for making false statements that harm the reputation of individuals or entities.

Example: Government officials making false statements about a private citizen.

4. Assault and Battery:

Definition: Liability may arise if state employees engage in intentional harmful actions, such as assault or battery.

Example: Excessive use of force by law enforcement officers.

5. False Imprisonment:

Definition: The state may be liable for wrongfully restraining the freedom of an individual.

Example: Unlawful arrest or detention by government agents.

6. Breach of Statutory Duty:

Definition: Liability may arise when the state breaches a duty imposed by statute, leading to harm.

Example: Failure to comply with safety regulations, resulting in injuries.

7. Environmental Tort:

Definition: Liability for harm caused by the state's actions that result in environmental pollution or degradation.

Example: Improper disposal of toxic waste by a government agency.

Landmark Cases on Tortious Liability of State

The ***Nilabati Behera v. State of Orissa*** case is a landmark judgment in Indian legal history that addressed issues related to custodial deaths and the liability of the state for violations of fundamental rights. The case gained significance for establishing the right to compensation for victims of custodial violence or their legal heirs.

he primary legal issue in this case was whether the state could be held liable for the custodial death of an individual. Nilabati Behera argued that her son's fundamental rights under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution were violated, and sought compensation from the state for its failure to protect those rights.

The court held that the state is vicariously liable for the actions of its employees, including the police. It stated that custodial violence is a serious violation of human rights, and the state cannot plead sovereign immunity for such actions.

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India is a landmark case in Indian environmental law that played a crucial role in shaping the legal framework for environmental protection. The case involved issues related to the operation of industries in and around the Taj Trapezium Zone, an ecologically sensitive area near the Taj Mahal in Agra.

The primary legal issues in the case included the protection of the environment and the cultural heritage of the Taj Mahal. M.C. Mehta argued that the operation of industries within the TTZ was leading to air pollution and posed a threat to the preservation of the monument.

The court emphasized the application of the public trust doctrine, asserting that natural resources, including the environment, are held in trust by the state for the benefit of the public, and the state is obligated to protect these resources.

State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati is a landmark judgment that laid the foundation for the doctrine of sovereign immunity in India. It involved a fatal accident caused by a government-owned bus in the state of Rajasthan. The primary legal issue was whether the State could be sued for tortious acts committed by its servants while performing governmental functions. The State

argued that it was immune from such lawsuits, relying on the principle of sovereign immunity.

The Court held that the State is immune when its employees act in the discharge of sovereign functions. Sovereign functions were broadly defined to include activities that are essential for the normal functioning of the government, such as maintenance of law and order and administration of justice.

The Court clarified that the State could be vicariously liable for the acts of its servants in certain situations, especially when they are acting in the course of their employment.

The case of ***Kasturi Lal Ralia Ram Jain v. State of Uttar Pradesh*** is a significant case in India that deals with the concept of sovereign immunity in the context of governmental functions.

The primary legal issue was whether the State could be held liable for the tortious acts committed by its employees while engaged in governmental functions. The State argued that it was immune from such liability based on the principle of sovereign immunity.

The Court clarified that the State could be vicariously liable for the acts of its employees if those acts are committed in the course of their employment and in the discharge of governmental functions.

Conclusion

Tortious liability of the state represents a crucial aspect of government accountability, balancing the rights of individuals with the need to protect the state's ability to function effectively. Legal frameworks continue to evolve to address the complexities of holding the state accountable for its actions.