

News

In a PIL to outlaw betting apps, the Supreme Court wants the Center's response.



When sending notice to the Central Government, a bench made up of Justices Surya Kant and NK Singh said that it would think about sending notice to the States later on if it felt it was necessary.

On Friday, the Supreme Court asked the Union Government to respond to a Public Interest Litigation that demanded strict rules for online gambling and fantasy sports as well as a ban on betting apps [**Dr. KA Paul @ Kilari Anand vs. Union of India**].

When sending notice to the Central Government, a bench made up of **Justices Surya Kant**

and NK Singh said that it would think about sending notice to the States later on if it felt it was necessary.

"Notice respondent number 1 of the Union of India." The Learned Attorney General and Learned Solicitor General of India will receive a soft copy of the paper book. If we later see the need, we will send notices to every state," the court ruled.

Dr. KA Paul, a politician and evangelist, submitted the petition and personally attended in court.

He said that young people are suffering as a result of internet gambling. There is no public awareness of the risks associated with internet betting, in contrast to cigarettes, which are warned about their negative effects. Additionally, Dr. Paul referenced a news article concerning the terrible suicide of twenty-four people in Telangana who were unable to pay back debts they had accrued via online gambling.

Concerns regarding well-known public figures endorsing these platforms were also voiced by Dr. Paul. He pointed out that people are persuaded to believe that such behaviors are okay when they are promoted by well-known cricket figures.

He demanded, among other things, that betting be included in the definition of gaming and that a complete regulation framework be passed.

Justice Surya Kant considered the wider societal effects of digital access in response to Dr. Paul's claims, pointing out that the internet's ubiquitous availability has influenced shifting social behavior and family dynamics.

"We provided internet. Children watch one TV while parents watch another. "It's a total social aberration," he said.

The Court denied the petitioner's request for temporary relief.

"No, nothing in meanwhile," Justice Kant answered.