

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

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

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

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

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

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

ABOUT US

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

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

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

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines.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

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

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

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

“THE ROLE OF JUDICIARY IN THE TRIAL AND SENTENCING OF ORGANISED CRIME: CHALLENGES AND EVOLVING STANDARDS”

AUTHORED BY - SHAMILI A

I. Abstract

Organised crime constitutes one of the most significant challenges confronting contemporary criminal justice systems worldwide. The expansion of criminal syndicates involved in activities such as drug trafficking, human trafficking, money laundering, cybercrime, extortion, terrorism financing, and transnational smuggling has increasingly threatened public security, economic stability, and the rule of law. These criminal networks operate through highly structured and sophisticated mechanisms that often transcend national boundaries, employ violence and intimidation, exploit technological advancements, infiltrate legitimate institutions, and undermine democratic governance through corruption and unlawful influence.

In combating organised crime, the judiciary occupies a central position within the criminal justice framework. Courts are entrusted not only with adjudicating complex criminal prosecutions but also with ensuring that the administration of justice remains consistent with constitutional guarantees, human rights principles, and the rule of law. The judicial process in organised crime cases presents unique and multifaceted challenges. These include witness intimidation and retaliation, difficulties in securing reliable evidence, the use of encrypted communication technologies by criminal groups, cross-border jurisdictional issues, prolonged investigations, and the need to balance effective law enforcement with the protection of individual liberties and procedural safeguards.

The increasing sophistication of organised criminal enterprises has prompted significant developments in judicial approaches to trial management, evidentiary assessment, witness protection mechanisms, and sentencing practices.

This article critically examines the evolving role of the judiciary in the trial and sentencing of organised crime offenders. It analyses the procedural, evidentiary, and constitutional

challenges faced by courts, evaluates contemporary judicial responses to organised criminal activity, and explores emerging sentencing standards adopted in various jurisdictions. The article further assesses the effectiveness of existing legal frameworks and proposes measures to strengthen judicial capacity while preserving the fundamental principles of justice and due process.

Through a doctrinal and comparative analysis, the study highlights the judiciary's indispensable role in maintaining the delicate balance between public security and the protection of individual rights in the fight against organised crime.

Keywords: Organised Crime, Judiciary, Criminal Justice System, Criminal Networks, Sentencing Standards, Due Process, Witness Protection, Judicial Independence, Rule of Law, Transnational Crime.

II. Introduction

Organised crime is one of the most serious challenges to modern criminal justice systems and democratic governance. Unlike ordinary crime, it involves structured groups that engage in continuous illegal activities for financial gain through violence, intimidation, corruption, and secrecy. With globalisation and technological advancements, organised criminal networks now operate across borders, engaging in offences such as drug trafficking, human trafficking, cybercrime, money laundering, arms smuggling, and terrorism financing.¹

The transnational nature of organised crime creates significant challenges for law enforcement and legal institutions. Criminal groups exploit differences in legal systems, weak regulations, encrypted communications, cryptocurrencies, and complex financial structures to evade detection and prosecution.²

In response, governments have enacted specialised laws and strengthened international cooperation through instruments such as the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC).³ Within this framework, the judiciary plays a crucial role in combating organised crime while upholding the rule of law. Courts must ensure fair trials, protect fundamental rights,

maintain public confidence while addressing complex issues such as conspiracy, electronic

evidence, witness protection, surveillance, asset forfeiture, and international cooperation.⁴

Organised crime trials often involve witness intimidation, corruption, multiple accused persons, and extensive evidence, requiring specialised judicial expertise and procedural safeguards.⁵

As organised crime has evolved, judicial standards for trials and sentencing have become more stringent. Courts increasingly recognise the serious social and economic harm caused by organised criminal enterprises while emphasising that anti-organised crime measures must remain consistent with constitutional protections and due process guarantees.⁶ Thus, the judiciary serves as a vital institution in balancing public security with individual rights and reinforcing the rule of law.

III. The Nature and Scope of Organised Crime

A. Definition and Legal Framework

The concept of organised crime has evolved significantly in recent decades. In India, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, introduced the first statutory definition of organised crime under Section 111, which defines it as any continuing unlawful activity including kidnapping, robbery, vehicle theft, extortion, land grabbing, contract killing, economic offence, cyber-crimes, trafficking of persons, drugs, weapons or illicit goods or services, human trafficking for prostitution or ransom, by any person or a group of persons acting in concert, singly or jointly, either as a member of an organized crime syndicate or on behalf of such syndicate, by use of violence, threat of violence, intimidation, coercion, or by any other unlawful means to obtain direct or indirect material benefit including a financial benefit.⁷

For an activity to qualify as organised crime, five elements must be present: (1) commission of enlisted offences; (2) involvement of an organised crime syndicate; (3) the activity must be "continuing unlawful"; (4) use of violence, intimidation, or coercion; and (5) derivation of direct or indirect material benefit.⁸

B. Transnational Dimensions

Organised crime increasingly operates across national boundaries, exploiting differences in legal systems, enforcement capacity, and jurisdictions.⁹ Transnational criminal organisations such as the Sinaloa and Jalisco cartels demonstrate how criminal networks leverage global instability and technological advancements to expand their operations.¹⁰ This transnational

character complicates prosecution, as it requires international cooperation, evidence sharing, and coordination among multiple judicial systems.¹¹

IV. The Judiciary's Critical Role

A. Ensuring Effective Prosecution

The judiciary serves as the final gatekeeper in the criminal justice process, determining whether evidence meets the threshold for conviction and whether procedural safeguards have been respected.¹²

Judges must navigate complex evidentiary issues, including the admissibility of intercepted communications, financial records, [i]and testimony from protected witnesses.^{13 14}

B. Safeguarding Constitutional Rights and Due Process

The Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, adopted by the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in 1985, establish that the independence of the judiciary shall be guaranteed by the State and enshrined in the Constitution or the law of the country.¹⁵ It is the duty of all governmental and other institutions to respect and observe the independence of the judiciary.¹⁶

Furthermore, Principle 2 mandates that the judiciary shall decide matters before them impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any restrictions, improper influences, inducements, pressures, threats or interferences, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason. These principles are particularly critical in organised crime cases, where political pressure, public outrage, and national security concerns may tempt the executive to undermine judicial independence. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause in the United States, for example, protects criminal defendants against practices that violate "fundamental fairness," even if they do not violate specific guarantees of the Bill of Rights.

V. The Judicial Role in Organised Crime Trials

A. Ensuring Fair Trial Rights

The judiciary plays a crucial role in organised crime prosecutions by ensuring that efforts to punish serious offences such as violence, corruption, drug trafficking, extortion, and money laundering do not compromise constitutional rights. Courts must guarantee a fair and impartial trial for every accused person, regardless of the seriousness of the allegations.¹⁷

The right to a fair trial includes key safeguards such as the presumption of innocence, access

to legal representation, protection against arbitrary detention, and the opportunity to challenge prosecution evidence.¹⁸ Courts must balance public security with individual rights, ensuring that organised crime prosecutions comply with constitutional and legal standards.¹⁹ By upholding these safeguards, the judiciary strengthens the legitimacy of convictions and public confidence in the justice system.²⁰

B. Scrutiny of Evidence

Investigations often involve electronic surveillance, intercepted communications, financial records, forensic accounting reports, digital data recovered from electronic devices, undercover operations, and testimony provided by accomplices or confidential informants.²¹ The admissibility and reliability of such evidence require rigorous judicial examination. Courts must determine whether investigative methods complied with statutory requirements and constitutional limitations, particularly where privacy interests or procedural rights are implicated.²²

Evidence obtained through illegal searches, unauthorized surveillance, coercive questioning, or other due process violations can jeopardize the fairness of a trial and weaken the integrity of the justice system.²³ Judges must also carefully assess testimony from cooperating offenders, as it may be influenced by plea bargains, immunity, or expectations of reduced punishment. Although such evidence can assist in organised crime cases, it should be supported by independent corroboration to minimize the risk of wrongful convictions.²⁴ Therefore, rigorous scrutiny of evidence is essential to ensure that convictions rest on reliable and lawfully obtained proof.

C. Protection of Witnesses

Witness intimidation poses a serious obstacle to the prosecution of organised crime, as criminal groups may use threats, coercion, or violence to discourage individuals from providing evidence.²⁵ To ensure witness safety and encourage cooperation, courts may permit measures such as anonymous testimony, video-link appearances, closed hearings in exceptional cases, and witness protection programs.²⁶

At the same time, judges must carefully balance witness security with the accused's right to challenge evidence and present a defence.²⁷ This balance is essential for maintaining both effective prosecutions and the fairness of criminal proceedings

D. Managing Complex Proceedings

Organised crime prosecutions frequently involve multiple defendants, extensive documentary evidence, sophisticated financial transactions, and investigations extending across several jurisdictions.

Organised crime cases are often complex and resource-intensive, involving multiple defendants, extensive evidence, and lengthy proceedings.²⁸ Judges play a vital role in managing these trials by coordinating charges, establishing procedural timelines, overseeing disclosure requirements, and resolving evidentiary disputes.²⁹ Effective case management helps prevent unnecessary delays and ensures that proceedings remain efficient.

At the same time, courts must safeguard the rights of all parties and ensure that efficiency does not come at the expense of fairness. Through active and impartial supervision, the judiciary enhances both the effectiveness and legitimacy of organised crime prosecutions.³⁰

VI. Unique Challenges in the Trial of Organised Crime Offenders

A. Witness Intimidation and Protection

Witness intimidation remains one of the most formidable obstacles in the successful prosecution of organised crime. Criminal organisations frequently rely on threats, violence, coercion, and economic pressure to discourage witnesses from cooperating with law enforcement agencies or providing truthful testimony before courts.³¹ Recognising these dangers, several jurisdictions have developed witness protection mechanisms designed to safeguard individuals who assist criminal investigations. In India, the Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, was approved by the Supreme Court and continues to operate as an important framework for protecting vulnerable witnesses.³²

Although witness protection measures are essential, their implementation often faces challenges such as limited resources, administrative difficulties, and the need for long-term security. Courts must therefore balance the protection of witnesses with the accused's right to a fair trial. Protective measures should safeguard witnesses from intimidation while ensuring that procedural fairness and the opportunity to challenge evidence are preserved.

B. Evidentiary Complexities

Organised crime prosecutions frequently involve complex evidentiary issues that distinguish them from conventional criminal proceedings. Criminal networks often operate through sophisticated hierarchies, shell entities, intermediaries, and covert communication systems

designed to conceal the involvement of senior members in unlawful activities. As a result, direct evidence linking organisational leaders to specific criminal acts is often unavailable. To establish criminal liability, prosecutors increasingly rely upon electronic surveillance, financial records, forensic accounting, digital evidence, and expert testimony. The evaluation of such evidence requires courts to engage with highly technical materials while ensuring compliance with established rules of admissibility and reliability.³³

C. Transnational Criminal Operations

Modern organised crime often operates across national borders, involving activities such as drug trafficking, money laundering, cybercrime, and human trafficking.³⁴

As a result, investigations frequently depend on evidence and cooperation from foreign jurisdictions. International mechanisms such as mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) and extradition agreements facilitate this cooperation, but their effectiveness can be limited by procedural delays, differing legal standards, and jurisdictional challenges.³⁵

D. Balancing National Security and Individual Liberties

Organised crime occasionally intersects with broader national security concerns, particularly where criminal groups maintain links with terrorist organisations, insurgent movements, or activities that threaten public order and state stability.³⁶ In response, governments may adopt enhanced investigative powers, preventive detention measures, and specialised prosecutorial procedures intended to address heightened security risks.

The judiciary plays a critical role in supervising the exercise of such powers. Courts must ensure that measures adopted in the name of security remain consistent with constitutional guarantees, human rights obligations, and principles of due process. While effective law enforcement is essential to combating organised crime, judicial oversight is necessary to prevent excessive restrictions on personal liberty and to safeguard the rule of law.³⁷

VII. Emerging Sentencing Standards

A. Principles of Sentencing

Common principles relied upon in making sentencing decisions include proportionality, deterrence, rehabilitation, incapacitation, and reparation. These principles express the purpose and objectives of criminal sentencing. The deterrence aims to prevent crime through the example of offenders being punished, including general deterrence (general population) and specific deterrence (particular offender).³⁸

Rehabilitation views criminal behaviour as the product of shortcomings that can be overcome to prevent future crimes.³⁹ Incapacitation prevents future crime by physically restraining the offender, primarily through incarceration.⁴⁰

The principle of proportionality is explicitly recognised in Article 11 of the UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, which mandates that offences be "liable to sanctions that take into account the gravity of that offence."

B. Sentencing Enhancements and Minimum Sentences

Many jurisdictions have established special sentencing options for organised crime cases due to the ongoing and serious nature of these crimes. Minimum sentences are often gauged according to the weight or value of contraband (e.g., drugs trafficked) to ensure that high-volume traffickers do not escape serious penalties.⁴¹

Enhanced punishments account for the systematic nature of organised crime. Many jurisdictions provide increased sentences for repeat offenders, including "three strikes" laws that punish habitual criminals severely upon their third conviction, sometimes permitting enhanced sentences up to life imprisonment.⁴²

Some jurisdictions have special punishment provisions reserved for organised crime cases, including longer sentences, larger fines, and asset confiscation or forfeiture. Offenders in organised crime cases are thus subject to both minimum sentences and sentence enhancements due to the seriousness of organised crime activity.⁴³

C. Confiscation of Criminal Assets

The Organised Crime Convention, in Article 14, encourages countries to use confiscated assets to give compensation to victims of crime.⁴⁴ Confiscation serves multiple purposes: it deprives criminal organisations of their financial resources, deters future criminal activity, and provides restitution to victims.

VIII. Constitutional Concerns and Legal Challenges

A. Double Jeopardy and Retrospective Application

Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita raises concerns about the legal principle of double jeopardy. The section allows authorities a ten-year window to file charge-sheets for continuing unlawful activities, potentially leading to multiple prosecutions under different statutes for the same conduct, conflicting with Article 20(2) of the Indian Constitution, which protects against double jeopardy (*nemo debet bis vexari*).⁴⁵

B. Judicial Review and Constitutional Safeguards

The landmark case of *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar* emphasised the importance of clear legal standards to avoid arbitrary enforcement.⁴⁶ Legal practitioners may challenge broad organised crime provisions by arguing that they violate the principle of "nullum crimen, nulla poena sine lege" (no crime, no punishment without law), which prohibits retroactive criminalization.⁴⁷

IX. Indian Perspective

India has established a strong legal framework to combat organised crime through various statutes. The **Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999 (MCOCA)** was one of the earliest laws specifically targeting organised criminal syndicates by providing enhanced investigative powers and stricter penalties.⁴⁸

At the national level, laws such as the **Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA)** and the **Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA)** address terrorism, unlawful associations, and the laundering of criminal proceeds, strengthening the ability of enforcement agencies to tackle complex criminal networks.⁴⁹

A major reform came with the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)**, which introduced a nationwide definition of organised crime under Section 111 and prescribed penalties for related offences. The **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** further modernised criminal procedures and investigative processes.⁵⁰ The judiciary plays a crucial role in ensuring that anti-organised crime measures comply with constitutional principles. Courts have repeatedly stressed that effective enforcement must be balanced with the protection of individual rights and procedural safeguards.⁵¹ Through judicial review, Indian courts continue to prevent misuse of special criminal laws while maintaining a balance between public security, the rule of law, and fundamental rights.⁵²

X. Conclusion

The judiciary plays a central role in ensuring an effective response to organised crime while preserving the fundamental principles of justice. As organised criminal groups become more sophisticated and technologically advanced, courts are increasingly required to address complex evidentiary issues, protect vulnerable witnesses, and oversee lengthy and multifaceted prosecutions. These challenges demand judicial independence, expertise, and careful

adherence to due process.

In the sentencing phase, courts seek not only to punish offenders but also to deter future criminal activity and disrupt the economic foundations of organised crime through measures such as enhanced penalties and asset confiscation. However, the objective of combating organised crime cannot override constitutional guarantees and human rights protections.

The continued evolution of organised crime necessitates corresponding developments in judicial practices and legal standards. A criminal justice system that effectively balances rigorous enforcement with fairness, accountability, and respect for the rule of law remains essential for protecting society and maintaining public confidence in democratic institutions.

Reference

Primary Sources

International sources

- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 14, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.
- United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, Nov. 15, 2000, 2225 U.N.T.S. 209.
- Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms art. 6, Nov. 4, 1950, 213 U.N.T.S. 221.
- Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, U.N. Doc. A/CONF.121/22/Rev.1 (Sept. 6, 1985).

Indian Legislation

- Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, No. 45 of 2023 (India).
- Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, No. 46 of 2023 (India).
- Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, No. 30 of 1999 (India).
- Prevention of Money Laundering Act, No. 15 of 2003 (India).
- Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, No. 37 of 1967 (India).
- Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, Gazette of India, Dec. 5, 2018.
- Constitutional Provisions

- INDIA CONST. art. 20.

Cases (India)

- Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer, (2014) 10 S.C.C. 473.
- Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab, (1994) 3 S.C.C. 569.
- Mahender Chawla v. Union of India, (2019) 14 S.C.C. 615.
- Maqbool Hussain v. State of Bombay, A.I.R. 1953 S.C. 325.
- Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248.
- Rattan Lal v. State of Punjab, A.I.R. 1965 S.C. 444.

Cases (Foreign)

- In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358 (1970).
- Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961).
- Doorson v. Netherlands, 1996-II Eur. Ct. H.R. 446.
- Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514 (1972).

Secondary Sources

Books

- Jay S. Albanese, *Organized Crime in Our Times* (10th ed. 2023).
- Neil Boister, *An Introduction to Transnational Criminal Law* (2d ed. 2018).
- Mirjan R. Damaška, *The Faces of Justice and State Authority* (1986).
- K.I. Vibhute & P.S.A. Pillai, *Criminal Law* (15th ed. 2024).

Journal Articles

- Andrew Ashworth, *Responsibilities, Rights and Restorative Justice*, 42 *Brit. J. Criminology* 578 (2002).
- Mirjan R. Damaška, *Evidentiary Barriers to Conviction and Two Models of Criminal Procedure: A Comparative Study*, 121 *U. Pa. L. Rev.* 506 (1973).
- David P. Stewart, *Internationalizing the Admissibility of Electronic Evidence*, 41 *Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev.* 455 (2009).
- Stephen S. Trott, *Words of Warning for Prosecutors Using Criminals as Witnesses*, 47 *Hastings L.J.* 1381 (1996).

Reports and Institutional Publications

- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Legislative Guides for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (2004).
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime (2008).

¹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *The Globalization of Crime: A Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment* 25–31 (2010).

² Europol, *Internet Organised Crime Threat Assessment (IOCTA) 2024* 12–18 (2024).

³ United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime art. 2, Nov. 15, 2000, 2225 U.N.T.S. 209.

⁴ Mirjan R. Damaška, *The Faces of Justice and State Authority* 121–25 (1986).

⁵ Jay S. Albanese, *Organized Crime in Our Times* 179–87 (10th ed. 2023).

⁶ Council of Europe, *Criminal Law Convention on Corruption* pmbl., Jan. 27, 1999, E.T.S. No. 173; see also *R v. Smith*, [2011] UKSC 37, [2012] 1 A.C. 144 (discussing sentencing principles in serious organised crime cases).

⁷ *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, No. 45 of 2023, § 111 (India).

⁸ *Id.*; K.I. Vibhute & P.S.A. Pillai, *Criminal Law* 1005–08 (15th ed. 2024) (discussing the essential ingredients of organised crime under Indian criminal law).

⁹ United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime art. 3, Nov. 15, 2000, 2225 U.N.T.S. 209 [hereinafter UNTOC].

¹⁰ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Global Report on Cocaine 2023* 45–50 (2023); ¹¹ U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, *National Drug Threat Assessment 2024* 26–34 (2024).

¹¹ UNTOC, *supra* note 13, arts. 16–20; Neil Boister, *An Introduction to Transnational Criminal Law* 25–38 (2d ed. 2018).

¹² UNTOC, *supra* note 13, arts. 16–20; Neil Boister, *An Introduction to Transnational Criminal Law* 25–38 (2d ed. 2018).

¹³ Mirjan R. Damaška, *Evidentiary Barriers to Conviction and Two Models of Criminal Procedure: A Comparative Study*, 121 U. Pa. L. Rev. 506, 507–10 (1973).

¹⁴ David P. Stewart, *Internationalizing the Admissibility of Electronic Evidence*, 41 *Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev.* 455, 459–64 (2009).

¹⁵ Stephen S. Trott, *Words of Warning for Prosecutors Using Criminals as Witnesses*, 47 *Hastings L.J.* 1381, 1384–89 (1996).

¹⁶ Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, *Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary* princ. 1, U.N. Doc. A/CONF.121/22/Rev.1 (Sept. 6, 1985).

¹⁷ See *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 363–64 (1970).

¹⁸ *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* art. 14, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

¹⁹ *Salabiaku v. France*, 141-A Eur. Ct. H.R. (ser. A) at 15–16 (1988).

²⁰ *A v. United Kingdom*, 2009-II Eur. Ct. H.R. 137, 178–79.

²¹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Legislative Guides for the Implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime* 267–70 (2004).

²² *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 353–57 (1967).

²³ *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 655–57 (1961).

²⁴ *On Lee v. United States*, 343 U.S. 747, 757–58 (1952).

²⁵ United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime art. 24, Nov. 15, 2000, 2225 U.N.T.S. 209.

²⁶ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* 15–28 (2008).

²⁷ *Doorson v. Netherlands*, 1996-II Eur. Ct. H.R. 446, 470–72.

²⁸ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Digest of Organized Crime Cases* 7–10 (2012).

²⁹ *Barker v. Wingo*, 407 U.S. 514, 530–33 (1972).

³⁰ *H. v. France*, 162-A Eur. Ct. H.R. (ser. A) at 20–21 (1989).

³¹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal*

Proceedings Involving Organized Crime 5–8 (2008).

³² Mahender Chawla v. Union of India, (2019) 14 S.C.C. 615; Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, Gazette of India, Dec. 5, 2018.

³³ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, G.A. Res. 55/25, annex I, art. 2(a) (Nov. 15, 2000).

³⁴ Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993); Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer, (2014) 10 S.C.C. 473.

³⁵ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, supra note 26, arts. 18–20.

³⁶ Neil Boister, *An Introduction to Transnational Criminal Law* 233–45 (2d ed. 2018).

³⁷ United Nations Security Council Res. 2482, U.N. Doc. S/RES/2482 (July 19, 2019).

³⁸ Andrew von Hirsch, *Censure and Sanctions* 13–21 (1993).

³⁹ Francis T. Cullen & Cheryl Lero Jonson, *Rehabilitation and Treatment Programs*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* 1, 7–10 (Alison Liebling et al. eds., 7th ed. 2023).

⁴⁰ Michael Tonry, *Sentencing Matters* 38–42 (1996).

⁴¹ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime art. 11, Nov. 15, 2000, 2225 U.N.T.S. 209.

⁴² Ernesto U. Savona & Michele Riccardo, *From Illegal Markets to Legitimate Businesses: The Portfolio of Organised Crime in Europe* 89–95 (2015).

⁴³ Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-322, § 70001, 108 Stat. 1796, 1982–83 (codified as amended at 18 U.S.C. § 3559(c)).

⁴⁴ Council of Europe, *Criminal Assets Recovery and Organised Crime* 21–27 (2014).

⁴⁵ INDIA CONST. art. 20, cl. 2; see also *Maqbool Hussain v. State of Bombay*, A.I.R. 1953 S.C. 325 (India).

⁴⁶ *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar*, A.I.R. 1962 S.C. 955 (India).

⁴⁷ See *Rattan Lal v. State of Punjab*, A.I.R. 1965 S.C. 444 (India) (discussing the principle against retrospective criminal punishment); INDIA CONST. art. 20, cl. 1.

⁴⁸ Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, No. 30 of 1999, §§ 2–3 (India).

⁴⁹ Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, No. 37 of 1967 (India); Prevention of Money Laundering Act, No. 15 of 2003 (India).

⁵⁰ Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, No. 45 of 2023, § 111 (India).

⁵¹ *Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union of India*, 2022 S.C.C. OnLine S.C. 929, ¶¶ 449–467 (India).

⁵² *Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab*, (1994) 3 S.C.C. 569, ¶¶ 352–355 (India); *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248, ¶ 56 (India)

