# HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION FOR PUBLICATION

This final report should be read as the continuation of the Interim Report since the materials stood then were treated as Prima Facie to record findings on several questions subject to the Final Report which was clearly declared therein at each stage of drawing inferences.

The incidents of attack in various places of worship has occurred in various Districts and the cause, the event and the consequences have not been uniform. Diverse circumstances and varying degree of responses are found in different locations both in terms of people who have perpetrated or been victims and also District Administration. Therefore, the Findings in respect of each incident of attack have been separately recorded and forms the body of the main report. These highlights give only a gist and broad view of the situation and by no means uniformly applicable to all incidents in generality .

- The attacks on various places of worship across Karnataka are true and definitely in the Districts of Bangalore, Kolar, Chikkaballapur, Bellary, Davanagere, Chikkamagalur, Udupi and Dakshina Kannada and more particularly in cities of Mangalore and Davanagere.

- The extent and magnitude of attacks varies from very little to colossal.(Annexure-XLVII)

- Not all attacks were spontaneous or accidental. Some were deliberate, well planned communal antagonism with fundamentalism brewing since several years. The events leading to attacks were many including local groupism, personal, competition in trade, education and political activities.

- It is evident that the reprehensible, unjustified and atrocious attack on a monastery in Mangalore (Adoration Monastery) and its ardent pious devotees which is considered as a very holy and sacred place by all denominations of Christians and which stirred their heart and soul and religious sentiments triggered off series of incidents across the state. Some incidents of attack are true, some self inflicted, some make believe, some blown out of proportions and some totally politicalised.

- The true Hindus have no role to play in any attack directly or indirectly, but the attacks are indulged in by misguided fundamentalist miscreants of defined or undefined groups or organizations against Christians and Christianity who have mistakenly presumed that they would be protected by the Party in power with their policies at the relevant time.

- The concerned Police in all the districts did their best and have been successful in nabbing most of such miscreants and large number of charge sheets have been filed in various Courts which will have to finally adjudicate their identity and culpability.(Annexure-L).

- There is no basis to the apprehension of Christian petitioners that the Politicians, BJP, mainstream Sangha Parivar and State Govt. directly or indirectly, are involved in the attacks. In fact no Politician or representative of any political party in the state who politicalized the incidents of attack for their benefits immediately did not come before the Commission with their affidavits or to give evidence or opinion in the matter

- The issue of conversions and circulation of derogatory literature with insulting attitude against Hindus has been the recurring impressions of large number of Hindu petitioners and is being projected as the reason for attacks.

- There appears to be no conversions at all by Roman Catholic Churches or its members except for routine purposes like marriage or voluntary instances. But there are clear indications of conversions to Christianity in the districts of Bangalore, Kolar, Chikkaballapur, Bellary, Davanagere, Chikkamagalur, Udupi by few organizations and self styled or self appointed Pastors continuing as Hindus by religion for all benefits of law by circumstances and inducements and as a commercial bargain using unaccounted local and funds of the foreign countries but not necessarily by compulsion or fraud or coercion but definitely by inducements.

- However, even such conversions were only of faith and not of religion in legal or technical sense. But this has damaged the reputation and holy image of the genuine and true Christians in sacred Indian Christianity and their known service and valuable contribution to the nation in various fields and in various ways specially in education and Health. Such activities of some organisations are going on uncontrolled by any law or regulation requiring some legislation to regulate them within the scope of Art 25 of the Constitution of India.

- The attack on the churches or places of worship has deeply affected the harmony between the members of Hindu and Christian religions and created suspicion in the minds of each other.

- The failure of the District Administration functionaries including Corporation, Municipality, Electricity Board and Village Panchayath authorities in protecting the rights of the religious minorities guaranteed under the Constitution and their interference in their activities by misuse of power is evident and apparent particularly in Bellary and Davanagere Districts as indicated in the report. Their acts of locking the places of worship and preventing the devotees from

offering prayers is unprecedented in the history of Administrative process and constitutional Governance.

- The impression and allegations that the top Police Officers and the District Administration had colluded with attackers in attacking the churches or places of worship has no merit.

- The Police action against the Christian protestors in several incidents were justified except at St. Sebastian Church, Permanur unexplainably excessive and unreasonable and is in violation of the expected norms prescribed . But the same cannot be generalised for all police actions at different locations.

- It was imprudent, unreasonable and inexperienced act on the part of the Police to enter into the premises of some Churches in Dakshina Kannada without following legal requirements amounting to violation of religious interests and human rights protected under the Constitution of India. But the saving grace is that there is no evidence to conclude that it was motivated or influenced by any other force.

- The impression created incidentally that due to the alleged excesses of the police during the lathi charge etc. in Dakshina Kannada incidents the innocent people like children, women were also victimised unjustifiably is true in a few instances noted in the report categorically.

- The impressions and allegations that the Government and the District Administration did not treat the Christian protestors sympathetically and with compassion is justified in a few instances noted in the report categorically.

- The grievance that the compensation awarded in some of the districts is too meagre and scanty or inadequate and even contemptuous or nil and require enhancement is totally justified

- The impressions and allegations that some local leaders and the Govt did not evince any interest either by local enquiry, spot inspection or by other methods nor tried to console the victims by assuring necessary protection or remedies appear to be reasonable from the point of view of such victims but not totally justified.

- The impressions and allegations that the present ruling government is showing cold shoulders to the interest of minority Christian community in Karnataka and try to suppress them for the political ends like vote catching methods has no basis.

- The allegations and impressions given to the members of the Hindu religion that Christians are indulging in mischievous activities by commercializing or inducements etc and by using their literature maligning the Hindu Religion, Hindu ancient systems, Hindu sacred beliefs, practices and sentiments appears mostly probable and true at some locations.

- The allegation and the impression that some persons involved in conversions are getting funds from some sources including foreign countries and misuse it for mass conversions of innocent and helpless members of the society belonging to weaker sections is true.

- The proposal of some Hindu Memorialists that all the literatures including the portions of Bible that are anathema to Hindu practices should be banned including banning of conversion has no merit or justification.

- The proposal of many Hindu religious people for suitable legislation to prevent practices detrimental to the interest of Hindu religion is justified

- The plea of many Christian memorialists for taking action as per law against Mr.Mahendra Kumar, the then Convener of Bajrangdal who publicly sought to justify the attacks on Churches is totally justified.

- The plea of the Bible Society of India , Bangalore and other Christian Memorialists that the tenets or philosophy of Christianity tested or questioned during inquiry should be excluded from the records by expunging them is accepted and expunged totally and this shall be made applicable to Hindu tenets and religion also.

- The suggestion of the learned Advocates for the Govt. and Police and Hindu Memorialists that the Christian places of worship should be brought under some legislation like Hindus and Muslims in the Country for proper regulation and control within the meaning of Art.25 of the Constitution is well founded and accepted.

- The Plea of the learned advocate Mr.Jagadish that the Organizations like Bajrangdal needs identification and registration for legal control deserves acceptance. This may be applied to all such organizations of all religions.

- The suggestion of Mr. Ibrahim the learned Advocate that local religions conciliation Committees with statutory powers to be constituted for dealing with religious conflicts is accepted.

- The suggestion of Mr.Sathischandra, the learned Advocate for a stringent financial check and audit of the activities of Pastors is totally justified and accepted.

**The Commission suggests and recommends to the Govt to consider and implement the following;**

1. The sincerity and commitment of the Govt. to ensure protection to all the religions and their Institutions in the State and particularly in the affected Districts due to attacks detailed in the findings and specially to minority religions in all respects should be spelt out in clear terms without politicization. A suitable unanimous resolution of the State Legislature by all the Political parties is more desirable to satisfy all sections of society as model for the Country.

2. The Govt., through its appropriate high level elected representative, as a first measure, should convince the affected Christian Institutions and persons that it is sensitive to their miseries and sentiments suffered due to unpleasant incidents of attacks in all forms with sympathy, compassion and concern by taking all the religions and Political parties into confidence.

3. The District Administration at all levels should be made liable for all violations in any form and extent of such protection for the past and future.

4. A common modality should be framed and adopted for all the District Administration to deal with all situations of religious matters uniformly, impartially and effectively and speedily.

5. The Intelligence wing of the Govt at least in each District may be geared up with trained personnel, infrastructure, headed by expertise, and commitment to social and religious causes specially to deal with religious

conflicts supervised and monitored at least by an Officer of the Division or District of IGP Cadre of the State who should report to the DGP periodically for review and action for implementation once in six months and to be reviewed by the Govt., with a report to be placed on the floor of the House annually for information and discussion and confirmation and for necessary action.

6. An exclusive Police Station with specially trained Police Officers like CBI for religious matters in each District under the control of an exclusive Dy, S.P may be constituted with special powers to effectively function without the interference of the Govt. A special legislation may be made for the purpose if necessary.

7. The State should take all the measures to ensure fundamental rights for freedom of conscience, profession and propagation of religion within the meaning of Art 25 of the Constitution of India in letter and spirit. For this purpose a 'Commission of Religions' with statutory powers may be constituted representing all religions through their religious heads and a Registrar of Religions to execute the policies of the Commission through the agencies of the Govt. with its own regulations and decisions binding on the Govt. The Govt. may conduct a special census of religions and their institutions and constitution through the Commission and maintain a record of the same with the Registrar of Religions which will ensure protection and privileges to genuine members of a religious minority and eliminate fraudulent methods of misusing a religious tag for selfish purposes detrimental to the religious interests of the Country within the Constitutional expectations. With this the Registrar must be able to regulate the activities of the respective religions within the meaning of Art 25 and Art 30 of the Constitution.

8. Religious harmony awareness programme may be initiated at village and taluk levels to avoid any expected religious conflicts with elders of all religions Constituting peace Committees with statutory powers to the members with wide publicity through press and media.

9. Legislations through Special Law within the competence of the State under the Lists of the Constitution may be passed to ensure prevention of Atrocities on any person in the name of Religion in any form and protection of all persons claiming the privileges by virtue of a religion as per law without reference to the conflicting legal consequences. ( may be called 'Prevention and punishments for atrocities on the religions and the faiths Act, 2011 with Rules for immediate implementation through an Ordinance if necessary)

10. The scope of Chapter XV (Sections 295, 295-A to 298) of IPC may be enlarged under the said Special Law with stringent sentences of minimum period of punishment, with no bail and no right of appeal in addition to disqualification to contest in any election or to hold any post or office in any status either for a term or permanently.

11. All Organizations in whatever name or form preaching or practicing any activity against any religion in any form should be under constant scrutiny of the Law enforcing agencies as per law existing or to be legislated with the serious consequences of stringent punishments like recommendations at Sl. No. 9 and 10 above .

12. All materials in any form (electronic also) including literature, books, pamphlets publications the press and media using abusive or insulting expressions directly or indirectly with innuendos touching the religious interests should be prohibited and censured.

13. Filming and /or televising or playing offending religious sentiments should be totally prohibited and censured as the case may be with stringent legal action as per law if violated.

14. A religion regulatory authority may be constituted under a legislation or executive power of the State for the purpose of recommendations in Sl. Nos. 9 to 13

15. The appropriate Authorities should be instructed to consider and dispose of applications by all religious Institutions or persons pending or made for change of Khatha, licence or permission as per law within a reasonable time with report of Compliance to the Govt. within a short time frame.

16. Compensation of all claims pending or made after the interim report or within a reasonable time hereinafter as recommended for damages to the property or injury to any person during the incidents and thereafter shall be inquired and paid within one month from the date of communication of the recommendations of the Commission by the Govt., by the appropriate authorities like the Dy Commissioner of the Districts deducting any amount already paid as indicated in the report while dealing with petitions of each District.

17. There must be least or no policing regarding all religious matters of all religions and to be handled with care and compassion by taking the religious leaders or heads into confidence and entry into any religious place by the police for any action should be totally prohibited except with the permission or at least in consultation with the religious persons in charge of such places or as per law of Criminal Procedure with search warrant etc..

18. The highlights of this report shall be published immediately thorough a special notification through all methods including press and media (including electronic) as required under the provisions of RTI Act .

19. The recommendations of the Commission are expected to be totally or as far as possible shall be implemented within a period of six months from today with any modification if necessary. A task force under the Chairmanship of this Commission with nominated members representing the Govt, Advocate General or his nominee, some Advocates who participated in the inquiry and assisted by the Secretary of the Commission may be constituted for monitoring the implementation of the report within the time stipulation or at the earliest.

20. Suitable legislations may be passed for implementing the recommendations of the Commission in the proper form.

21. All decisions taken by the Govt. on the recommendations of the Commission and the implementation by the Govt may be published as per the provisions of RTI Act by a special notification.

Place: Bangalore
Date: 28-01-2011

**(Justice B.K.Somasekhara)**
**(Justice B.K.Somsekhara Commission of Inquiry)**

**Implications of the Commissions Inquiry Act, 1952 and The Right to Information Act, 2005 on the powers of the Commissions of Inquiry**

When the interim report was submitted to the Government on 1.2.2010, a big adverse response was generated regarding the manner and method in which the report was submitted with its said to be controversial contents. Therefore, a clarificatory note (Annexure 34(A) was issued to clear the misgivings and mis-interpretations regarding the same). Many persons and institutions and the press and media raised a volley of questions about the procedure adopted by the Commission in submitting the report. In addition to that, a serious contention was raised by most of the learned Advocates about the scope and jurisdiction of this Commission to inquire into certain issues within the meaning of references of the Government in its Order of appointment of the Commission dated 19.9.2008 (Annexure II). Therefore, the Commission has proposed to record its definite views regarding such issues for its own benefit and for the benefit of all the wise and learned people raising such issues.

The Commission has proposed to briefly record the scope and implications of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 (In short COI Act) and the Right to Information Act, 2005 ( In short RTI Act) . However this may not be taken as the elaborate Treatise or interpretation of the two enactments since this is meant only for the purpose of the Report in this inquiry.

We are dealing with the Commissions of Inquiry Act (COI Act) initially. This Act came into force on 14th August 1952. It was amended under Act 79/71, 4/1986, 36/1986, 63/1988 and 19/1990. Presently 1990 Act is in operation. Rules may be framed by the appropriate Government under Sec.12 of the Act. The Central Government Rules 1972 are in operation since 15th July 1972. None pointed out any rules framed by the Govt. of Karnataka. The Commissions of Inquiry (Central) Rules, 1972 are not applicable to this Commission since Rule 1(3) makes it applicable to a COI appointed by the Central Government only and this Commission was appointed by the State Government of Karnataka. Historically the root of this in India is in Public Service inquiries Act 1850 which was repealed

by this Act. It is a small legislation with only 12 provisions with very big consequences on individuals and the State. Since this Act is not properly and fully interpreted lot of misunderstandings and misapplication of many known or unknown practices by many in their own way has occurred and therefore, this small effort to examine the implications became necessary for the Commission.

The Act is for (1) Appointment of Commissions of Inquiry and (2) for vesting the Commission with certain powers. This is a Central Act with provisions with a preamble.

The powers of the Government under the Act are defined or incorporated in the provisions of Section 3 under the title "Appointment of Commission", Sec.5 "Additional powers of the Commission", Sec.7 "Commission to cease to exist when so notified" and Sec. 12 "Power to make rules". The powers of the Commission are under the provisions Sec.3 -to make an inquiry into any definite matter of public importance and performing such functions as may be specified in the notification under the provisions and report to the Government if necessary, Sec.4-the powers of the Civil Court, which can be exercised by the Commission, Sec.5-additional powers conferred by the Government under sub clause 2 to 4 of this provision, 5-A- power to utilize the services of certain officers and investigating agencies for conducting investigation pertaining to inquiry, Sec.5-B-power to appoint assessors, Sec.8 -to regulate the procedure to be followed by the Commission and Sec.10-A- prosecution of any person for the act calculated to bring the Commission or any member thereof into disrepute.

The powers of the legislatures whether Parliament or State legislatures is found in nothing more than Sec. 3 sub clause (1) -to pass a resolution to appoint a Commission and the right to get the report of the Commission placed on the floor of the House by the government together with the memorandum of action taken thereon within a period of six months of the submission of the report by the Commission to the Government and under Section 7- the power to pass a resolution to close the Commission if its existence is unnecessary. Therefore, the legislature or the parliament comes into picture only on three stages - if necessary for appointment , to know the report and the action taken by the Government

and to close the Commission under certain circumstances. The Act has not provided any nexus or relationship or obligation between the Commission and the Parliament or legislatures for any purpose. The impressions of certain persons or institutions including the legislatures that it has a right to know about the contents of the report of the Commission first is misconceived and beyond the scope of the provisions of the Act. If at all the legislatures have a role it is in dealing with the matter against the Government as per law for violation of Sec. 3 sub clause 4 of the Act for not placing the report on the floor of the House along with the memorandum of the action taken thereon or in case the Commission is appointed by resolution passed by the legislatures to close the Commission by passing a resolution under Sec. 7 of the Act. Beyond this neither there is any privilege for the houses or Legislatures regarding the conduct of the Commission at any stage nor any conduct of the Commission becomes a privilege issue to be dealt with by the legislatures as against the Commission.

The impressions that the report should be submitted to any particular functionary of the Government either confidentially or otherwise and failure is a violation is an absolute ignorance of law and the true implications of the provisions of the Act for anyone in the field of law or outside. Truly, the appropriate Government, which is the Central Government or State Government is empowered to frame rules under Sec 12 sub clause (2) (b) & (c) of the Act regarding the manner in which inquiry may be held and the procedure to be followed by the Commission in respect of the proceedings, and the powers of the civil court which may be vested in the Commission. This is also in view of Sec. 4 of the Act conferring the powers of the Civil Court on the Commission under C.P.C. for certain purposes from sub clause (a) to (f) and however by virtue of framing the rules under later provision, the scope of the same can be enlarged. The law appears to be settled by precedents that a Commission of Inquiry is deemed to be a Civil Court for all purposes and not a mere empty formal institution to cater the needs of particular forces. Truly the Government could have framed the rules to regulate the procedure of the Commission including the manner and method in which the reports are to be submitted by the Commission to the Government either confidentially or otherwise. However, with the reservations of the

contentions that the Government could have regulated it under the notification issued under Sec. 3(1) of the Act to regulate the procedure, the Commission feels that the executive power of the Government under the Administrative Law may be normally extended for the benefit of the public and not for the detrimental to the proceedings of the Commission. This can be further fortified with the true implications of Sec. 8 of the Act which empowers the Commission to regulate its own procedure subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf. This Commission has already framed the Regulations (Annexure-IV) and has been continuously implementing it in letter and spirit. Presuming that the Government had framed relevant rules under Sec. 12 regarding the manner and method in which the report has to be submitted , probably the regulations under Sec. 8 were subject to such rules. None of the learned Advocates including the Additional Advocate General point out any such rules framed by the Government under Sec. 12 of the Act. Therefore, the regulations (Annexure-IV) framed by this Commission is the law for all purposes to be followed and binding on all concerned persons within the meaning of definition of law under Article 13 of the Constitution of India since the regulation has the force of law. Therefore, the manner and method in which the report has to be submitted by the Commission is also within its own powers under Section 8 of the Act ( may be as a delegated or subordinate legislation) and nobody could question it except according to law. At the same time, since the Commission had nothing to do with the legislatures or the Houses under the provisions stated above either regarding its obligation or relationship, regulations of its own procedure in submitting the report could never become the issue of privilege of the Houses either under the Constitution of India or under the present Act.

Probably these expressions with the interpretations of the Commission of Inquiry Act, 1952 and Right to Information Act, 2005 may clear the doubt of all the persons raising their eyebrows as to why this Commission submitted the interim report on 1.2.2010 in the manner it regulated its procedure in an open manner to the extent necessary or possible.

Now we are examining the provisions of The Right to Information Act, 2005 (In short The RTI Act), to understand its implications on the provisions of The Commission of Inquiry Act while regulating its own procedure under section 8 of the COI Act.

Definitions:

The law is settled that the Right to information is a fundamental right under Article 14 of Constitution of India. This law is codified in the RTI Act.

RTI Act is a special law and prevails over general law of the privileged communications in law of Evidence and official secrets law however subject to limitation prescribed in the very Act ( Generalia specialibus non derogant).

The Act is a small one with great ideals, with 5 Chapters and 26 Provisions. It came into force on 12-10-2005. Whatever principles are included in the Act regarding the subject matter "Right to Information" prevails over all other laws including the COI Act.

The preamble is clear and significant in implications and to read;

**"**An Act to provide for setting out the practical regime of right to information for citizens to secure access to information under the control of public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority, the constitution of a Central Information Commission and State Information Commissions and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto**.**

Whereas the Constitution of India has established democratic Republic;

And whereas democracy requires an informed citizenry and transparency of information which are vital to its functioning and also to contain corruption and to hold Governments and their instrumentalities accountable to the governed;

And whereas revelation of information in actual practice is likely to conflict with other public interests including efficient operations of the Governments, optimum use of limited fiscal resources and the preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information;

And whereas it is necessary to harmonise these conflicting interests while preserving the paramountcy of the democratic ideal;

Now, therefore, it is expedient to provide for furnishing certain information to citizens who desire to have it."

Certain definitions in the Act are important and relevant. They are under Section 2 (f) 'information' 2(h) 'public authority' 2(i) 'record', 2(j) right to information and may be repeated;

2(f) "information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, **reports**, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;

2(h) "public authority" means any authority or body or institution of self-government established or constituted—

(a) by or under the Constitution;
(b) by any other law made by Parliament;
(c) by any other law made by State Legislature;
(d) by notification issued or order made by the appropriate Government, and includes any—

i) body owned, controlled or substantially financed:
ii) non-Government Organisation substantially financed,

directly or indirectly by funds provided by the appropriate Government

2(i) "record" includes –

(i) any document, manuscript and file;

(ii) any microfilm, microfiche and facsimile copy of a document;

(iii) any reproduction of image or images embodied in such microfilm (whether enlarged or not); and

(iv) any other material produced by a computer or any other device

2(j ) "right to information" means the right to information accessible under this Act which is held by or under the control of any public authority and includes the right to –

(i) inspection of work, documents, records
(ii) taking notes, extracts, or certified copies of documents or records;
(iii) taking certified samples of material;
(iv) obtaining information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes, video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such is stored in a Computer or in any other device;

The definition of "public authority" has to be understood initially. As repeated supra a public authority is any authority or body or institution established or constituted under the Constitution, by any other law made by Parliament, or by any other law made by State Legislature, by notification issued or order made by the appropriate Government etc., etc., Admittedly and undoubtedly this Commission has been appointed by the State Government under Sec. 3 (1) of the Act which is the law made by the Parliament and under dt. 19/09/2008 (Annexure-II) by the State Govt of Karnataka . Therefore this Commission being a public authority within the meaning of Sec.2(h) can never be doubted at all.

Patently, the definition of information includes ***Report.*** Logically and legally such a ***Report*** should be meant to be a report of the public authority to be read within the meaning of Sec. 3 (1) & (4) of the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Therefore deductably it means ***the Report of the Commission*** under Section 3(4) of COI Act.

The public authority is bound to or oblige to publish all the information for the benefit of the public according to the procedure regulated under Sec. 4 of the Act including online as per sub clause (4). Because, every citizen or every person has right to information which includes report within the meaning of Sec. 2 (f) of the Act. It is contended that such an obligation is subject to Sec. 8 of the RTI Act. It is true that according to Sec. 8 sub clause (1) (a), if the disclosure of information may prejudicially affect the security etc., it may exonerate such public authority from disclosure, but the Commission is doubtful whether Sec. 8 is applicable to a public authority and whether it applies to only to the Commission of Information within the meaning of Sec. 2 (b) to (d) of the Act. Even then the Commission has discretion and the duty to examine whether the disclosure of the report to the public as information would affect the interest of sovereign and affects the security etc.,. and cannot be absolute on the Commission to disclose the information.

In the context of the provisions of Commissions of Inquiry Act, RTI Act supra, this Commission is of the considered opinion and the view that it is obligatory for the Commission to disclose the information and the report to all the persons who are the members of the public in the manner it deems fit, however, subject to certain conditions to be imposed if necessary. Therefore, the Commission is certain that what it did while submitting the interim report on 1.2.2010 was justified or obligatory and was reasonable and totally legal and constitutional within the meaning of Article 14 of the Constitution to disseminate the Right to Information to the beneficiaries viz., the members of the public. Therefore the Commission has proposed to follow the same procedure while submitting this final report also and further improving to publish it online subject to whatever conditions which the Commission deems fit.