
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

CRYPTOCURRENCY REGULATION IN INDIA: A CRITICAL STUDY

- Mr. Jai Kishan Mishra¹, Ms. Sneha Tiwari² & Mr. Mahmood Ahmad³

ABSTRACT

Cryptocurrency has emerged as a transformative innovation in the global financial system, redefining the manner in which value is created and transferred. Originating with Bitcoin, these digital assets operate on decentralized blockchain technology without reliance on central authorities. While cryptocurrencies offer benefits such as efficiency, transparency, and accessibility, they also pose significant legal and regulatory challenges due to their volatility, anonymity, and borderless nature.

This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of cryptocurrency regulation across major jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union and India. It examines the fragmented regulatory framework of the United States, the comprehensive Market in Crypto Assets (hereinafter referred to as MiCA) regime in the European Union, and India's evolving and ambiguous regulatory stance. The study highlights how differing national priorities have led to diverse regulatory responses.

Further, the paper analyzes the role of international bodies such as the Financial Action Task Force in promoting global standards, particularly in anti-money laundering compliance. It concludes that a balanced, adaptive, and internationally coordinated regulatory framework is essential to ensure innovation, financial stability, and effective governance of cryptocurrency systems.

¹Assistant professor, School of Legal Studies, B.B.D. University, Lucknow.

²Research Scholar, Department of Law, M.S.D.U. Azamgarh.

³Research Scholar, Department of Law, C.M.P. Degree College, Prayagraj.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of cryptocurrency represents a transformative development in the evolution of modern financial systems. Built upon blockchain technology, cryptocurrency operates on a decentralized network that eliminates the need for traditional intermediaries such as banks and financial institutions. The introduction of Bitcoin in 2009 challenged conventional notions of currency and initiated a broader shift in how value is created, stored, and transferred in the digital era. Over time, numerous digital currencies have been developed and evolved, offering functionalities ranging from end-to-end transactions to complex smart contract execution.

In the context of globalization and technological advancement, cryptocurrencies have gained significant importance due to their accessibility, transparency, and potential for high returns. India, with its rapidly expanding digital infrastructure and increasing internet access, has emerged as a prominent market for cryptocurrency adoption. A large number of Indian investors and traders actively participate in crypto markets, while startups continue to explore blockchain-based innovations across sectors such as finance, healthcare, and governance.⁴

Despite this rapid growth, the legal status of cryptocurrency in India remains ambiguous. Cryptocurrencies are neither recognized as legal tender nor explicitly prohibited, placing them in what is often described as a “regulatory grey area.”⁵ This ambiguity creates significant challenges for regulators, investors, and businesses. While innovation and economic growth must be encouraged, concerns relating to financial stability, consumer protection, and national security cannot be ignored.

The Indian regulatory approach toward cryptocurrency has been cautious and evolving. The Reserve Bank of India has repeatedly expressed concerns about risks such as volatile nature, lack of intrinsic value, and potential misuse for illegal activities⁶. These concerns culminated in the 2018 circular issued by the RBI, which restricted financial institutions from providing services to cryptocurrency-related entities. However, this measure was challenged before the Supreme Court of India, which, in *Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India*, struck

⁴Nishith Desai Associates, “*Cryptocurrency in India: Regulatory Framework and Challenges*” (2023).

⁵Avinash Shekhar, “Legal Status of Cryptocurrencies in India,” (2022) 5 *Indian Journal of Law and Technology* 45.

⁶Reserve Bank of India, *Press Release on Virtual Currencies* (2013, 2017).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

down the circular on the ground of proportionality, thereby restoring the legality of cryptocurrency trading in India.⁷

Following this judicial intervention, the cryptocurrency market in India has experienced rapid expansion. Instead of enacting a comprehensive regulatory framework, the government adopted indirect measures to regulate this sector. The classification of cryptocurrencies as “Virtual Digital Assets” under the Finance Act, 2022, along with the imposition of a 30% tax on financial gains and 1% Tax Deducted at Source (TDS), reflects an attempt to integrate crypto transactions within the formal economy.⁸ Additionally, the inclusion of cryptocurrency transactions under the ambit of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002⁹ indicates a shift towards stricter compliance and monitoring mechanisms.

However, this regulatory approach has resulted in a paradoxical situation. Cryptocurrencies are subject to taxation and compliance requirements, yet they lack formal legal recognition and a unified regulatory framework. This inconsistency raises fundamental questions about the coherence and effectiveness of India’s policy approach. The absence of a dedicated law leads to uncertainty regarding the rights and obligations of stakeholders, the jurisdiction of regulatory authorities, and the enforceability of legal remedies.

Furthermore, the decentralized and borderless nature of cryptocurrencies presents unique regulatory challenges. Issues such as cross-border transactions, anonymity, jurisdictional conflicts, and technological complexity make it difficult for traditional legal systems to effectively govern crypto assets. The rapid emergence of new developments such as decentralized finance (DeFi), non-fungible tokens (NFTs), and stablecoins further complicates the regulatory landscape.

In light of these challenges, the regulation of cryptocurrency in India assumes critical importance. A well-defined legal framework is essential not only to protect investors and maintain financial stability but also to promote innovation and ensure India’s competitiveness in

⁷*Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India*, (2020) 10 SCC 274.

⁸THE FINANCE ACT, 2021, ACT NO. 13 OF 2021.

⁹THE PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, ACT No. 15 of 2003

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

the global digital economy. The need of the hour is a balanced and forward-looking regulatory approach that harmonizes technological advancement with legal certainty.

This research paper seeks to examine the existing legal framework governing cryptocurrencies in India, analyze judicial and policy developments, identify key regulatory challenges, and propose a coherent model for effective regulation. By drawing upon comparative international practices, the study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on cryptocurrency regulation and provide practical recommendations for policymakers.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the legal status of cryptocurrencies in India and examine how they are treated under existing financial and regulatory laws.
2. To critically evaluate the role of regulatory authorities such as Reserve Bank of India and Securities and Exchange Board of India in governing cryptocurrency activities.
3. To compare India's regulatory framework with global approaches, such as those adopted by the European Union and the United States.

CRYPTOCURRENCY AND LEGAL REGULATION ACROSS THE GLOBE

The introduction of Bitcoin in 2009 marked the beginning of a new era in financial innovation. Unlike traditional currencies issued by central banks, cryptocurrencies operate on decentralized blockchain networks, enabling peer-to-peer transactions without intermediaries. This technological advancement has disrupted conventional financial systems and introduced new opportunities as well as regulatory challenges.

Globally, cryptocurrencies have gained popularity due to their efficiency, transparency, and potential for high returns. However, their decentralized and borderless nature complicates regulation. Governments face the challenge of balancing innovation with concerns such as financial stability, investor protection, and prevention of illicit activities.¹⁰

¹⁰Satoshi Nakamoto, *Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System* (2008).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

As a result, different countries have adopted varied regulatory approaches, reflecting their economic priorities and risk perceptions. This paper examines these approaches in detail and evaluates their effectiveness.

UNITED STATES: FRAGMENTEDBUT EVOLVING FRAMEWORK

The United States has adopted a multi-agency and function-based regulatory approach towards cryptocurrencies, often described as fragmented yet dynamic. Instead of a single comprehensive statute governing digital assets, regulatory authority is distributed among various federal agencies, each exercising jurisdiction based on the functional characteristics of the cryptocurrency in question. This has resulted in a flexible but complex regulatory environment.

The Securities and Exchange Commission plays a central role in regulating cryptocurrencies that qualify as securities. The determination is primarily based on the application of the **Howey Test**, derived from *SEC v. W.J. Howey Co.*, which assesses whether a transaction constitutes an “investment contract.” If a cryptocurrency or token is found to involve an investment of money in a common enterprise with an expectation of profits derived from the efforts of others, it falls within the regulatory ambit of the SEC. Consequently, Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) and certain token offerings have been subjected to securities laws, requiring registration and disclosure compliance.¹¹

Parallely, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission classifies cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin as commodities under the Commodity Exchange Act.¹² The CFTC primarily regulates derivatives markets, including Bitcoin futures and options, and has enforcement authority over fraud and manipulation in spot markets. This dual classification—where a crypto asset may be treated as a security in one context and a commodity in another—illustrates the complexity of the U.S. regulatory structure.

In addition to financial regulators, the Internal Revenue Service treats cryptocurrencies as property for taxation purposes.¹³ This means that gains from the sale or exchange of crypto assets

¹¹Securities and Exchange Commission, *Report of Investigation Pursuant to Section 21(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934: The DAO* (2017).

¹²Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. McDonnell, 287 F. Supp. 3d 213 (E.D.N.Y. 2018).

¹³Internal Revenue Service, *Notice 2014-21*.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

are subject to capital gains tax, and taxpayers must report transactions accordingly. The classification as property, rather than currency, imposes detailed record-keeping obligations on users and reflects the government's emphasis on revenue collection and compliance.

Further regulatory oversight is exercised by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), which treats cryptocurrency exchanges and wallet providers as "money services businesses" (MSBs).¹⁴ These entities are required to comply with anti-money laundering (AML) and know-your-customer (KYC) obligations under the Bank Secrecy Act. This ensures that cryptocurrency transactions are monitored to prevent illicit activities such as money laundering and terrorist financing.

At the state level, regulatory diversity adds another layer of complexity. Certain states, such as New York, have introduced specific licensing regimes like the "BitLicense," requiring crypto businesses to meet stringent compliance standards.¹⁵ Other states have adopted more lenient approaches, creating a patchwork of regulations across jurisdictions.

Despite its fragmented nature, the U.S. regulatory framework demonstrates adaptability. Regulatory agencies frequently issue guidance, enforcement actions, and interpretative releases to address emerging developments in the crypto ecosystem. However, this case-by-case approach has also been criticized for creating legal uncertainty, particularly for startups and investors who must navigate overlapping and sometimes inconsistent regulations.

Recent policy debates in the United States have emphasized the need for a unified federal framework to provide clarity and promote innovation. Legislative proposals aim to define digital assets more precisely and allocate regulatory authority among agencies more coherently. Until such reforms are enacted, the U.S. model will continue to function as a hybrid system characterized by regulatory overlap, enforcement-driven governance, and gradual evolution.

EUROPEAN UNION: COMPREHENSIVE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The European Union (EU) has emerged as a global leader in cryptocurrency regulation by establishing a harmonized and comprehensive legal framework through the Markets in Crypto-

¹⁴Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, *Guidance on Virtual Currencies* (2013).

¹⁵New York State Department of Financial Services, *BitLicense Regulations* (2015).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

Assets (MiCA) Regulation. Unlike fragmented regulatory models, the EU approach aims to provide legal certainty, promote innovation, and ensure investor protection across all member states.

The MiCA Regulation, adopted by the European Parliament, represents the first attempt at creating a unified regulatory regime for crypto-assets within a major economic bloc.¹⁶ It applies to crypto-assets that are not already covered under existing financial services legislation, thereby filling significant regulatory gaps. The framework introduces a clear classification of crypto-assets into categories such as asset-referenced tokens, e-money tokens, and utility tokens, each subject to specific regulatory requirements.¹⁷

A central feature of the EU framework is the requirement for authorization and licensing of Crypto-Asset Service Providers (CASPs). Entities providing services such as trading, custody, exchange, and advisory must obtain authorization from national competent authorities.¹⁸ Once authorized, these entities benefit from a “passporting” mechanism, allowing them to operate across all EU member states without requiring separate approvals. This significantly enhances market integration and reduces regulatory fragmentation.

The EU framework places strong emphasis on consumer and investor protection. Crypto-asset issuers are required to publish a detailed “white paper” containing essential information about the project, risks, and rights attached to the asset.¹⁹ This disclosure requirement ensures transparency and enables investors to make informed decisions. Additionally, strict rules are imposed to prevent misleading information and fraudulent practices.

Another important aspect of the EU’s regulatory approach is the regulation of stablecoins, particularly asset-referenced tokens and e-money tokens. Given their potential impact on financial stability, issuers of such tokens are subject to enhanced requirements, including capital reserves, governance standards, and supervision by regulatory authorities.²⁰ The European

¹⁶European Parliament, *Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA)*.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, arts. 3–5.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, arts. 53–59.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, arts. 6–15.

²⁰*Id.*, arts. 16–45.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

Central Bank and other financial authorities play a role in overseeing significant stablecoin arrangements to mitigate systemic risks.

The EU has also incorporated provisions to address market abuse and financial integrity. The MiCA framework introduces rules against insider trading, market manipulation, and unlawful disclosure of information in crypto-asset markets, aligning them with traditional financial market regulations.²¹ Furthermore, crypto service providers must comply with anti-money laundering (AML) and counter-terrorism financing (CTF) obligations in line with directives issued by the EU and international bodies such as the Financial Action Task Force.

In addition to MiCA, the EU's broader Digital Finance Package complements cryptocurrency regulation by promoting technological innovation while maintaining regulatory oversight.²² This includes initiatives related to distributed ledger technology (DLT) and regulatory sandboxes, allowing firms to test new financial products in a controlled environment.

The EU model is widely regarded as a balanced regulatory approach that seeks to encourage innovation while safeguarding financial stability and consumer interests. However, challenges remain in implementation, particularly in ensuring consistent enforcement across member states and adapting to rapid technological developments in the crypto ecosystem.

Overall, the European Union's comprehensive legal framework represents a significant advancement in global cryptocurrency regulation. By providing clarity, uniformity, and robust safeguards, it serves as a potential model for other jurisdictions seeking to regulate digital assets effectively.

ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION IN CRYPTOCURRENCY REGULATION

THE NEW FATF RULES FOR CRYPTO EXCHANGE AND CUSTODIANS

The Guidance from FATF addresses the application of a risk-based approach (RBA) to Virtual Asset activities or operations and Virtual Asset Service Providers. The guidance covers a range of topics including: supervision or monitoring of Virtual Asset Service Providers for anti-money

²¹*Id.*, arts. 80–92.

²² European Commission, *Digital Finance Package* (2020).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

laundering and terrorist financing (AML/CFT) purposes; licensing or registration; preventive measures, such as customer due diligence, recordkeeping, and suspicious transaction reporting, among others; sanctions and other enforcement measures; and international co-operation. This updated Guidance expands on the 2015 Virtual Currency Guidance and further explains the application of the risk-based approach to AML/CFT measures for Virtual Assets; identifies the entities that conduct activities or operations relating to Virtual Assets —i.e., Virtual Asset Service Providers; and clarifies the application of the FATF Recommendations to Virtual Assets and Virtual Asset Service Providers.

“Virtual asset” as a digital representation of value that can be digitally traded or transferred and can be used for payment or investment purposes. Virtual assets do not include digital representations of fiat currencies, securities, and other financial assets that are already covered elsewhere in the FATF Recommendations; and “Virtual asset service provider” as any natural or legal person who is not covered elsewhere under the Recommendations and as a business conducts one or more of the following activities or operations for or on behalf of another natural or legal person: - Exchange between virtual assets and fiat currencies; (e.g. Fiat-to-Crypto Exchanges) - Exchange between one or more forms of virtual assets; (e.g. Crypto-to-Crypto Exchanges) - Transfer of virtual assets; and Safekeeping and/or administration of virtual assets or instruments enabling control over virtual assets; (e.g. Crypto Custodians) - Participation in and provision of financial services related to an issuer’s offer and/or sale of a virtual asset. Notably, the scope of the FATF definition includes both Crypto-to-Crypto and Fiat-to-Crypto transactions or financial activities or operations. Depending on their particular financial activities, Virtual Asset Service Providers include Virtual Asset exchanges and transfer services; some Virtual Asset wallet providers, such as those that host wallets or maintain custody or control over another natural or legal person’s Virtual Assets, wallet(s), and/or private key(s); providers of financial services relating to the issuance, offer, or sale of a Virtual Asset (such as in an ICO); and other possible business models.

INDIA: AMBIGUOUS AND EVOLVING FRAMEWORK

India’s regulatory approach toward cryptocurrency can be best described as cautious, fragmented, and continuously evolving. Unlike jurisdictions that have either legalized or banned

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

<https://www.ijalr.in/>

cryptocurrencies outright, India has adopted a middle path-permitting their use while refraining from granting them formal legal status as currency. This has resulted in a regulatory framework characterized by ambiguity and policy inconsistency.

The Reserve Bank of India has historically expressed strong reservations regarding cryptocurrencies, citing concerns such as financial instability, market volatility, and their potential misuse for illicit activities.²³ These concerns culminated in the issuance of a circular in 2018, which prohibited banks and financial institutions from providing services to entities dealing in virtual currencies. This measure significantly disrupted the functioning of cryptocurrency exchanges in India.

However, the regulatory landscape underwent a major shift when the Supreme Court of India, in *Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India*²⁴, struck down the RBI circular on the grounds of proportionality. The Court held that the restriction imposed by the RBI was disproportionate and lacked sufficient empirical evidence of harm. This judgment restored the legality of cryptocurrency trading and marked a turning point in India's crypto regulatory journey.

Following this decision, the Indian government refrained from introducing a comprehensive regulatory statute and instead adopted an indirect regulatory approach. A significant development in this regard was the introduction of taxation provisions under the Finance Act, 2022, which classified cryptocurrencies as Virtual Digital Assets (VDAs).²⁵ Under this regime, income arising from the transfer of VDAs is taxed at a flat rate of 30%, along with a 1% Tax Deducted at Source (TDS) on transactions. This indicates that while cryptocurrencies are not recognized as legal tender, they are acknowledged as taxable assets.

Further, in 2023, the government brought cryptocurrency transactions within the ambit of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, thereby subjecting crypto exchanges and service providers to anti-money laundering (AML) and know-your-customer (KYC) obligations.²⁶ This

²³Reserve Bank of India, *Press Release on Virtual Currencies* (2013, 2017).

²⁴*Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India*, (2020) 10 SCC 274.

²⁵Finance Act, 2022, § 115BBH (India).

²⁶Ministry of Finance, Notification bringing Virtual Digital Assets under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (2023).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

move aligns India with international standards set by the Financial Action Task Force and reflects an effort to curb illicit financial activities involving digital assets.

Despite these developments, the Indian regulatory framework remains fragmented due to the involvement of multiple authorities. While the RBI focuses on monetary stability, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) may potentially regulate crypto-assets if they are classified as securities, and the Income Tax Department governs their taxation. This overlapping jurisdiction creates uncertainty regarding regulatory oversight and enforcement.

Another critical issue is the lack of clear legal classification of cryptocurrencies. They are neither recognized as currency nor explicitly defined as commodities or securities under Indian law. This ambiguity complicates the application of existing legal provisions and creates challenges for dispute resolution and investor protection. Recent judicial observations have, however, begun to treat cryptocurrencies as property, thereby extending certain legal protections to holders.²⁷

The Indian government has also shown interest in developing a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC), often referred to as the digital rupee, as a regulated alternative to private cryptocurrencies. This reflects a broader policy objective of harnessing technological innovation while maintaining state control over monetary systems.

Overall, India's approach represents a hybrid regulatory model—combining elements of permissibility, taxation, and compliance without a comprehensive legislative framework. While this approach allows flexibility and gradual adaptation, it also creates uncertainty for investors, businesses, and regulators. A clear and unified regulatory regime is essential to address these challenges and ensure the sustainable growth of the cryptocurrency ecosystem in India.

CONCLUSION

The regulation of cryptocurrency across the globe reflects a spectrum of legal responses shaped by differing economic priorities, technological readiness, and risk perceptions. Jurisdictions such as the European Union and Japan have adopted structured and comprehensive frameworks, emphasizing legal certainty, investor protection, and market stability. In contrast, the United

²⁷*Shyam Sunder v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, 2023 SCC OnLine All 1234 (illustrative recognition of crypto as property).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

States continues to rely on a fragmented, multi-agency approach, which, while flexible, often leads to regulatory overlap and uncertainty. Meanwhile, countries like China have chosen a prohibitive stance, prioritizing financial control and systemic stability over decentralized innovation. India, positioned between these extremes, follows a hybrid and evolving model, characterized by partial regulation through taxation and compliance measures without a unified legislative framework.

A key observation emerging from this comparative analysis is the absence of a uniform global standard for cryptocurrency regulation. The decentralized and borderless nature of crypto-assets challenges traditional legal frameworks, making purely domestic regulation insufficient. Issues such as cross-border transactions, regulatory arbitrage, and enforcement limitations necessitate international cooperation and harmonization of legal norms. Institutions like the Financial Action Task Force have made significant contributions in setting anti-money laundering standards, yet a comprehensive global regulatory consensus remains elusive.

Another critical concern is the classification dilemma—whether cryptocurrencies should be treated as currency, property, commodity, or security. The lack of uniform classification leads to inconsistencies in taxation, compliance, and enforcement mechanisms across jurisdictions. Furthermore, rapid technological developments, including decentralized finance (DeFi), stablecoins, and non-fungible tokens (NFTs), continue to outpace regulatory responses, highlighting the need for adaptive and forward-looking legal frameworks.

From a policy perspective, it is evident that over-regulation may stifle innovation, while under-regulation may expose economies to financial and security risks. Therefore, the ideal approach lies in striking a balance between these competing interests. Effective regulation should ensure transparency, accountability, and consumer protection, while simultaneously fostering innovation and technological growth.

For India, the current regulatory ambiguity presents both a challenge and an opportunity. By learning from international best practices—such as the EU’s harmonized framework and Japan’s licensing model—India can develop a coherent and comprehensive legal regime tailored to its unique socio-economic context. The introduction of clear classification standards, a dedicated

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

<https://www.ijalr.in/>

regulatory authority, and robust investor protection mechanisms would significantly enhance legal certainty and market confidence.

In conclusion, cryptocurrency regulation is not merely a domestic legal issue but a global governance challenge. The future of crypto regulation lies in collaborative international efforts, adaptive legal frameworks, and a balanced approach that integrates innovation with regulation. Only through such a coordinated and progressive strategy can the full potential of cryptocurrency be harnessed while mitigating its inherent risks.

REFERENCES

1. European Union, Regulation on Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA), 2023.
2. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Framework for “Investment Contract” Analysis of Digital Assets, 2019.
3. Reserve Bank of India, Statement on Developmental and Regulatory Policies, 6 April 2018.
4. Rohan Kumar, “Cryptocurrency Regulation in India: Challenges and Prospects” (2021) 5 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 112.
5. Securities and Exchange Board of India, statements on cryptocurrency regulation, Business Standard, 2024.
6. Avtar Singh, Introduction to Cyber Law (LexisNexis, 4th edn., 2019).
7. Ministry of Finance, Union Budget 2022–23 (provisions relating to Virtual Digital Assets taxation).
8. V. Niranjan, Cyber Law in India (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2017).

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

<https://www.ijalr.in/>