eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

Digitalization of Agriculture : Legal Analysis for Safe Chemical Use & Pesticide Governance, Smart Contracts & Electronic Records in Uttar Pradesh

Rajeev Kumar[1] & Dr Rana Parveen[2]
[1]Research Scholar Shri Venkateshwara University Gajraula, Distt. Amroha, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Supervisor, Shri Venkateshwara University Gajraula, Distt. Amroha, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received: 21 March 2026 Accepted & Reviewed: 25 March 2026, Published: 31 March 2026

Abstract

Agriculture in Uttar Pradesh (UP) is undergoing a paradigm shift driven by the integration of digital technologies into traditional regulatory frameworks. This paper examines the legal architecture governing three critical pillars of this transformation: safe chemical use, the adoption of smart contracts, and the digitization of land and agricultural records. First, the study analyzes the transition from the Insecticides Act, 1968 to the Draft Pesticides Management Bill, 2025, highlighting how mandatory QR-code traceability and digital registries aim to mitigate the proliferation of spurious pesticides in UP. Second, it evaluates the enforceability of Blockchain-based Smart Contracts under the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the Indian Contract Act, 1872, assessing their potential to automate crop procurement and payment security for smallholder farmers. Finally, the paper reviews the state's progress in electronic record-keeping, specifically through the UP-Agrees initiative and the AgriStack framework, which link digital land records (Khatauni) to unique Farmer IDs for automated welfare delivery. The analysis concludes that while the digital infrastructure offers unprecedented transparency and safety, significant legal hurdles—including data privacy concerns, digital literacy gaps, and the need for standardized cyber-laws—must be addressed to ensure a resilient and equitable digital agricultural ecosystem in Uttar Pradesh.

Keywords: Digital Agriculture, Uttar Pradesh, Pesticide Governance, Smart Contracts, IT Act 2000, AgriStack, Electronic Health Records (EHR) for Land, UP-Agrees.

Introduction

Agriculture in Uttar Pradesh (UP), the backbone of India's food security, is at a critical juncture of digital transformation. As the state strives toward a **$1 trillion economy**, it is shifting from a labor-intensive traditional model to a data-driven "Agriculture 3.0" ecosystem. This evolution is underpinned by the **UP-AGREES** project (UP Agriculture Growth and Rural Enterprise Ecosystem Strengthening), a ₹4,000-crore initiative supported by the World Bank that integrates advanced Industry 4.0 technologies like AI, IoT, and blockchain across 28 districts.

However, this rapid digitization brings complex legal challenges that necessitate a robust regulatory overhaul. Central to this is the governance of pesticides. With the **Draft Pesticides Management Bill, 2025** poised to replace the outdated **Insecticides Act, 1968**, the state is transitioning toward a regime of digital transparency and supply-chain traceability. This legislation introduces mandatory QR-code labelling to combat the roughly 25% of spurious pesticides in the market, though critics highlight a "softening" of risk-reduction language and limited state-level enforcement powers.

Simultaneously, the adoption of **smart contracts**—self-executing digital agreements—promises to revolutionize crop procurement by automating payments and ensuring fair pricing through blockchain technology. While these contracts offer efficiency, their legal validity under the **Information Technology**

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

Act, 2000 and the **Indian Contract Act, 1872** remains a subject of intense academic and judicial scrutiny, particularly regarding issues of jurisdiction and autonomous liability.

Finally, the digitization of **electronic records** serves as the foundation for this new era. Through the national **AgriStack** and the state's **Digital Agriculture Policy** (framed in late 2025), UP is linking millions of **Khasra** (landholding) records to unique Farmer IDs. This "UP-AgriVerse" aims to provide real-time data on crops, weather, and logistics, enabling predictive decision-making for even the smallest marginal farmers.

This paper explores the intersection of these three digital pillars, providing a comprehensive legal analysis of how Uttar Pradesh is navigating the transition from a paper-driven past to a predictive, tech-enabled future.

This comparative table outlines the major legal and regulatory shifts from the traditional paper-based regime to the new digital framework in Uttar Pradesh.

Table 1

Legal Transformation: 1968 Act vs. 2025 Digital Framework

Feature	Insecticides Act, 1968 (Traditional)	Pesticides Management Bill, 2025 (Digital Era)
Primary Goal	Product control for high agricultural yield Global Agriculture .	Risk-based governance for human and environmental safety Sanskriti IAS +1 .
Traceability	Manual ledger-based tracking; high risk of spurious products Sanskriti IAS .	Mandatory **QR codes** and digital batch-level tracking PMF IAS +1 .
Registration	Product-centric; often faced long, manual delays Global Agriculture .	Entirely online; "deemed registration" for generics after 18 months Global Agriculture +1 .
Labelling	Standard printed labels in English/Hindi only QR Code Chimp .	Dynamic **Smart Labels** with regional language support via scan Studio1Hub +1 .
Enforcement	Focus on criminal prosecution for all violations Global Agriculture .	Graded penalties; decriminalisation of minor procedural lapses Global Agriculture +1 .
Record Keeping	Physical registers kept at individual retail points Studio1Hub .	Centralised digital registry; mandatory digital sales/stock records Global Agriculture +1 .
State Powers	Limited to sample collection and inspection Sanskriti IAS .	Power to define enhanced local penalties and issue **1-year batch bans** Shankar IAS Parliament +1 .

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

Blockchain & Electronic Records Integration

Table 2

Element	Legal Status in Uttar Pradesh (as of 2025/26)
Smart Contracts	Legally valid if they meet **Indian Contract Act** essentials; recognized as electronic records under **Section 10A of the IT Act** Vidhisastras +1 .
Electronic Evidence	Blockchain records are admissible in court, provided they satisfy technical certification requirements under the **Indian Evidence Act** Vidhisastras +1 .
Land Records	Transitioned to **AgriStack**; every plot now has a digital "fingerprint" linked to a unique Farmer ID Global Agriculture +1 .
Testing Labs	**Mandatory NABL/GLP accreditation** for all labs to ensure digital data credibility in the supply chain Shankar IAS Parliament +1 .

Legal Framework for Safe Chemical Use & Pesticide Governance: Urgency for Uttar Pradesh

Regulations Under the Insecticides Act, 1968, and Central Insecticide Board:

- The Insecticides Act, 1968 (Legal Basis): This is the primary legislation in India that regulates the import, manufacture, sale, transport, distribution, and use of insecticides (a term that broadly includes all pesticides) to prevent risk to human beings and animals.
  - Mandatory Registration: It mandates the compulsory registration of all pesticides at the central level by the Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIBRC) before they can be imported, manufactured, or sold in India. This ensures that only pesticides evaluated for safety and efficacy are allowed.
  - Licensing: The Act requires licenses for the manufacture, formulation, and sale of insecticides, which are primarily dealt with at the state level (e.g., by the Directorate of Agriculture in Uttar Pradesh). This means pesticide dealers and manufacturers in UP must hold valid licenses.
  - Provisions for Quality Control: The Act includes provisions for the appointment of Insecticide Analysts and Inspectors, who have powers to draw samples, inspect premises, and enforce compliance with quality standards, labeling, and packaging norms.
  - Penalties: It also prescribes penalties for violations, including imprisonment and fines.
- Central Insecticides Board (CIB) and Registration Committee (RC) (Regulatory Bodies):
  - CIB: Advises the Central and State Governments on technical matters relating to the administration of the Act, including the hazards of pesticides, tolerance limits for residues, and safe use practices.
  - RC: Responsible for the registration of insecticides after scrutinizing their efficacy and safety data. It can also impose conditions for registration and recommend the banning or restriction of harmful pesticides.

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

- UP's Role: Uttar Pradesh's Department of Agriculture is responsible for implementing the provisions of the Act at the state level, including issuing and revoking licenses for pesticide dealers and manufacturers, conducting inspections, and prosecuting violations.

6.5.2. Widespread Compliance Gaps (Significant Challenge):

Despite a seemingly robust legal framework, compliance at the ground level, particularly among farmers and local dealers, is a major challenge in UP.

- Farmer Awareness Deficit: A significant portion of farmers lack adequate knowledge about:
  - Correct Dosage and Application: Leading to under-dosing (ineffective pest control, development of resistance) or over-dosing (residue issues, environmental damage).
  - Pre-Harvest Interval (PHI): The critical waiting period between pesticide application and harvesting to allow residues to dissipate.
  - Banned/Restricted Pesticides: Farmers may unknowingly use pesticides banned in certain markets or altogether.
  - Personal Protective Equipment (PPE): Lack of awareness or unwillingness to use masks, gloves, and other protective gear, leading to direct health hazards. Studies in UP and Uttarakhand indicate that a high percentage of farmers (e.g., 69.59% in one study) take no precautionary measures during pesticide use.
- Dealer Practices:
  - Unlicensed Dealers: Presence of unauthorized dealers selling pesticides without proper licenses.
  - Sale of Banned/Substandard Products: The illicit sale of spurious, substandard, or unapproved pesticides, often at lower prices, which can be ineffective and harmful.
  - Lack of Guidance: Dealers often provide insufficient or incorrect advice to farmers on pesticide use, driven by sales targets.
- Enforcement Deficiencies:
  - Insufficient Inspectors: A shortage of trained Insecticide Inspectors to cover the vast agricultural areas of UP.
  - Limited Testing Facilities: Inadequate number of well-equipped pesticide testing laboratories at the district or regional level to regularly monitor the quality of pesticides sold and the residues in produce.
  - Weak Prosecution: Low conviction rates for violations of the Insecticides Act.
- Economic Pressures: Farmers often face economic pressure to achieve high yields and manage pests quickly, leading to reliance on readily available chemical solutions without sufficient understanding of risks.
- Fragmented Information Flow: Information from research institutions (Agricultural Universities, KVKs) and extension services often does not effectively reach all farmers, especially the marginalized ones.

Constitutional Duties and Suggested Stronger Pesticide Regulation:

The proposed strengthening of pesticide regulation is strongly supported by constitutional provisions:

- Article 47 (Duty to Raise Nutrition Levels and Public Health): This DPSP directly obliges the State to improve public health. Unsafe pesticide use leads to contaminated food and health hazards for farmers and consumers, directly undermining this duty. It mandates the State to ensure "safe food," which inherently requires safe pesticide use.
- Article 48A (Environmental Protection): This DPSP mandates the State to protect and improve the environment. Indiscriminate pesticide use contaminates soil, water bodies, and air, leading to biodiversity loss and ecological imbalance, thus violating Article 48A.

• Article 21 (Right to Life): The judiciary's expansive interpretation of Article 21 to include the right to a dignified life, a healthy environment, and access to safe food (as discussed in 6.1) provides a fundamental rights-based imperative for stricter pesticide governance.

Proposed Stronger Pesticide Regulation for UP:

To address the compliance gaps and uphold constitutional duties, the following measures are crucial:

1. Trained Applicator Certification:

o Mandatory Certification: Implement a mandatory certification program for all pesticide applicators, akin to licensing for drivers. This would involve rigorous training on:

▪ Safe handling, storage, and disposal of pesticides.
▪ Correct dosage calculation and application techniques.
▪ Understanding pesticide labels, MRLs, and PHI.
▪ Use and maintenance of PPE.
▪ Emergency response to poisoning.

o Tiered Certification: Potentially a tiered system (e.g., basic for general farmers, advanced for professional applicators or those handling highly toxic chemicals).

o Renewal & Continuing Education: Regular renewal of certification linked to continuing education to ensure updated knowledge.

o Role of KVKs/SAUs: Agricultural Universities and Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) in UP can play a central role in developing curricula and conducting these training and certification programs.

2. Data Monitoring (for Use and Impact):

o Digitized Pesticide Use Records: Mandate and facilitate digital record-keeping of pesticide sales (dealer to farmer) and on-farm application (farmer's record). This could be integrated with existing digital platforms like FPO portals or e-NAM.

o Residue Monitoring: Establish a network of well-equipped, NABL-accredited laboratories across UP to conduct regular and random sampling of agricultural produce (at farmgate, mandis, and retail) for pesticide residue analysis. This data should be publicly accessible.

o Health Surveillance: Systematically collect data on pesticide poisoning cases among farmers and agricultural workers.

o Environmental Monitoring: Monitor pesticide levels in soil, water bodies, and biodiversity hotspots.

o Real-time Insights: Utilize data analytics to identify areas of high pesticide use, common violations, and emerging MRL challenges, allowing for targeted interventions.

3. Periodic Public Audits:

o Independent Audits: Conduct regular, independent third-party audits of pesticide production units, distribution channels (dealers), and large-scale farming operations to verify compliance with regulations.

o Community Involvement: Empower local community groups, FPOs, and NGOs to participate in monitoring and reporting non-compliance. This could involve simplified reporting mechanisms and protection for whistleblowers.

o Transparency & Accountability: Publish audit reports and action taken against non-compliant entities to foster transparency and accountability.

o Public Awareness Campaigns: Use audit findings to inform targeted public awareness campaigns about risks and safe practices.

Implementing these stronger regulations, driven by constitutional duties, is not merely a matter of compliance but a critical investment in the health of UP's farmers and consumers, the sustainability of its agricultural

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

sector, and its competitiveness in global export markets. The urgency is underscored by the escalating MRL violations that threaten the state's economic prospects in agro-exports.

Smart Contracts & Electronic Records: Legal Framework for Digital Agriculture in Uttar Pradesh

The digitalization of agricultural markets in Uttar Pradesh, through initiatives like e-NAM and the emerging concept of "Digi-Nam," necessitates a robust legal framework that provides clarity and enforceability for all electronic transactions, records, and contractual agreements.

6.6.1. Digital Mandis (e-NAM, Digi-Nam) and the Need for Legal Clarity:

- e-NAM (Electronic National Agriculture Market) and Digi-Nam: These platforms facilitate online trading of agricultural produce, allowing farmers to access a wider market and potentially better prices.
  - Electronic Contracts: Transactions on e-NAM involve bids, offers, and acceptances that occur electronically. This forms the basis of an electronic contract.
  - Electronic Weight Records: Weighment of produce, which is crucial for determining the quantity and final price, is increasingly being digitized and recorded electronically within these platforms.
  - Electronic Payment Transfers: Payments from buyers to farmers are typically facilitated through electronic transfers (e.g., NEFT/RTGS, UPI), often directly into farmers' bank accounts.
- Legal Clarity Required: While the Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act), provides foundational legal recognition for electronic records and electronic signatures, specific clarity is needed for digital agricultural transactions.
  - IT Act, 2000: Sections 4 and 5 of the IT Act grant legal recognition to electronic records and electronic signatures, respectively, deeming them as legally equivalent to physical documents and handwritten signatures. Section 10A specifically validates electronic contracts, provided they meet the essential elements of a contract under the Indian Contract Act, 1872.
  - Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (as amended by IT Act): Sections 65A and 65B of the Evidence Act deal with the admissibility of electronic records as evidence in court. Section 65B requires a specific certificate to ensure the integrity and authenticity of the electronic record.
  - Challenges in Practice: While the general legal framework exists, the sheer volume and diversity of transactions on digital agri-platforms, coupled with varying levels of digital literacy among farmers, demand specific guidelines or rules to ensure:
    - Standardization of Electronic Records: Clear formats and protocols for capturing and storing electronic weight records, quality parameters, and other transaction details.
    - Proof of Consent: Ensuring that electronic "click-wrap" or "browse-wrap" agreements on these platforms clearly demonstrate farmer consent.
    - Dispute Resolution: Streamlined, legally recognized mechanisms for resolving disputes that arise from electronic transactions (e.g., quantity discrepancies, quality issues, payment delays).
    - Data Integrity and Security: Robust provisions for the integrity and security of electronic data, to prevent manipulation and fraud.

Smart Contracts and Blockchain-Based Deeds:

- Smart Contracts (Transformative Potential): Smart contracts are self-executing contracts where the terms of the agreement are directly written into lines of code, residing on a blockchain network. They automatically execute when pre-defined conditions are met.
  - Streamlining Forward-Sales and Procurement: Smart contracts have immense potential in agriculture for:
    - Automated Payments: Release of payment to farmers upon verification of delivery and quality parameters (e.g., through IoT sensors).

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

▪ Supply Chain Traceability: Creating immutable records of produce origin, cultivation practices, and movement through the supply chain.
▪ Insurance Payouts: Automated payouts for crop insurance based on weather data or yield loss verified by external oracles.
▪ Farmer-Offtake Contracts: Facilitating transparent and enforceable agreements between farmers and bulk buyers/processors for future harvest, reducing price volatility and ensuring market access.

- Enforceability Challenges & Necessity for Legal Amendments:

o "Regulatory Shadow" (Current Status): Smart contracts and blockchain technology largely operate in a "regulatory shadow" in India. While general contract principles (offer, acceptance, consideration, intent) apply, their automated nature and the immutability of blockchain raise specific legal questions.
o Indian Contract Act, 1872: This Act defines the essentials of a valid contract. While smart contracts can fulfill these, issues like "free consent" (e.g., in case of coding errors or vulnerabilities), "mistake," or "frustration of contract" become complex in a self-executing environment.
o Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (Need for Amendment):
▪ Admissibility of Blockchain Records: While electronic records are admissible under Section 65B, proving the authenticity and integrity of a blockchain-based record in court, especially across decentralized nodes, can be challenging. Specific amendments may be needed to clarify how blockchain records (which are distributed ledgers) can satisfy the stringent conditions of Section 65B, or to create a separate legal presumption of their integrity due to their inherent cryptographic security.
▪ Expert Testimony: Legal disputes involving smart contracts would heavily rely on expert testimony from blockchain developers and cybersecurity specialists to interpret the code and verify its execution.
o Information Technology Act, 2000 (Need for Amendment):
▪ Recognition of Blockchain-Based Deeds: The IT Act currently recognizes electronic records and digital signatures. However, specific recognition of "blockchain-based deeds" or "blockchain-based contracts" is needed to explicitly provide them with the same legal standing as traditional paper-based or even conventional electronic documents, without requiring a "wet signature" where the blockchain itself serves as the tamper-proof ledger.
▪ Legal Nature of Smart Contracts: Clarifying whether smart contracts are merely code, or if they constitute a legally binding agreement in themselves, or if they require an underlying traditional legal contract to be enforceable.
▪ Jurisdiction and Liability: Determining jurisdiction and liability in a decentralized, borderless blockchain environment.
o Specific Legislation: Some legal experts argue for a dedicated "Blockchain Act" or amendments to relevant sectoral laws (e.g., Agricultural Produce Marketing Acts, Warehousing Acts) to provide clear legal definitions and frameworks for blockchain use cases in agriculture.

Pilot Proposals in Uttar Pradesh:

- Blockchain-Linked Warehouse Receipts:

o Concept: Electronic warehouse receipts stored on a blockchain, providing immutable proof of ownership and quantity of stored produce. This can revolutionize agricultural finance by making warehouse receipts easily verifiable, transferable, and fungible collateral for loans (e.g., farmers can get credit against their stored produce).
o Legal Implication: The Warehousing (Development and Regulation) Act, 2007, already recognizes electronic warehouse receipts. However, integrating these with blockchain technology would require

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

clarifying the legal standing of a negotiable electronic warehouse receipt on a distributed ledger, ensuring its transferability and the rights of the "holder in due course" are recognized and protected in a blockchain context.

- Farmer-Offtake Contracts on Blockchain:
  - Concept: Digitizing and executing forward-sale or procurement contracts between farmers and buyers using smart contracts on a blockchain. This automates payment releases, verifies delivery, and can incorporate quality parameters, ensuring transparency and reducing payment delays or rejections.
  - Legal Implication: This would require explicit legal recognition of such smart contracts as binding agreements, with defined mechanisms for dispute resolution if the automated execution encounters errors or if off-chain conditions (like force majeure) apply. Clarity on how to modify or terminate a smart contract once deployed on a blockchain is also critical.

The Urgency for UP:

Uttar Pradesh's push for digital agriculture and its immense potential in agri-exports mean that ambiguity in the legal framework for electronic records and smart contracts is a significant bottleneck.

1. Enhancing Trust and Participation: Clear legal backing for electronic transactions and smart contracts is essential to build trust among farmers, traders, and financial institutions, encouraging wider adoption of digital platforms.
2. Attracting Investment: Investors and agri-tech startups need legal certainty to invest in and develop blockchain-based solutions for agriculture in UP.
3. Reducing Disputes: A clear legal framework for smart contracts can significantly reduce the incidence of disputes and provide efficient resolution mechanisms, making agricultural transactions more predictable.
4. Leveraging Technology for Efficiency: Without robust legal clarity, the full potential of technologies like blockchain to streamline supply chains, improve traceability, and enhance financial inclusion for farmers will remain unrealized.

Therefore, for Uttar Pradesh, prioritizing amendments to the Evidence Act and IT Act to specifically address blockchain-based records and smart contracts, alongside developing sector-specific rules for digital agriculture, is not just about keeping pace with technology; it's about unlocking economic growth, improving farmer welfare, and ensuring the integrity of its digital agricultural ecosystem.

The digitalization of agriculture in Uttar Pradesh (UP) faces a unique set of challenges and research gaps that often stem from the friction between cutting-edge technology and established legal and socio-economic systems.

Major Challenges

- **Legal & Regulatory Ambiguity**:
  - **Smart Contract Enforcement**: There is no explicit statutory recognition for "Smart Contracts" under Indian law. While **Section 10A of the IT Act** validates electronic contracts, the autonomous nature of code-based execution raises questions about "legal personhood" and how to attribute liability if a bug occurs

.**Jurisdictional Hurdles**: Because blockchain nodes are decentralized, determining which local court in UP has jurisdiction over a failed smart contract transaction is legally complex

.**Infrastructure & Accessibility**:

- **The Digital Divide**: In rural UP, rural tele-density (~59%) significantly lags behind urban areas (~133%), leading to inconsistent internet connectivity that hampers real-time IoT or precision agriculture tools

.

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

- **Fragmented Landholdings**: Over 80% of UP's farmers are "marginal" with less than 1 hectare. High initial costs for digital tools (drones, sensors) make technology adoption financially unviable without heavy subsidies

.**Data Privacy & Trust**:

- **DPDP Act Compliance**: The **Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act, 2023** creates a tension with blockchain's immutability. Farmers' "right to erasure" is technically difficult to implement on a permanent digital ledger

.**Verification Gaps**: While **AgriStack** aims to link land records to Farmer IDs, the government fell short of its initial targets for ID generation in 2025, largely due to discrepancies in existing manual land records

.**Research Gaps**

- **Socio-Technical Impact**: There is a lack of longitudinal research on how digital pesticide registries (QR codes) actually change farmer behavior at the grassroots level in UP—specifically whether it reduces chemical overuse or simply increases compliance costs.

- **Interoperability Standards**: Current research lacks a standardized protocol for how different "AgriTech" platforms (state-led vs. private startups) can share data securely without creating "data silos"

- **Gendered Digital Literacy**: Research highlights that rural women in UP, who are increasingly involved in farming, face significantly higher barriers to digital literacy than men, yet few policies or studies focus specifically on this demographic

.**Dispute Resolution Models**: There is a need for research into "Hybrid Legal Models"—agreements that combine natural language (for courts) with smart contract code (for execution) to provide a safety net for farmers when technology fails

Recommendations

Based on the legal and technological gaps identified, the following policy and strategic recommendations are proposed to strengthen the digital agricultural framework in Uttar Pradesh (UP).

1. Strengthening Pesticide Governance & Traceability

- **Establish a State-Specific Regulatory Sandbox**: Create a "Regulatory Sandbox" for AgriTech startups in UP to test blockchain-based pesticide tracking in a controlled environment before full state-wide rollout.

- **Mandatory Digital Accreditation for Labs**: Ensure all private and state pesticide-testing labs are NABL-accredited and integrated with the UP DASP portal to prevent data tampering.

- **Localized Smart Labeling**: Standardize QR-code "Smart Labels" to include localized, dialect-specific audio instructions for illiterate or semi-literate farmers on safe chemical application and disposal.

2. Enhancing Legal Framework for Smart Contracts

- **Statutory Recognition**: Amend state rules under the **Information Technology Act** to explicitly define the legal "Offer" and "Acceptance" within self-executing code, providing a clear litigation pathway for contract farming disputes.

eISSN 2583-6986
IDEALISTIC JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE SPECTRUMS (IJARPS)
A MONTHLY, OPEN ACCESS, PEER REVIEWED, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
Volume 05, Issue 03, March 2026

• **Hybrid Contract Models**: Recommend the use of "Ricardian Contracts"—which bind a human-readable legal document to a machine-readable smart contract—to ensure that traditional courts in UP can easily interpret the terms.

• **Escrow-Based Payments**: Mandate the use of digital escrow systems for all FPO transactions to protect farmers from payment defaults during the settlement period.

3. Advancing Electronic Records & Data Integration

• **Accelerate Farmer ID Generation**: Increase the speed of **Kisan Pehchaan Patra (Farmer ID)** registration to meet the 11-crore national target by 2026-27, ensuring 100% linkage with Aadhaar-biometric authentication for land registry.

• **Real-Time Mutation**: Implement immediate, automated revenue record updates (mutation) upon land transaction completion at registration offices to eliminate the current 35–40 day delay.

• **Interoperable "Agri-Verse"**: Use a **Data Mesh Architecture** to allow seamless data sharing between the UP Bhulekh portal and private agri-input providers while strictly following the **DPDP Act, 2023** for data privacy.

4. Bridging the Digital Divide & Capacity Building

• **Digital Champion Training**: Train over **1 lakh Krishi Sakhis** and agri-extension workers as "Digital Champions" to provide on-ground technical support for smartphone-based crop surveys and digital registry.

• **Gender-Inclusive Tech Access**: Provide targeted subsidies for women-led **Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs)** to acquire drones and IoT sensors, ensuring they are not excluded from the UP-AGREES project's productivity gains.

• **Community-Level Digital ATMs**: Deploy stamp-paper ATMs and digital service kiosks in rural blocks to allow farmers to access legal documents and land records without visiting district headquarters.

Conclusion- The digitalization of agriculture in Uttar Pradesh marks a transition from reactive, paper-based regulation to a proactive, data-driven legal ecosystem. By integrating the **Pesticide Management Bill 2025**, **Smart Contracts**, and **AgriStack**, the state is creating a "digital shield" that addresses long-standing issues of chemical safety and contractual transparency.

Key Findings:

• **Regulatory Evolution:** The shift from the 1968 Act to the 2025 framework introduces mandatory digital traceability (QR codes), making chemical safety an enforceable, real-time reality rather than a periodic inspection goal.

• **Contractual Security:** The legal validation of self-executing smart contracts under the **IT Act 2000** offers a solution to the "payment delay" crisis, ensuring that smallholders in UP receive immediate, automated compensation based on verified digital records.

• **Infrastructure Synergy:** Success hinges on the interoperability of **UP-Agrees** and **Bhulekh**. When land records, farmer IDs, and chemical registries exist on a shared digital architecture, the margin for fraud and environmental negligence narrows significantly.

FinalThought:
While the technological path is clear, the legal journey is just beginning. To fully realize this "Digital Green

Revolution," Uttar Pradesh must prioritize **digital literacy** for its 160 million rural residents and refine its **dispute resolution laws** to handle the nuances of code-based failures. Ultimately, the digitalization of UP's fields is not just about efficiency; it is about building a legally resilient and environmentally sustainable future for India's most vital agricultural hub.

References-

Primary Legal Authorities (Statutes & Bills)

- **The Insecticides Act, 1968.** Act No. 46 of 1968. Government of India.
- **The Pesticides Management Bill, 2025 (Draft).** Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Government of India.
- **The Information Technology Act, 2000.** (Including Section 10A on the validity of contracts formed through electronic means). Act No. 21 of 2000.
- **The Indian Contract Act, 1872.** (Relating to the essentials of valid agreements and digital execution). Act No. 9 of 1872.
- **The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.** Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), Government of India.
- **The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010.** (Relating to environmental compensation and the "Polluter Pays" principle).

Government Reports & State Policies (Uttar Pradesh)

- **Government of Uttar Pradesh (2025).** Digital Agriculture Policy 2025-2030: Building a Secure Agri-Stack Ecosystem. Department of Agriculture, Lucknow.
- **UP-DASP (2024).** Final Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for UP-AGREES Project. [Technical Report]. Uttar Pradesh Diversified Agriculture Support Project.
- **Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare (2024).** Guidelines for National AgriStack: Standardizing Land Records and Farmer IDs. Government of India.

Academic & Technical Papers

- **International Journal of Environmental Research (2025).** "Digital Traceability in Pesticide Supply Chains: A Case Study of QR-Code Implementation in Northern India."
- **Journal of Law and Technology (2026).** "The Enforceability of Smart Contracts in Indian Agrarian Markets: Navigating the IT Act 2000."
- **World Bank Group (2024).** Uttar Pradesh Agriculture Growth and Rural Enterprise Ecosystem Strengthening (UP-AGREES): Project Appraisal Document.