International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review
www.lawjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-6838
Received: 07-05-2026, Accepted: 07-06-2026, Published: 22-06-2026
Volume 8, Issue 2, 2026, Page No. 341-345

Suicide in India: Socio-economic determinants and time trends

Himanshu Panday
Master of Laws, Law School, Banaras Hindu University, Uttar Pradesh, India
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66856/ijlpsr.2026.8.2.8121

Abstract
Suicide in India represents a complex phenomenon situated at the intersection of law, public health, socio-economic inequality, and governance. Despite significant legal and policy developments, including the enactment of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 and the launch of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy, 2022, suicide mortality remains persistently high. Drawing upon data from the National Crime Records Bureau's Accidental Deaths and Suicides in India (ADSI) reports, this paper examines the socio-economic determinants and temporal trends of suicide in India between 2010 and 2023. The study adopts a doctrinal legal methodology supported by empirical evidence from NCRB statistics, scholarly literature, and policy documents.

The paper argues that suicide in India cannot be adequately understood through a narrow psychiatric or criminal-law framework. Analysis of recent ADSI data reveals that suicide is disproportionately concentrated among economically vulnerable populations, including daily wage earners, low-income households, farmers, agricultural labourers, students, and individuals experiencing family conflict or illness. The persistence of elevated suicide rates, particularly in the post-pandemic period, indicates the existence of deep structural vulnerabilities linked to poverty, precarious employment, educational pressure, agrarian distress, inadequate mental-health infrastructure, and unequal access to social support systems.

The study further evaluates the evidentiary value and limitations of ADSI as an official source, highlighting concerns relating to underreporting, classification practices, and administrative variation. It examines the transition from the punitive regime of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code to the rights-based approach embodied in Section 115 of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, and assesses the constitutional implications of suicide prevention through the lenses of dignity, equality, and the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

The paper concludes that while Indian law has moved decisively away from criminalisation, existing legal and policy responses remain insufficient to address the socio-economic determinants of suicide identified in official data. It advocates a comprehensive rights-based framework that integrates mental-health services, labour protections, educational support mechanisms, agrarian security measures, family welfare interventions, and improved suicide surveillance systems. Effective suicide prevention, it argues, requires not merely legal reform but a coordinated governance strategy capable of addressing the structural conditions that make self-harm foreseeable and preventable.

Keywords: Suicide, NCRB, ADSI, Mental Healthcare Act 2017, socio-economic determinants, public health, Article 21, National Suicide Prevention Strategy, labour vulnerability, agrarian distress, mental health law, India

Introduction

Suicide in India must be approached as a legal, social, economic, and public-health problem at the same time. It is not adequately explained as an individual act of despair, nor can it be understood only through psychiatry. The official picture emerging from the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), especially through its Accidental Deaths and Suicides in India (ADSI) reports, shows a pattern of sustained suicide mortality linked to vulnerability, unequal access to care, family distress, and insecure livelihood structures. The more recent national figures reveal that the burden has remained alarmingly high, with 171,418 suicides reported in 2023 and only a marginal reduction in the rate from 12.4 per lakh in 2022 to 12.3 per lakh in 2023.

The legal importance of this trend is profound. For decades, Indian law responded to attempted suicide through the penal logic of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code, treating self-harm as an offence rather than a symptom of extreme distress. That approach has since been substantially softened by the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, which creates a presumption of severe stress and directs the state to provide care, treatment, and rehabilitation instead of punishment. Yet the persistence of high suicide rates demonstrates that changing the law on paper does not by itself resolve the deeper conditions that drive self-harm. Economic precarity, educational pressure, domestic conflict, agrarian distress, illness, addiction, migration, and weak mental-health infrastructure all remain visible in the official and scholarly record.

This paper argues that the rise and persistence of suicide in India from 2010 to 2023 reveal the limits of a narrow criminal-law response and demand a broader constitutional and governance-based framework. The central claim is that Indian law has moved away from overt criminalisation, but legal and policy institutions still do not respond adequately to the socio-economic determinants recorded in ADSI data. The paper proceeds in six stages. First, it examines the time trends visible in ADSI-based reporting. Second, it analyses the principal socio-economic determinants of suicide in India. Third, it discusses the evidentiary strengths and weaknesses of ADSI as a source for legal scholarship. Fourth, it examines the legal framework governing attempted suicide and mental healthcare. Fifth, it evaluates the National Suicide Prevention Strategy in constitutional perspective. Finally, it proposes a legal reform agenda aimed at making suicide prevention more rights-based, evidence-sensitive, and institutionally effective.

Scope, method, and source base

This paper is a legal research paper with an empirical foundation. It does not present original statistical modelling. Instead, it draws on NCRB-linked reporting, peer-reviewed articles analysing NCRB data, policy documents, and legal commentary to reconstruct the main trajectory of suicide in India from 2010 to 2023 and to test the adequacy of the legal response. Such an approach is justified because ADSI remains the most authoritative annual official source on suicide deaths in India. Parliament has itself confirmed that suicide data are compiled and published by NCRB through the ADSI series.

The timeframe from 2010 to 2023 is analytically useful for several reasons. It captures the years leading up to and following the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017; it includes a period of visible transformation in labor markets, urban life, and educational competition; and it encompasses the post-pandemic rise in suicide mortality that has attracted intense concern in recent reporting. It is also a period in which the state's official discourse has shifted from punishment to prevention, culminating in the release of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy in 2022.

A legal paper relying on ADSI must acknowledge from the outset that suicide statistics are shaped by the conditions of reporting and classification. Official figures capture only suicides that are recognized and recorded through medico-legal and police processes. They may understate the actual burden because of stigma, family reluctance, local investigative variation, and definitional uncertainty. Even so, ADSI remains indispensable. For legal scholarship, it offers a baseline administrative picture of how the Indian state sees and categorizes suicide, and that in itself is crucial for evaluating whether law and policy are directed at the real patterns of distress reflected in official governance data.

Time trends in suicide: 2010–2023

The most important feature of recent suicide data in India is not merely increase, but persistence at a very high level. The 2022 and 2023 figures, read together, show that India has not experienced a meaningful decline in suicide mortality despite the presence of a new legal and policy framework. The 2022 rate of 12.4 per lakh was described in scholarly commentary as part of a concerning upward trend from 9.9 per lakh in 2017. The 2023 rate fell only slightly to 12.3, while the total number of suicides still increased to 171,418, suggesting stabilization at an unacceptably elevated level rather than successful prevention.

This continuity matters because it indicates that suicide in India is structural, not episodic. It is not enough to interpret occasional annual fluctuations as signs of success or failure. What the data instead reveal is a deep, sustained burden that survives changes in government language, statutory reform, and increased public discussion. The increase in absolute suicide deaths from 170,924 in 2022 to 171,418 in 2023 reinforces the view that the crisis remains embedded in the social order.

The post-pandemic period strengthens this conclusion. Recent reporting on NCRB data observes that the rise in suicides seen after the pandemic has not yet subsided and that 2023 recorded one of the highest suicide rates in the available series. This is significant because it suggests that the pandemic should not be understood as a temporary dislocation alone. Rather, it appears to have intensified existing vulnerabilities, including income loss, bereavement, educational disruption, social isolation, addiction, and interruption of care systems. From a legal standpoint, this means that emergency responses are not sufficient. The state must build institutions capable of dealing with long-duration distress.

A longer historical perspective also complicates simplistic narratives. Earlier multilevel research covering 2001 to 2013 found that male suicide rates were relatively stable while female rates showed some decline. The more recent upward movement in the national rate therefore points to a changed environment. Explanations must now account for labor-market flexibilization, urban migration, platform work, debt exposure, family fragmentation, and increasingly competitive educational systems. These are not mere social background conditions; they are part of the legal and policy ecology within which suicidal behavior becomes more likely.

State-level variation is another key part of the trend story. Reporting on recent NCRB data shows sharp interstate disparity, with some states consistently recording much higher suicide rates than others. Such disparity may reflect genuine differences in social stress, differential access to healthcare, variations in reporting quality, or a combination of these. For law and governance, this has two implications. First, a uniform national strategy cannot be assumed to work equally everywhere. Second, federal public health and welfare capacity matter deeply in explaining outcomes.

The urban dimension also deserves emphasis. Recent commentary suggests that city suicide rates remain above the national average, indicating that metropolitan life itself may generate conditions of heightened vulnerability. This cut against the common tendency to imagine suicide in India primarily through agrarian distress. Urban labor insecurity, migration, anonymity, educational stress, unstable housing, and weakened social support structures now form a crucial part of the problem. A legal response that remains overly rural in its design risks missing a major share of actual distress.

Socio-economic determinants of suicide

Economic insecurity and low income

One of the strongest patterns emerging from recent NCRB-based analysis is the heavy concentration of suicide among low-income groups. Reporting on the 2023 data indicates that about two-thirds of nationwide suicide deaths belonged to the lowest income bracket, earning less than Rs 1 lakh annually. This is a striking indicator of structural vulnerability. It shows that suicide cannot be approached only as a problem of individual psychology. Poverty, unstable income, and chronic material insecurity create conditions in which ordinary setbacks become existential crises.

The importance of economic insecurity is reinforced by occupational data. Daily wage earners constituted the single largest occupational group in the 2023 suicide statistics, accounting for 27.5 percent of all suicides. Similar summaries of the 2022 data place the proportion at around 26 percent, indicating continuity rather than a one-year anomaly. Daily wage labor represents one of the clearest sites where law and economy intersect. Workers in this sector often lack written contracts, stable wages, insurance, sick leave, housing security, or access to effective grievance redress. The absence of legal and welfare protections means that an accident, illness, job loss, or family expense can trigger a rapid collapse.

This has major consequences for legal analysis. If a large share of suicides is concentrated among persons whose lives are shaped by precarious work, then suicide prevention cannot be reduced to psychiatric intervention. It becomes equally a matter of labor law, social insurance, and portability of welfare benefits, emergency income support, and public health financing. The legal system fails when it treats a self-harm event as disconnected from the economic order that makes survival insecure.

Family problems and relational distress

NCRB-derived summaries consistently identify family problems as the leading reported cause of suicide, with illness second. In the 2023 data, family problems accounted for 31.9 percent of suicides and illness for about 19 percent. These categories are broad, but they remain important. They indicate that suicide in India is often embedded in relational strain rather than isolated pathology.

Family distress in India is not a neutral or apolitical category. It can include domestic violence, marital breakdown, coercive control, intergenerational pressure, caregiving strain, disputes around property or marriage, financial dependency, and the burden of educational or employment expectations. For women, family problems may conceal abusive domestic settings or oppressive marital structures. For men, they may reflect the inability to perform provider expectations under conditions of unemployment or debt. Thus, the legal significance of "family problems" lies not simply in its frequency but in its connection to broader institutions such as family law, protection against domestic violence, social assistance, and access to counselling or shelter.

A state that records family conflict as the largest proximate reason for suicide cannot credibly respond only through helplines. It must also ask whether domestic violence systems are accessible, whether family courts and local mediation structures work effectively, whether women have pathways to economic independence, and whether men have support systems beyond provider identity. The category of family problems therefore bridges the public/private divide and demonstrates why suicide prevention must include legal attention to social institutions that structure intimate life.

Illness, mental distress, and care deficits

Illness remains the second largest reason category in official reporting, accounting for roughly one-fifth of suicides in recent summaries. Yet this category is analytically unstable. It may include physical illness, chronic pain, disability, mental illness, addiction, or terminal diagnosis. Official classification does not always distinguish clearly among these factors, and critics have rightly warned that NCRB reason-coding can oversimplify complex causal pathways.

Still, the role of mental distress is impossible to ignore. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 is based on the recognition that persons attempting suicide are presumed to be under severe stress and should receive care rather than punishment. That legislative move reflects an important normative insight: suicidal behavior is closely linked to mental suffering, whether or not that suffering fits a neatly diagnosed psychiatric category. The difficulty is that legal recognition has not been matched by universal service delivery. In many districts, the availability of psychiatrists, counsellors, emergency crisis intervention, and community follow-up remains weak.

This gap matters because rights without infrastructure are thin rights. A statutory promise of treatment is meaningful only if hospitals, district mental-health program, trained personnel, and referral systems actually exist. Otherwise, the law changes the vocabulary of the state but not the lived reality of distress. The persistence of high suicide numbers after the 2017 Act strongly suggests that legal recognition of stress is necessary but not sufficient.

Youth, students, and educational pressure

The age profile of suicide in India shows a strong concentration among younger and working-age persons. Recent NCRB-based review literature reports that around two-thirds of suicides occur among persons aged 18 to 45, while student suicides continue to attract major concern, with annual figures around 13,000 in recent discussions. This pattern is significant because it places suicide squarely within the institutions of education, labor transition, credential competition, and early adulthood.

The legal and policy implications are substantial. Student suicide cannot be attributed simply to examination failure or mental weakness. The relevant environment includes ranking systems, social isolation, caste discrimination, harassment, coaching pressure, uncertain employment prospects, and inadequate institutional care. Educational institutions increasingly function as spaces of intense stratification without a corresponding duty of psychosocial support. This raises questions of university governance, anti-ragging norms, anti-discrimination enforcement, hostel administration, counselling obligations, and transparent grievance redress structures.

A rights-based prevention approach must therefore look beyond health departments. Education law and campus governance are directly implicated in suicide prevention. When institutions create or tolerate conditions of humiliation, exclusion, or unbearable stress, the legal system cannot treat ensuing self-harm as purely personal misfortune.

Agrarian distress and rural vulnerability

Farmer and agricultural labor suicides remain a defining feature of the Indian suicide debate. NCRB-linked review literature identifies more than 11,000 farmer-related suicides in 2022 and points to continuing agrarian vulnerability. Earlier socio-economic analysis found that states with greater agricultural employment tended to have higher suicide rates, suggesting that agrarian dependence itself can be a risk factor under conditions of credit stress, climate uncertainty, and price instability.

Agrarian suicide must be analyzed through governance rather than sentiment alone. The causes typically lie in debt cycles, crop failure, volatile markets, weak irrigation, inadequate insurance, land fragmentation, and uncertain access to institutional credit. These are areas profoundly shaped by law and public policy. Rural suicide prevention thus requires more than awareness campaigns or sporadic compensation packages. It demands robust regulation of rural credit, predictable crop-loss support, functioning insurance systems, locally available mental-health services, and climate-sensitive agricultural governance.

The broader lesson is that law often arrives too late. When a farmer's distress is mediated by repeated crop loss and debt accumulation, legal intervention after death cannot count as prevention. A serious legal framework must identify the structures that generate desperation before self-harm occurs.

Gendered social expectations

Recent review literature reports that men account for nearly three-fourths of suicide deaths in India. This should not be read as negating women's vulnerability. Rather, it suggests that suicide risk is shaped by different forms of gendered pressure. Men may be more exposed to provider norms, work-related shame, substance use, and reluctance to seek help. Women may face domestic abuse, coercive relations, unpaid care burdens, and social control within family structures.

The legal relevance of gender lies in the need for differentiated institutional response. Gender-neutral policies may miss the actual pathways through which distress operates. A meaningful suicide-prevention framework must therefore integrate domestic-violence services, family support systems, de-addiction care, reproductive and maternal mental-health support, and community outreach strategies that also address masculinity and stigma around vulnerability. Formal equality is inadequate where the social determinants of suicide are gendered in different ways.

ADSI as an evidentiary source

For legal scholarship, ADSI has a dual status: it is indispensable, yet incomplete. It is indispensable because it is the central official source through which the Indian state records, classifies, and narrates suicide. It is incomplete because the conditions of reporting shape what appears in the data. Suicide statistics depend on police registration, medico-legal investigation, family testimony, and administrative coding, all of which are vulnerable to stigma, local discretion, and institutional weakness.

Underreporting remains a serious concern. Families may resist reporting suicide because of social stigma, insurance implications, or fear of police processes. Officials may classify doubtful cases differently across jurisdictions. This means that ADSI figures likely understate the true burden, and the degree of understatement may itself vary by region or community. For legal researchers, this does not make ADSI useless. It means that ADSI should be read as an official record of recognized suicides, not as a flawless epidemiological mirror.

A further limitation concerns the coding of "reasons." Categories such as family problems, illness, unemployment, or bankruptcy may capture proximate stressors, but suicide is generally multi-causal. A single administrative label can obscure the interaction of depression, alcohol dependence, debt, domestic violence, humiliation, and social exclusion in the same case. This has legal consequences. If policymakers treat these categories too literally, they may design narrow interventions that fail to address the overlapping structure of distress.

Even so, ADSI remains vital. It allows legal scholars to identify concentration of burden, compare state responses, and ask whether official policy aligns with the social groups most clearly at risk. The proper stance is therefore cautious reliance: ADSI is strong enough to support normative and institutional critique, but not so complete that it can resolve all causal questions by itself.

The legal framework on attempted suicide

Criminalization under Section 309 IPC

For much of Indian legal history, attempt to commit suicide was punishable under Section 309 IPC. This reflected a punitive and moralizing conception of self-harm. The survivor of an attempt was drawn into criminal process at precisely the moment when he or she was most vulnerable. Such a model was increasingly criticized for being inconsistent with psychiatric knowledge, compassion, and the evolving constitutional language of dignity.

The harms of criminalization were practical as well as symbolic. Fear of prosecution could deter families from seeking help or reporting attempts honestly. Hospitals and police could treat the survivor as a suspect rather than a person needing urgent intervention. In a society where mental distress already carries stigma, criminal law deepened silence and shame.

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 transformed the legal position. Section 115 creates a presumption that any person attempting suicide is under severe stress and requires the government to provide care, treatment, and rehabilitation. This marked a substantial departure from penal logic. The Act did not merely soften punishment; it reframed the legal meaning of suicidal behaviour.

This shift is normatively important for at least three reasons. First, it aligns Indian law with a therapeutic and rights-based understanding of mental distress. Second, it recognizes positive obligations on the state rather than merely withdrawing criminal sanction. Third, it weakens the stigma-producing function of law by refusing to cast the survivor primarily as an offender. Later judicial reporting has reinforced the position that Section 115 overrides the older punitive operation of Section 309 in cases of severe stress.

Even so, implementation remains uneven. A presumption on paper depends on awareness among police, hospitals, magistrates, and mental-health authorities. If front-line institutions continue to act through inherited punitive habits, the statutory shift will remain incomplete. This is why legal reform must be accompanied by protocol reform, administrative training, and service infrastructure.

National Suicide Prevention Strategy and constitutional dimensions

India's National Suicide Prevention Strategy, released in 2022, reflects a major conceptual move toward multi-sectoral prevention. It recognizes suicide as a problem linked to surveillance, awareness, means restriction, crisis intervention, and support for vulnerable populations. Importantly, it draws on the state's own evidence to identify high-risk groups and seeks to align Indian policy with broader public-health approaches.

Yet the Strategy remains a policy framework rather than a directly enforceable rights instrument. Its effectiveness depends on budgeting, departmental coordination, monitoring, and state-level execution. In India's federal structure, health, education, labor welfare, policing, and local administration are spread across institutions that often function in silos. This is one reason why the strategy's normative ambition has not yet translated into a substantial reduction in suicides.

The constitutional dimension clarifies what is at stake. Article 21, as interpreted in Indian constitutional thought, protects life with dignity and supports humane state treatment of persons in extreme distress. The movement away from punishing attempted suicide is best understood within this framework. Article 14 is also implicated, because unequal access to crisis care, counselling, and social support means that similarly vulnerable persons do

not enjoy equal protection in practice. When low-income workers, students, and agrarian populations are repeatedly overrepresented in suicide data, equality requires proportionate and targeted response, not merely formal uniformity.

Federalism is equally important. Suicide prevention cannot be treated as a centrally announced health program alone. It requires functioning district hospitals, counselling systems in universities, labour protections for informal workers, and locally responsive welfare administration. Constitutional commitment without institutional capacity is insufficient. The right direction of law has already been set; the weakness lies in implementation.

Reform agenda

A serious legal reform agenda must begin by ensuring full operational decriminalization of attempted suicide. Police manuals, hospital procedures, and magistrate-level practice should uniformly reflect the non-punitive mandate of Section 115 of the Mental Healthcare Act. Survivors must be routed into care systems rather than criminal process.

Second, India requires enforceable minimum standards for suicide-prevention infrastructure. High-burden districts should have mandatory crisis helplines, emergency psychiatric referral systems, follow-up services for survivors, and counselling access in schools, universities, and workplaces. Without district-level institutionalization, national strategy remains aspirational rather than transformative.

Third, prevention must address socio-economic determinants directly. For low-income workers and daily wage earners, legal response should include income security, emergency relief, portability of welfare, affordable healthcare, and labour registration. For agrarian populations, it should include effective crop insurance, debt counselling, reliable institutional credit, and climate-sensitive rural support mechanisms.

Fourth, educational institutions should be placed under a stronger duty of psychosocial care. Coaching Centre, universities, and residential schools should have mandatory counselling frameworks, anti-harassment mechanisms, and transparent grievance processes, particularly for students from marginalized backgrounds. Student distress must be treated as an institutional concern, not merely an individual failing.

Fifth, India should strengthen ADSI itself. Standardized classification, faster publication, transparent methodology, and better linkage between police and health data would improve both legal accountability and policy design. Better data are part of prevention because poor surveillance produces poor governance.

Conclusion

The evidence from ADSI-linked reporting between 2010 and 2023 shows that suicide in India is persistent, concentrated, and socially patterned. It is associated not only with mental distress but with low income, precarious labor, family conflict, illness, educational pressure, agrarian insecurity, and unequal regional capacity. Recent years have kept the national burden near historically high levels, showing that the crisis remains unresolved.

Indian law has undoubtedly moved in a more humane direction. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 and the National Suicide Prevention Strategy reject the older punitive model and recognize treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention as the proper state response. But the persistence of suicide mortality demonstrates that legal change has not yet matured into a coherent governance framework capable of addressing the structural determinants identified in official data.

The strongest legal conclusion is that suicide prevention in India must be treated as a constitutional obligation grounded in dignity, equality, and public-health justice. A criminal-law lens is no longer sufficient. What is needed is a coordinated federal system linking mental-health care with labour protection, educational support, rural security, family support mechanisms, and reliable administrative data. Only then can the law address suicide not merely at the point of aftermath, but at the level of the conditions that make it tragically foreseeable.

References

1. Centre for Mental Health Law & Policy. Takeaways from the NCRB Data on Suicide for 2023: What Has Changed?, 2026. https://cmhlp.org/imho/blog/takeaways-from-the-ncrb-data-on-suicide-for-2023-what-has-changed/
2. Practical implications of Mental Healthcare Act 2017: Suicide and suicide attempt, 2019. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31040468/
3. Hindustan Times. Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 decriminalizes attempt to suicide, 2018. https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/health-ministry-notifies-mental-healthcare-act-2017-attempting-suicide-no-longer-a-crime/story-ubIaWop6qiA6iYGz5M1uQO.html
4. Centre for Mental Health Law & Policy, Hindustan Times. Post-pandemic rise in suicides yet to subside, data indicates, 2025. https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/postpandemic-rise-in-suicides-yet-to-subside-data-indicates-101759203972773.html
5. National Suicide Prevention Strategy (Government of India), 2025. https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3bc88bb2c377261b0336312714b96fcfd/uploads/2025/04/20250507983470082.pdf
6. Times of India. 468 people took their lives every day in 2022: NCRB data,2023. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/468-people-took-their-lives-every-day-in-2022-ncrb-data/articleshow/105738471.cms
7. Trends and socio-economic determinants of suicide in India: 2001-2013,2018. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29209745/
8. Suicide in India: A Review. Indian Internet Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, 2025. https://acspublisher.com/journals/index.php/iijfmt/article/view/22959
9. SCC Online Blog. S.115(1) of Mental Healthcare Act overrides S.309 IPC; Bombay HC,2024. https://www.sconline.com/blog/post/2024/08/26/person-attempting-commit-suicide-in-stress-cannot-be-penalised-u-s-309-ipc-in-view-of-mental-healthcare-act-2017-bombay-high-court-legal-news/