Lyceum India Journal of Social Sciences || ISSN (Online): 3048-6513
Volume: 3 Issue: 1 || January 2026 || DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18404755

Customary Rights, Statutory Laws and the Politics of Land and Forest In Arunachal Pradesh

Byabang Agnes[1]

Abstract: *This article examines the historical evolution of land and forest governance in Arunachal Pradesh and its implications for customary tenure and indigenous rights. It argues that contemporary legal insecurity is not the result of regulatory absence but of layered statutory interventions that progressively subordinate community-based systems to state control. Tracing trajectories from colonial forestry frameworks to post-independence centralisation under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, and the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement and Records Act, 2000 (amended in 2018), the study highlights how presumptive state ownership over unrecorded land, limited recognition of customary rights, and long-term leasing mechanisms have reconfigured access to land and resources. The article contends that these overlapping regimes facilitate indirect land alienation and deepen socio-political marginalisation, underscoring the need to re-centre customary institutions within statutory frameworks for equitable and sustainable governance.*

Keywords: *Customary Rights, Statutory Laws, Land, Forest, Arunachal Pradesh*

Introduction

Forest and land in the North Eastern region of India are deeply interlinked and cannot be meaningfully understood in isolation from one another. In tribal societies especially, these areas cut across not only as ecological spaces but as sites of livelihood and social organisation for centuries. Attempts by the State to regulate land and forests through formal legal frameworks often bring these customary systems into conflict with statutory provisions that are misaligned with indigenous practices and therefore rendering tribal rights into vulnerability.

Arunachal Pradesh is a frontier state predominated by 68.79 per cent of the Scheduled Tribes, accounting for 0.91 percent of the total Scheduled Tribes in India as per the 2011 Census (Development Statistics Atlas of Arunachal Pradesh - 2020). The state is composed of twenty-six major tribes and more than a hundred

[1] *Department of Political Science, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh*

sub-tribes. The geographical area of the State reveals that about 79 per cent of the total area are recorded as forest areas and more than 60 percent of the recorded forest areas are unclassed forests (FSI 2023). These forests, although notified as reserved, protected or unclassified, were historically managed by the indigenous tribes under customary systems.

Statement of the Problem

The governance of forest land rights in Arunachal Pradesh is marked by a complex coexistence of colonial period regulations, post-colonial forest laws and indigenous customary tenure system such as Assam Forest Regulation, 1891, Indian Forest Act, 1927, Jhum Land Regulation of 1947, Anchal Forest Reserve Act,1975, and Forest Conservation Act, 1980 (as amended in 2023). These statutory frameworks were largely designed without adequate recognition of the customary land-use practices and collective ownership systems prevalent thereof.

While statutory enactments aimed at forest land and resource conservation efforts, the indigenous ownership over forest land and its resources were marginalised over the years. The tribal communities continue to face legal uncertainty regarding access, ownership and control over forest land. Statutory enactments have frequently reclassified community-managed forests as state-controlled land and has constrained traditional livelihood practices such as shifting cultivation and collective resource management.

The state's attempt to introduce a formal framework came with the enactment of the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement and Records Act, 2000. The Act sought to formalise land ownership by recording land rights, regulating transfers and reducing disputes. However, the application of this Act has generated further complications by overlapping with both customary land systems and central forest legislations and has raised critical questions regarding jurisdiction, legal compatibility and institutional redundancy. The absence of a clear congruent mechanism between statutory forest laws and customary tenure arrangements has resulted in fragmented governance and contested authority over land and forest resources. This paper, aims to address in this study, the lack of legal and institutional coherence in the governance of land and forest rights in Arunachal Pradesh and examine how overlapping statutory regimes and customary laws interact, and how these dynamics shape the legal position of indigenous communities.

Research Questions

1. How do statutory forest laws and customary tenure systems overlap and shape land and forest governance in Arunachal Pradesh?

2. How has the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement and Records Act, 2000 evolved in parlance with customary land systems and state forest legislations?
3. What legal ambiguities arise from this interaction, and how do they affect the rights of tribal communities in the frontiers?

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative and doctrinal research methodology to examine the governance of land and forest rights in Arunachal Pradesh. It involves a critical analysis of constitutional provisions, central and state forest legislations and land laws with particular focus on the Assam Forest Regulation, 1891; the Indian Forest Act, 1927; the Forest Conservation Act, 1980 (as amended in 2023) and; the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement and Records Act, 2000. These legal enactments are analysed to assess their scope, objectives and relation with indigenous customary tenure systems. This study further employs a qualitative interpretive approach to examine customary land and forest practices among tribal communities by drawing upon secondary sources such as government reports, census data, policy documents, scholarly works and ethnographic and anthropological studies. The methodology applied to the study analyses the legal and institutional coherence, or lack thereof, between statutory enactments and indigenous practices.

Customary Law and Land Rights in Arunachal Pradesh

Customary law for centuries has been the principal regulator of land as well as the forest land use among Arunachal's tribes. Each community has its own system with certain features that are shared across the state. Land is often held across three tenure systems - *community, clan* and *individual.* The nature of forest land rights is that respective tribes have collective ownership over community forest lands for purposes of hunting, cattle grazing, timber use, rituals, etc. In some areas, clan ownership is recognized in the forest areas falling within the village jurisdiction (Dabi & Mitra, 2019). Customary law emphasises flexibility and community participation. Access to forests is sometimes restricted to lineage members but outsiders may be granted rights temporarily through negotiation however encroachment without permission (fishing, hunting or felling of woods or bamboos) leads to dispute resolutions where penalties are imposed on the offender in kind or cash (equivalent to the cost of produce extracted). The practice of jhum cultivation (slash and burn method) is also prevalent among the tribes. The ttask of cutting trees in a jhum is long and arduous, and every new cultivator has to go to no little expense on sacrifices to the spirits of the hill and forest which he is invading. This helps to impress on the people that the land is theirs (Elwin, 1960). The nature of shifting cultivation where lands are left as 'fallows' for certain years for its regeneration and another patch

of hills is cultivated upon even in sparsely populated villages has shaped the nature of land and forest rights claimed by the tribes. Each family acquires rights over the plots which it has cleared, thus bringing on the notion of natural justice.

Historical Evolution of Land and Forest Policies in Arunachal Pradesh.

For centuries, the region existed in administrative aloofness until the advent of British expediency in the northeast in the Nineteenth century. The administrative evolution can be traced from the annexation of Assam and its dependencies by the British from the Ahoms in 1826 after the signing of the Treaty of Yandaboo (Bose, 1997). Gradually, the region began to feature in historical documents like the enactment of the Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulation of 1873. The Regulation established for the first time a direct connection with the tribal region Gradually, the broader northeast region was brought under the colonial administration and Arunachal too, which was understood as North East Frontier Tracts, found itself being affected at the frontiers albeit the nature of control was a 'loose political control' (Bose, 1997).

The majority of the tribal communities in the state were therefore governed by customary norms that regulated ownership, inheritance, shifting or 'Jhum' cultivation and community or clan-based use of forests. (Sharma C. K., 2019) writes that "The ownership and management of much of the land in the state belonged to the community as a whole rather than the individual. Each single strip of land, starting from rivers to riverbanks or even small river islands, forests, hills and streams belong to one clan or the other. Land is reserved for jhum (shifting) cultivation by each community, and communities have a mutual understanding about the boundaries of their own jhum land." This system throws light on the matter of land, forests and water bodies being subjects of customary practices. Later statutory distinctions made between forest land and agricultural land called for legal disruption. However, it did witness the extension of various Regulations and statutory enactments over the forests and its resources and which had direct and significant consequences for the tribes as rights over agricultural land, forests and other resources often intersected with each other.

The first significant statutory measure was the *Assam Forest Regulation, 1891***.** It empowered the colonial government to constitute *Reserved Forests* and impose restriction on shifting cultivation, grazing, hunting and extraction of forest produce. A theme central to most forest policies in the region till date, which is the notion that land not formally recorded as individual or community property by default belongs to the government, can be traced to this particular Regulation. It demarcated forest blocks for timber exploitation

and administrative control. This was the first formal assertion of state authority over forests that were traditionally managed by communities.

Another very important Act that needs to be highlighted is the *Indian Forest Act, 1927* which consolidated colonial forest law throughout India. Like the 1891 Regulation, it enabled the state to declare *Reserved*, *Protected Forests and Village Forests* and further criminalised practices integral to tribal livelihoods like jhum cultivation and subsistence extraction of timber and non-timber products[2]. For any tribe who depended on communal forests for shifting cultivation and whose culture was so intrinsically linked to the forests, the 1927 Act was a structural constraint to the customary systems especially considering how the statutory provision blanketed the whole of Indian territories without taking into account the complexities of land rights and ownership on the ground. The blanket application of the Act across India ignored the legal plurality of frontier regions and has contributed long-term conflicts between statutory law and customary tenure.

The *Jhumland Regulation,* 1947 for Balipara, Tirap and Sadiya Frontier tracts under Assam province empowered the Deputy Commissioner to approve, restrict, or prohibit jhum farming or shifting cultivation in specified areas. It also laid down regulations for customary rights to jhum land transfer, inheritance and lease (Department, 1982). The regulation introduced a system where jhum was no longer a matter of village decision alone but became subject to official sanctions. In the Regulation, the legal framing of long fallows as "wastelands" have evidently set precedents for future policies in the region. The subduing of jhum cultivation to bureaucratic approval, as mandated by the Regulation, transformed a practice governed by the community into a regulated activity and reinforced state authority over agricultural land use.

Another important milestone that needs mention is that after Independence, the NEFA administration worked closely with the Assam Forest Department under the care of the Governor of Assam. NEFA's administration aligned with India's 1952 *National Forest Policy* that laid down a broad framework for state forest management and especially enshrined in section 19 of the document that 'India, as a whole, should aim at maintaining one-third of its total land area under forests' (Indian Kanoon, 2019). The assertion of conservation control and establishing forest reserves and initiating wildlife protection frameworks were witnessed. One key illustration is Namdapha which was officially designated a Wildlife Sanctuary in 1972 and later elevated to a National Park and Tiger Reserve in 1983. This course reveals that the traction gained in forest reservation during this timeline has curbed traditional land use system, the effect of which is still

[2] Indian Forest Act 1927, Government of India

evident by 'encroachment' allegations put on smaller tribesman, particularly the *Lisu* tribe residing along the designated area.[3]

In the same light, the Arunachal Pradesh Anchal Forest Reserve (Constitution and Maintenance) Act, 1975, later amended in 1984 to include Village Forest Reserves, too represents the state's attempt at framing a distinct legal category of reserved forest within its administrative geography[4]. It empowers the government to declare any land "at the disposal of the government" as an Anchal Forest Reserve (AFR) by applying the settlement and notification machinery of the 1891 Regulation. Section 3(2) goes further, requiring that "all lands where forest plantations can be raised" shall be constituted as AFRs (Indiankanoon.org). This clause makes reservation the default wherever silviculture is technically possible thus leaving little room for customary long-fallow cycles or communal grazing grounds. The 1984 amendment further inserted Section 3A to permit the creation of *Village Forest Reserves (VFRs)* under the same 1891 procedure. It extended also the principles of *Indian Forest Act of 1927*. The practical effect has been to bring large tracts of community-used forests into the legal category of state reserves. Shifting cultivation in particular has been constrained as the plantation mandate of Section 3(2) is at odds with long-fallow cycles. This framework illustrates how state legislation have internalised colonial forest logic centred on territorial control and revenue extraction even decades after independence.

Then came Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980[5] which applied 'restriction on the de-reservation of forests or use of forest land for non-forest purpose by the state government or other authority except with the prior approval of the Central Government.' This Act further centralized decision-making, thus bypassing customary village institutions. The 2023 Amendment of the FCA further has been argued to reduce the autonomy of the indigenous tribes. The Act broadened the definition of 'forest land' subjected to the Primary Act of 1980 to include 'land declared or notified as forest under the Act of 1927 (inclusive of both reserved and protected forests) and all land notified as forest in government records on or after October 5, 1980'[6]. The amendments further "seek to exempt linear infrastructure projects such as roads and highways from seeking forest clearance permissions if these are located within 100 km of the national border. Experts have raised concerns because "strategic linear projects of national importance" is an undefined term and can thus be misused to push through infrastructure projects that are devastating for the local ecology"

[3] The Arunachal Times article, June 16, 2023, "Illegal encroachment a threat to Namdapha National Park".
[4] The Act must be read against the longer backdrop of the Assam Forest Regulation of 1891, whose Chapter II procedures for constituting reserved forests were explicitly imported into the Arunachal framework.
[5] See The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 (Act No 69 of 1980), 27th December, 1980
[6] Insertion of new Section 1A by The Forest (Conservation) Amendment Act, 2023 (No. 15 Of 2023)

Lyceum India Journal of Social Sciences || ISSN (Online): 3048-6513
Volume: 3 Issue: 1 || January 2026 || DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18404755

(Mukherjee, 2023). The local ecology is inclusive of the livelihood concerns for those who live inside non-recognised forests or deemed forests along the national border. Arunachal Pradesh, with 79 percent forest cover according to FSI 2023, shares international boundaries with Bhutan, Tibet and gets potentially disproportionately affected by the statutory enactment. Recent land allocation controversies in Assam, where massive protests erupted in six Bodo (a tribal community) inhabited villages in Kokrajhar district, Assam, after the government and the Bodoland Territorial Council (the apex autonomous body of the Sixth Schedule Area) allotted 3,400 *bighas* of land for a proposed thermal power project to a famous industrialist without any due consultation with the affected people raises concerns regarding future land security of marginalised tribes (Sharma S. , 2025). The particular episode of tribals, formally protected under the Sixth Schedule and enjoying relatively greater autonomy in matters of one's forests, land, resources and customary laws reveal an uncertain reality for a state like Arunachal Pradesh, not enjoying any Constitutional benefits in matters of land and resources. The case highlights the central theme traced historically in this paper, that statutory frameworks, whether conservation-oriented forest laws or development-oriented land allocations, frequently override or bypass customary claims and statutory safeguards alike and produce legal uncertainty and political conflict.

The historical evolution of land and forest policies in Arunachal Pradesh shows that state control over forests expanded increasingly. This has been often without a corollary framework for recognising customary tenure. Colonial forest regulations introduced the idea of state ownership over unrecorded land and post-independence laws largely carried this logic forward under the guise of conservation and development. Instead of resolving customary arrangements, successive statutes have overlapped with them and produced uncertainty over authority and rights. Contemporary conflicts over forest land are therefore not accidental. It is the outcome of a historically layered and poor legal practices.

The Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement & Records Act, 2000 (and 2018 Amendments)

Against this historically layered and unresolved framework of forest governance, the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement & Records Act, 2000 (amended in 2018) was the state's first attempt at codifying land ownership and settlement systematically. It was the first instant where procedures for preparing 'Records of Rights' of the indigenous peoples were established. The Act also regulates the land revenue administration and is a legal framework for defining individual and government ownership, allotment, leasing and transfers of land. The legal design of the Act can be understood through three interrelated themes: (i) formal recognition of customary ownership without analogous security, (ii) presumptive state

ownership over unrecorded land and natural resources, and (iii) the formalisation of land through ownership conversion and long-term leasing.

Formal recognition of customary ownership without analogous security

Chapter I sets out the definitional framework of the Act and formally recognises customary and community-based ownership though lacking in guaranteeing substantive protection. It laid down critical definitions such as “common land" which means any land used or reserved for use of a community or a village; “Community” means residents of a village as a whole and includes a clan, sub- clan, kindred; "land owner" in relation to any land means a person who acquires rights of ownership in respect of such land by :- (i) inheritance or acquisition in accordance with a local custom. (ii) purchase, if such purchase is not contrary to local customs (iii) gift or donation as per local custom; "resident" means an indigenous person ordinarily residing in a village or area. In effect, the chapter gives effect to socially recognised customary tenure into administratively legible categories and subject indigenous land relations to state scrutiny. While the Act defines ‘common land’, ‘community’, and ‘land owner’ in ways that appear to cater to village and clan-based tenure systems, these definitions stop short of guaranteeing substantive protection. Recognition becomes conditional upon eventual recording and administrative approval rather than inherent customary legitimacy.

Presumptive state ownership over unrecorded land and natural resources

Chapter III introduces a critical shift by defining residual ownership claims over land and natural resources. Section 9(1) lays down that “all lands, public roads, lanes and paths and bridges. Ditches, dikes and fences on or beside the road, the beds of rivers, streams, nallahs, lakes, water courses and all standing and flowing water and rights connected to any of the activities related to it like fishing rights or use rights, which are not the property of a ‘person’ or community are declared to be the property of the government.” Basic idea here is that ownership must be proven through recognisable legal or record forms and failing to do so automatically vests ownership to the state.

Section 9(2) further states the government’s right to minerals and subsurface resources unless otherwise expressly provided through a grant made by the government. This provision is a protection of state’s control over natural resources; though framed as a mechanism to prevent unregulated private exploitation, this provision effectively consolidates state control over subsurface resources even where surface land is customarily held by indigenous communities. The section despite reflecting the broader Public Trust

Lyceum India Journal of Social Sciences || ISSN (Online): 3048-6513
Volume: 3 Issue: 1 || January 2026 || DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18404755

Doctrine – a legal principle establishing that certain natural and cultural resources are preserved for public use (Cornell Law School, 2022) and also the constitutional spirit of Article 39(b) of the Directive Principles of State Policy, its application in Arunachal operates in tension with customary practices that historically treated land and resources as indivisible.

Section 10 (1) lays that "The right to all trees, jungles or other natural products growing on land set apart for forest reserves and all trees, brush wood, jungle or other natural product, where-ever growing, except in so far as the same may be the property of any person or community, vests in the Government, and such trees, brush wood, jungle or other natural products shall be preserved or disposed of in such manner as may be prescribed, keeping in view the interests of the people in the area with regard to the user of the natural products." The discretionary power granted to the state to preserve or dispose of forest produce introduces executive flexibility that can override community decision-making, as witnessed in Kokhrajar Districts of Assam (Sharma S. , 2025).

At a glance, one may find the sections to be quite fulfilling as 'land that already belong to a person or a community' are exempt from government claims. However, a more in-depth analysis brings out various legal loopholes. The first inconsistency is that in Arunachal Pradesh customary landholding system, a large section of the genuine owners has no written record of their ancestral lands due to the collective nature of ownership. A 61.55 percent of total geographic area of the state comes under recorded forest area wherein the unclassified forest areas (all those forest areas not notified as reserved or protected forests and that which is owned and managed by the communities) constitutes 65.8 percent of the total reserved forest areas according to Forest Survey of India 2023 report. In such a scenario, Section 9 structurally overlap with customary law and community ownership as though such rights are socially recognised, they remain mostly unrecorded. And though the Act has defined in section 2(1) that 'land owner' is inclusive of customary ownership, the pace at which privatisation and developmental activities are being ushered into the forest areas at the behest of state government and the local elites, one cannot guarantee that every member of the community will benefit an equitable share of the community rights. The conversion of collective rights into administratively recognised titles may enable elite monopoly and benefits may accrue unevenly within communities.

Additionally, section 10(1) also sits uncomfortably with the Forest (Conservation)Act, 1980, as any diversion of forest areas requires central approval. This contradiction raises questions about the operational relevance of state-level discretion under the 2000 Act. Nonetheless, the Scheduled Tribes And Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 have successfully reinstated the

forests rights of the scheduled tribes by extending their rights. The Act rationalises that "ancestral lands and their habitat were not adequately recognised in the consolidation of State forests during the colonial period as well as in independent India resulting in historical injustice to the forest dwelling Scheduled Tribes and other traditional forest dwellers who are integral to the very survival and sustainability of the forest ecosystem" (Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 2014).

The formalisation of land through ownership conversion and long-term leasing

Chapter IX connotes another important set of sections. Section 88(1) converts government allotted agricultural land, before the commencement of the Act, into ownership for the holder and successors. The amendment in 2018 led to the insertion of clause 1(A) to the same. The new clause states that, "every person, who holds valid land possession document issued by the competent authority, outside notified forest shall be entitled to be conferred ownership rights on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed."

Further under section 90, sub-section 1 and 2 was also substituted. Through the amendment it introduced "the right of the land owner to lease out his land to another person or entity for the permissible land use on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon for a period of thirty-three years and also ensured that the lease could be further renewed [s.90(2)] for a period not exceeding thirty-three years."

The analysis of the chapter finds that the government converted the cultivators of agricultural lands into legal owners with transfer (s.88(1)) as prior to the commencement of the Act, almost all the agricultural land in Arunachal was technically 'government land' but was occupied, cleared and cultivated by tribal household or clan. This provision itself is limited in nature as it applies to land for purposes of agriculture only. Much of the forest land or grazing land held communally did not automatically get ownership status and to this day remain uncertain. The amendment in 2018 brought some relief as it conferred ownership rights to the people with valid land possession certificates (s.88(1A) but however here too, communities inside notified forests were excluded despite have long-standing customary occupation. The act continued to exclude communities in reserved or protected forests and thus echoing the Forest Act 1927 exclusions. Not to reiterate that many indigenous holders still lacked valid papers even outside forests. Moreover, the long-term leasing of land as per section 90(1) to any person or entity (indigenous or not) for thirty-three years and further enabling renewal for another thirty-three years period (s.90(2)) creates a mechanism of control without ownership. Even where sale to non-tribals is restricted by the virtue of Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulation, 1873, the leasing of land could facilitate corporate plantations, mining bases or other such establishments by non-natives, a phenomenon that has been quite rampant in the present times in the

urban centres. Sanjib Baruah, 2005 as cited in (Sharma C. K., 2019) makes a distinction between de facto and de jure property rights of such land. He argues that "although there is no formal transfer of tribal land to non-tribals, the cases of non-tribals using tribal land for agriculture or other purposes abound." In a state where large part of the land remains unclassed due to the factor of collective ownership, the lack of explicit cap and mandatory Gram Sabha consent, the weaker and poorer sections of the tribes are prone to further exploitation and deprivation further diluting the traditional landownership pattern.

The government, at the time of the passing of the amended Act in 2018, claimed through official statements that the act would go a long way in fulfilling the genuine aspirations of the people like mortgaging lands for loans by banks and other financial institutions as well as in bringing desired capital to the state for holistic and inclusive development (North East Now News, 2018). (Sharma C. K., 2019) writes that "the celebration for the ability to mortgage tribal land that has been legally protected, to banks and other financial institutions to receive loans is a puzzling phenomenon, for it is not clear why and for what purpose the local communities need such loans. The proposed reason for such need to monetise land is that it will help unemployed, educated indigenous youths to venture as entrepreneurs. This again betrays another failure of the state, that is, to provide employment to its educated youths. It is unclear as to why tribal youths from Arunachal Pradesh are pushed to mortgage their lands to become entrepreneurs."

In summary, the Arunachal Pradesh Land Settlement and Records Act, 2000 (as amended in 2018) presumes that unrecorded land belongs to the state, which dovetails with the Anchal Forest Reserve definition of "land at the disposal of the government." The Forest Conservation Act, 1980 centralises diversion decisions in Delhi and reinforces state claims. By contrast, the Forest Rights Act, 2006 envisages recognition of community forest resources, including in reserved forests. In Arunachal, however, implementation of the FRA has lagged behind, and most claims inside AFRs and VFRs remain unrecognised. Scholarly commentary in *Economic and Political Weekly* (Bijoy, 2019) and policy reviews by *TERI* (Agarwal, 2011) have underlined that the north-east states, including Arunachal, have been slow to operationalise the FRA leaving communities legally vulnerable in areas already notified as reserves largely because the region is presumed to be consisting of Scheduled Tribes who are supposedly already enjoying "customary rights." The Anchal and Village Forest Reserve framework represents continuity with colonial forestry law. It extends the 1891 model of reservation into the state's Panchayat geography but stops short of granting communities' control. Its fiscal sharing provisions provide some revenue but do not alter ownership or authority. As a result, customary tenure has been steadily subordinated to statutory categories while central legislation like the Forest Rights Act remains under-implemented.

Conclusion

The tension between customary and statutory frameworks is part of a larger debate on tribal autonomy. The Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulation, 1873 grants Arunachal Pradesh special protection with regards to its forest, land and resources but unlike states under the Sixth Schedule, its village councils lack constitutional recognition and constitutional bodies like the Panchayat have not been empowered in the matter in its true sense. This creates uncertainty when statutory laws clash with customary norms. The applicability of the Forest Rights Act, 2006 is also contested. While it recognises community rights of tribals elsewhere in India, in Arunachal its enforcement has been limited due to the dominance of customary systems, an argument often put forward by the government officials whenever issues on legalising of forest rights arise. Another very recurring question that arises often is that if the central has complete control over the forests and resources through the various enactments over the years, does the tribals even have any legal protection of their ownership over forests and resources? Further, a deeper analysis also finds that the laws, regulations or directives issues by the state government have either been redundant or contradictory to the central policies thus making it imperative for new changes and amendments that balances development and modernisation and that which does not compromise the indigenous identity of the people of the state.

References

Aarti, Y. (2019, June 7). *Tribes and the forest a study of common property resources in Meghalaya.* Retrieved August 23, 2025, from Shodhganga: http://hdl.handle.net/10603/246230

Affairs, M. o. (2025). *Protected and Restricted Areas.* New Delhi: Government of India.

Agarwal, A. (2011, September). Implementation of Forest Rights Act, changing forest landscape and'politics of REDD+' in India. *Journal of Resources, Energy and Development (JREaD)*, 137. Retrieved August 21, 2025

Baruah, S. (2025). *Why Mizoram, Nagaland are silent on Centre's bid to regulateentry of foreigners via India-Myanmar border.* Guawahati: The Indian Express.

Bijoy, C. R. (2019, November 16). Forest Rights in the North East: Inching towards exclusion. *Economic and Political Weekly, 54*(45), p. Para 1. Retrieved August 21, 2025, from https://www.epw.in/journal/2019/45/commentary/forest-rights-north-east.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Bose, M. (1997). *History of Arunachal Pradesh.* New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Cornell Law School. (2022, May). *Legal Information Institute*. Retrieved from Cornell Law School: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/public_trust_doctrine

Dabi, T., & Mitra, A. (2019). Forest Resources and its Management in Arunachal Pradesh - an introspection. *Bulletin of Arunachal Forest Research, 34 (1&2)*, p. 47. Retrieved August 2025

Department, G. o. (1982). *The Arunachal Pradesh Code - Volume I.* Government of Arunachal Pradesh.

Elwin, V. (1960). *A Philosophy for NEFA.* New Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation. Retrieved August 2025

Hazarika, P. (2024). Nexus Between Insurgency and Narco-Trafficking: A Case Study of Manipur. *Vivekananda International Foundation*.

Hina, N. N. (2013). *The customary laws of the tribes of Arunachal Pradesh.* Delhi: Authorspress.

Indian Kanoon. (2019, July 26). *National Forest Policy 1952.* Retrieved from Indiankanoon: https://indiankanoon.org/doc/59409913/

Indiankanoon.org. (n.d.). Aruanchal Pradesh Anchal Forest Reserve (Constitution and Maintenance) Act, 1975. *Indiankanoon*. Retrieved August 21, 2025, from https://indiankanoon.org/doc/195357508/

Jangu, S. (2024, February 28). Debate intensifies over scrapping of Free Movement Regime on India-Myanmar border. *Frontline Magazine* .

Lalrinchhana, D. (2024). *Mizoram CM Lalduhoma's speech on Mizo community in U.S. did not violate Indian Constitution.* Guwahati: The Hindu.

Ministry of Tribal Affairs, G. o. (2014). *Forests Rights Act, 2006*. Retrieved August 24, 2025, from forest.mizoram.gov.in: https://forest.mizoram.gov.in/uploads/attachments/827f93825f8de34b73553ff352c0a9f6/frarulesbook.pdf

Mukherjee, D. (2023, August 30). *Better or worsen conservation?* Retrieved August 23, 2025, from The Arunachal Times: https://arunachaltimes.in/index.php/2023/08/30/better-or-worsen-conservation/

North East Now News. (2018). *Arunachal Assembly passes Land Settlement and Records Amendment Bill 2018.* North East News. Retrieved August 24, 2025, from https://nenow.in/north-east-news/arunachal-assembly-passes-land-settlement-records-amendment-bill-2018.html

Pradesh, D. o. (2023). *Development Statistics Atlas of Arunachal Pradesh - 2020.* Itanagar: Directorate of Economics & Statistics.

Rhakho, R. (2025). *Nagaland Legislative Assembly echoes with opposition to FMR scrapping and PAR re-imposition.* Kohima: Eastern Mirror.

Sharma, C. K. (2019, June). The New Land Settlement Act in Arunachal Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, p. 1.

Sharma, C. K. (2019). The New Land Settlement Act in Arunachal Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly, 23*, 18.

Sharma, S. (2025, June 15). *Massive protest erupts in Assam's Bodoland over Adani's thermal power project in Kokrajhar*. Retrieved from The Federal: https://thefederal.com/category/states/north-east/assam/assam-govt-converts-forest-land-adani-thermal-plant-kokrajhar-bodo-tribals-192018

Lyceum India Journal of Social Sciences || ISSN (Online): 3048-6513

Volume: 3 Issue: 1 || January 2026 || DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18404755

Singh, R. (2024). *I regret, apologise': Chief Minister N Biren Singh on Manipur violence.* New Delhi: Business Standard.

Singh, V. (2024). *Why has the MHA reimposed restrictions in three North East States: Explain.* New Delhi: The Hindu.

Vanlalruata, H. (2025). *3.63Ltourists visited Mizoram from April-December: Minister.* Guwahati: Times of India.

Vijaita Singh, A. L. (2024). *Over 5,000 Myanmar refugees take shelter in Manipur's Naga district.* New Delhi: The Hindu.

Wire, T. (2025). *'State Being Used as Transit Route': Mizoram CM's U-Turn on Scrapping of Free Movement Regime.* Guwahati: The Wire.

Publisher's Note: *The views and opinions expressed in this article are solely those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher, editors, or the editorial board.*