

Death Penalty in India Deterrence or Violation of Human Rights

Monish Kumar. K¹, Vimala. R²

¹LL. B Student, Vels institute of science technology and advanced studies (VISTAS)- Chennai

²Assistant Professor, Vels institute of science technology and advanced studies (VISTAS)- Chennai

Abstract—The death penalty remains one of the most contested forms of punishment within modern criminal justice systems. In India, it is constitutionally permissible but restricted to the “rarest of rare” cases. This article critically examines whether capital punishment functions as an effective deterrent or constitutes a violation of fundamental human rights. Through doctrinal and analytical methods, the study evaluates constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks, and judicial precedents alongside criminological and human rights perspectives. The findings suggest that empirical evidence supporting deterrence is inconclusive, while concerns regarding arbitrariness, judicial inconsistency, and irreversible error persist. The article argues for a re-evaluation of India’s retentionist stance in light of constitutional morality and evolving global human rights standards.

The death penalty remains one of the most debated and controversial forms of punishment in contemporary criminal justice systems. In India, capital punishment continues to exist as a legal sanction for the “rarest of rare” cases, primarily involving heinous offences such as murder, terrorism, and crimes threatening national security. While proponents argue that the death penalty serves as a powerful deterrent against grave crimes and ensures retributive justice for victims, critics contend that it violates fundamental human rights, particularly the right to life and dignity guaranteed under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This paper seeks to examine whether the death penalty in India genuinely functions as an effective deterrent to crime or stands in conflict with evolving human rights norms.

The study analyses constitutional provisions, judicial interpretations, and landmark Supreme Court judgments governing capital punishment, alongside statistical and empirical data relating to crime deterrence. It also explores the ethical and moral dimensions of the death penalty, with particular emphasis on concerns of arbitrariness, judicial discretion, and the disproportionate impact on marginalized and economically weaker sections of society. The research further situates India’s position within the broader international context by examining global trends toward abolition and the country’s

obligations under international human rights instruments.

By assessing arguments both in Favor of retention and abolition, this paper aims to present a balanced and critical understanding of the death penalty’s role within India’s criminal justice framework. It questions whether capital punishment achieves its intended objectives of deterrence and justice or whether it perpetuates irreversible injustice within an imperfect legal system, thereby underscoring the need for re-evaluating India’s penal policy in light of constitutional values and contemporary human rights standards.

Index Terms—Death penalty, Capital punishment, Article 21, Rarest of rare doctrine, Human rights, Deterrence theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

Punishment has always been a central component of criminal justice systems, serving multiple objectives such as deterrence, retribution, prevention, and rehabilitation. Among all forms of punishment, the death penalty, also known as capital punishment, is the most extreme, irreversible, and controversial. While many countries across the world have abolished capital punishment either in law or in practice, India continues to retain it, albeit with significant judicial safeguards. The persistence of the death penalty in India raises critical questions about its necessity, effectiveness, and compatibility with constitutional values and human rights principles.

The concept of capital punishment is deeply rooted in ancient legal systems, including Indian jurisprudence. Historically, severe punishments were viewed as essential to maintain social order and deter potential offenders. However, with the evolution of democratic values, human rights discourse, and constitutional morality, the legitimacy of the death penalty has come under intense scrutiny. The primary debate centers on

whether the death penalty actually deters serious crimes more effectively than life imprisonment, or whether it constitutes a violation of the fundamental right to life and human dignity.

In India, capital punishment is legally sanctioned under the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and related statutes for certain categories of offences, such as murder under Section 302 IPC, terrorism-related offences, and crimes against the state. Nevertheless, the judiciary has played a crucial role in restricting its application. The landmark judgment in *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab* established the “rarest of rare” doctrine, emphasizing that the death penalty should only be imposed in exceptional circumstances when life imprisonment is unquestionably inadequate. This doctrine reflects the judiciary’s attempt to strike a balance between societal interests and individual rights.

Despite these safeguards, concerns persist regarding the arbitrary application of the death penalty. Several studies and judicial observations highlight inconsistencies in sentencing, socio-economic biases, and the risk of wrongful convictions. Given the fallibility of the criminal justice system, the irreversible nature of capital punishment poses a grave moral and legal dilemma. Once executed, any miscarriage of justice cannot be remedied, making the death penalty fundamentally different from all other punishments.

From a human rights perspective, the death penalty is increasingly viewed as incompatible with the right to life, the prohibition against cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, and the principles of human dignity. International human rights instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), reflect a growing global consensus against capital punishment. Although India has not abolished the death penalty, it faces mounting international and domestic pressure to reassess its stance in light of these evolving norms.

On the other hand, supporters of capital punishment argue that India’s unique social conditions, population size, and crime patterns necessitate the retention of the death penalty. They contend that it serves as a necessary deterrent against extremely heinous crimes, provides justice to victims and their families, and reinforces public confidence in the legal system. In cases involving brutal crimes or acts of terrorism,

public sentiment often strongly favors capital punishment, viewing it as a symbol of justice and moral condemnation.

This ongoing debate reflects a broader conflict between collective security and individual rights, public sentiment and constitutional morality, and retributive justice and reformative ideals. Whether the death penalty achieves its intended purpose or merely satisfies a desire for vengeance remains a key question. Empirical data on deterrence is inconclusive, further complicating policy decisions regarding retention or abolition.

This paper critically explores the death penalty in India by examining its legal framework, judicial evolution, and human rights implications. It seeks to analyze whether capital punishment functions as an effective deterrent or undermines the fundamental values enshrined in the Constitution of India. By engaging with legal precedents, human rights discourse, and global abolitionist trends, the study aims to contribute to the ongoing debate on whether India should retain, reform, or abolish the death penalty altogether.

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM

Despite its continued existence within the Indian criminal justice system, there is no conclusive empirical evidence to establish that the death penalty serves as an effective deterrent to serious crimes. The deterrence theory assumes that the fear of capital punishment prevents potential offenders from engaging in heinous acts; however, studies and crime statistics have failed to demonstrate a consistent correlation between the existence of the death penalty and a reduction in violent crime rates. Many offences that attract the death penalty are committed under extreme emotional disturbance, ideological motivations, or socio-economic pressures, where rational consideration of punishment is largely absent. As a result, the effectiveness of capital punishment as a preventive measure remains highly questionable, raising concerns about its continued justification as a tool of crime control.

In addition to doubts regarding deterrence, the death penalty poses serious legal and ethical challenges related to judicial errors, arbitrariness, and human rights violations. The irreversible nature of capital punishment amplifies the consequences of wrongful

convictions arising from flawed investigations, inadequate legal representation, or procedural lapses. Although the Supreme Court of India has sought to restrict its application through the “rarest of rare” doctrine, the subjective interpretation of this standard has resulted in inconsistent and uneven sentencing. Moreover, prolonged incarceration on death row and the psychological trauma associated with impending execution have been criticized as violations of the right to life and human dignity under Article 21 of the Constitution. These concerns collectively raise fundamental questions about whether the death penalty aligns with constitutional values, principles of justice, and India’s commitment to human rights.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the legal framework governing the death penalty in India

One of the primary objectives of this study is to examine the legal framework governing the death penalty in India. Capital punishment in India is not arbitrary but is sanctioned by specific statutory provisions, mainly under the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and other special legislations dealing with offences such as terrorism and crimes against the state. This objective aims to analyze the nature of offences for which the death penalty is prescribed and the legislative intent behind retaining such punishment. It also examines how Parliament has attempted to balance societal interests with constitutional safeguards.

This objective further extends to understanding the procedural safeguards built into the criminal justice system to regulate the imposition of the death penalty. These include sentencing hearings, confirmation of death sentences by the High Courts, and the availability of appellate remedies. Additionally, the study explores constitutional safeguards under Articles 14 and 21, as well as the role of executive clemency under Articles 72 and 161. By examining these aspects, the study seeks to assess whether the legal framework ensures fairness, due process, and protection of fundamental right.

2. To analyze judicial interpretations, especially the “rarest of rare” doctrine

Another significant objective of this study is to analyze the judicial interpretation of death penalty provisions, with particular focus on the “rarest of rare” doctrine.

The Supreme Court of India, through landmark judgments, has played a crucial role in limiting the application of capital punishment. The doctrine was introduced to ensure that the death penalty is imposed only in exceptional circumstances where life imprisonment is deemed inadequate. This objective examines the judicial reasoning behind this doctrine and its intended purpose within the criminal justice system.

The objective also involves analyzing how courts apply this doctrine in practice. Despite its aim to reduce arbitrariness, the interpretation of what constitutes the “rarest of rare” varies from case to case. This study examines how courts evaluate aggravating and mitigating circumstances, the role of judicial discretion, and the issue of inconsistency in sentencing. Through this analysis, the study seeks to understand whether judicial safeguards have been effective in preventing misuse of the death penalty.

3. To evaluate whether capital punishment acts as a deterrent to crime

A key objective of this research is to evaluate whether capital punishment acts as an effective deterrent to crime in India. The deterrence theory of punishment assumes that severe punishment discourages potential offenders from committing crimes. This objective seeks to examine whether the fear of death penalty actually leads to a reduction in serious crimes such as murder, rape, and terrorism. It involves a critical evaluation of theoretical arguments supporting deterrence.

This objective further examines empirical data, judicial observations, and criminological studies to assess the real impact of the death penalty on crime rates. It considers the argument that many serious crimes are committed under emotional stress, provocation, or ideological influence, where rational consideration of punishment is absent. By comparing deterrent claims with available evidence, the study assesses whether capital punishment is justified as a crime-control measure or whether alternative punishments may be equally effective.

4. To study the human rights implications of the death penalty

Another important objective of the study is to examine the human rights implications of the death penalty. Capital punishment raises serious concerns regarding

the right to life and human dignity guaranteed under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This objective seeks to analyze whether the deprivation of life by the state can be justified in a constitutional democracy that emphasizes dignity, fairness, and justice. It also engages with ethical arguments against state-sanctioned executions.

Additionally, this objective addresses issues such as prolonged delays in execution, the psychological suffering of death row prisoners, and the possibility of wrongful convictions. The concept of the “death row phenomenon” and its impact on mental health is critically examined. The study also explores whether marginalized and economically weaker sections are disproportionately affected by capital punishment. Through this analysis, the objective seeks to evaluate whether the death penalty is compatible with constitutional values and human rights principles.

5. To compare India’s position with international standards

The final objective of this study is to compare India’s position on the death penalty with international standards and global practices. Many countries have abolished capital punishment either in law or in practice, viewing it as incompatible with modern human rights norms. This objective examines international human rights instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which emphasize the protection of the right to life.

This objective also involves a comparative analysis of India’s retentionist approach with abolitionist and reformist jurisdictions. It evaluates how international trends and global human rights discourse influence domestic legal systems, including India. By comparing India’s legal stance with international norms, this objective seeks to assess whether India’s continued use of the death penalty aligns with evolving global standards of justice, human dignity, and human rights.

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Does the death penalty effectively deter crime in India?

This research question seeks to examine whether the death penalty functions as an effective deterrent to serious crimes in India. The deterrence theory of

punishment is based on the assumption that the fear of severe punishment, particularly death, discourages individuals from committing heinous crimes. This question explores whether capital punishment actually achieves its intended preventive objective by reducing crimes such as murder, terrorism, and rape. It also examines the rationale used by lawmakers and courts to justify the retention of the death penalty on deterrent grounds.

The question further analyzes empirical evidence, crime statistics, and judicial observations to evaluate the validity of deterrence claims. It considers the argument that many crimes punishable by death are committed under emotional distress, provocation, or ideological influence, where rational calculation of punishment is unlikely. By assessing the gap between theory and practice, this research question aims to determine whether the death penalty truly contributes to crime control or whether its deterrent effect is largely assumed rather than proven.

2. Is the “rarest of rare” doctrine applied consistently?

This research question focuses on examining the consistency in the application of the “rarest of rare” doctrine by the Indian judiciary. Introduced by the Supreme Court to restrict the imposition of the death penalty, the doctrine requires courts to award capital punishment only in exceptional cases. The question aims to analyze whether this standard has been clearly defined and uniformly interpreted across different cases and courts.

The question also seeks to identify inconsistencies, subjectivity, and variations in judicial reasoning while awarding death sentences. It examines how different benches assess aggravating and mitigating circumstances and whether similar cases are treated differently due to judicial discretion. Through this analysis, the research evaluates whether the doctrine has successfully reduced arbitrariness or whether it has resulted in unpredictable and uneven sentencing practices.

3. Does capital punishment violate human rights norms?

This research question examines whether capital punishment violates domestic and international human rights norms. In the Indian context, it focuses on the compatibility of the death penalty with the right to life and human dignity guaranteed under Article 21

of the Constitution. The question explores whether the state's power to take life can be justified within a constitutional framework that emphasizes individual rights, due process, and dignity.

Additionally, this question engages with international human rights principles that increasingly view the death penalty as cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishment. It considers issues such as prolonged delays in execution, psychological suffering of death row prisoners, and the possibility of wrongful convictions. By analyzing these concerns, the research aims to determine whether capital punishment aligns with evolving human rights standards or undermines fundamental principles of justice and humanity.

4. Should India abolish or retain the death penalty?

This research question addresses the broader policy debate on whether India should abolish or retain the death penalty. It examines arguments in favor of retention, such as deterrence, retributive justice, and public demand for stringent punishment in cases of heinous crimes. The question also considers the view that capital punishment serves as a symbol of societal condemnation and a means to ensure justice for victims.

At the same time, the question critically assesses abolitionist arguments based on human rights, judicial fallibility, arbitrariness, and global trends toward abolition. It evaluates whether alternative punishments such as life imprisonment without remission can effectively replace the death penalty. By weighing both perspectives, the research seeks to provide a reasoned conclusion on the future of capital punishment in India in light of constitutional values and international standards.

V. HYPOTHESIS

Null Hypothesis (H₀): The death penalty acts as an effective deterrent and does not violate human rights. The null hypothesis assumes that the death penalty functions as an effective deterrent to serious crimes in India. It is based on the deterrence theory of punishment, which suggests that the fear of the most severe punishment discourages individuals from committing heinous offences such as murder, terrorism, and crimes against the state. According to this perspective, capital punishment serves a preventive purpose by creating a strong psychological

fear that influences potential offenders and helps maintain public order. The hypothesis reflects the justification often provided by supporters of the death penalty, including lawmakers and sections of the judiciary.

Further, the null hypothesis assumes that capital punishment does not violate human rights when imposed within a legally regulated framework. It presumes that constitutional safeguards, judicial oversight, and procedural protections are sufficient to ensure fairness, due process, and proportionality. Under this hypothesis, the death penalty is viewed as compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution, as long as it is imposed in accordance with the "rarest of rare" doctrine and after exhaustive judicial scrutiny. Thus, retention of the death penalty is considered legally valid and ethically acceptable within India's criminal justice system.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁): The death penalty does not significantly deter crime and violates human rights. The alternative hypothesis challenges the assumption that the death penalty serves as an effective deterrent to crime. It argues that there is no significant empirical evidence to demonstrate that capital punishment reduces crime rates more effectively than life imprisonment. According to this view, many crimes punishable by death are committed under emotional, psychological, or ideological circumstances where fear of punishment does not influence behavior. Therefore, the existence of capital punishment does not substantially contribute to crime prevention, making its deterrent value questionable.

Additionally, this hypothesis asserts that the death penalty violates human rights, particularly the right to life and human dignity. It highlights concerns such as the risk of wrongful convictions, arbitrariness in sentencing, and prolonged psychological suffering of death row prisoners. The alternative hypothesis also aligns with international human rights standards that increasingly regard capital punishment as cruel, inhuman, and degrading. From this standpoint, the death penalty is seen as incompatible with constitutional values, moral principles, and India's obligations under international human rights law, thereby supporting the argument for its abolition.

VI. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of the present study is primarily confined to the examination of the death penalty within the Indian legal system. It focuses on the constitutional and statutory provisions governing capital punishment, particularly those contained in the Indian Penal Code, 1860, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and relevant constitutional articles. The study also includes an analysis of procedural safeguards, sentencing principles, and the role of judicial and executive authorities in regulating the imposition and execution of the death penalty. By limiting its focus to Indian law, the research aims to provide a detailed and context-specific understanding of capital punishment in India.

The study further encompasses an in-depth examination of landmark judicial pronouncements delivered by the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts. Special emphasis is placed on the evolution of the “rarest of rare” doctrine and its application in sentencing decisions. The scope includes analyzing how courts balance aggravating and mitigating circumstances, address issues of arbitrariness, and interpret the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution. Additionally, the study explores human rights perspectives related to the death penalty, such as the risk of wrongful convictions, the death row phenomenon, and concerns regarding human dignity and fairness.

The scope of the study also extends to a limited comparative analysis of global practices relating to the death penalty. While the primary focus remains on India, reference is made to international human rights instruments and conventions, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to assess India’s position in the global context. The study briefly examines abolitionist and retentionist trends worldwide to understand evolving international standards. However, an exhaustive comparative study of foreign legal systems is beyond the scope of this research, and such references are used only to supplement and contextualize the Indian perspective.

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Type: Doctrinal and Analytical Research

The study adopts a doctrinal research methodology, as

it is primarily based on the analysis of existing laws, judicial decisions, and constitutional provisions relating to the death penalty in India. Doctrinal research involves a systematic study of legal rules, principles, and concepts as developed through statutes and case laws. This method is appropriate because the research does not involve empirical data collection but focuses on understanding and interpreting established legal doctrines governing capital punishment.

In addition, an analytical research approach is employed to critically examine these legal doctrines and their practical implications. The analytical method helps in evaluating whether the objectives of the death penalty—such as deterrence and justice—are effectively achieved in practice. It also assists in identifying inconsistencies, gaps, and limitations in the application of legal principles, especially in relation to constitutional values and human rights considerations.

Sources

Primary Sources

Primary sources form the foundation of the study and include case laws, statutes, and constitutional provisions. Judicial pronouncements of the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts are examined to understand how courts have interpreted and applied death penalty laws over time. These judgments provide authoritative guidance on sentencing principles, procedural safeguards, and constitutional limitations.

Statutory sources such as the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, along with constitutional provisions like Articles 14, 21, 72, and 161, are analyzed to assess the legal framework governing capital punishment. These primary materials are essential for understanding the legal validity and procedural regulation of the death penalty in India.

Secondary Sources

Secondary sources are used to support and supplement the analysis of primary legal materials. These include standard textbooks, legal journals, research articles, and commentaries written by scholars in the fields of criminal law, constitutional law, and human rights. Such sources provide theoretical perspectives, critical opinions, and scholarly interpretations that enrich the study.

The research also relies on Law Commission of India reports, which offer expert recommendations and detailed analysis of the death penalty. These reports are particularly significant as they reflect policy considerations, empirical observations, and reform suggestions, thereby contributing to a broader and more informed understanding of the issue.

Approach: Comparative and Critical Analysis

A comparative approach is adopted to briefly examine India's position on the death penalty in relation to international practices and standards. Reference is made to global trends, particularly the increasing movement toward abolition or restriction of capital punishment in many countries. International conventions such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) are considered to place India's approach within a global human rights framework.

Alongside this, a critical approach is used to objectively evaluate arguments both in favor of and against the death penalty. This includes examining claims related to deterrence and retributive justice, as well as criticisms concerning arbitrariness, judicial discretion, and human rights violations. The combined comparative and critical approach enable the study to arrive at reasoned conclusions regarding the relevance and future of the death penalty in India.

VIII. LITERATURE REVIEW (BRIEF)

The debate on the death penalty in India has been significantly influenced by the findings of the Law Commission of India. In its 262nd Report (2015), the Law Commission undertook a comprehensive study of capital punishment, examining its deterrent value, consistency in application, and compatibility with constitutional principles. The Commission recommended the abolition of the death penalty for all crimes except terrorism-related offences and crimes against the state, citing the absence of conclusive evidence proving its deterrent effect. The report emphasized that the death penalty is prone to arbitrariness and fails to meet the standards of fairness required in a constitutional democracy.

Several legal scholars and criminologists have critically analyzed the deterrence argument used to justify capital punishment. A dominant view in academic literature is that there is no strong empirical

evidence to establish that the death penalty reduces crime more effectively than life imprisonment. Scholars argue that violent crimes are often committed in situations involving emotional distress, provocation, or ideological motivation, where rational calculation of punishment is absent. Consequently, the assumption that fear of execution deters potential offenders has been widely questioned and regarded as largely speculative.

Judicial perspectives have also contributed significantly to the academic discourse on capital punishment. Scholars have examined landmark Supreme Court judgments such as *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab* and *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab* to analyze how the judiciary has attempted to limit the use of the death penalty through the "rarest of rare" doctrine. However, academic critiques highlight that despite this safeguard, the doctrine has resulted in inconsistent sentencing due to its subjective interpretation. Legal commentators point out that similar cases often receive different punishments, raising concerns about equality before law and judicial arbitrariness.

Human rights scholars have approached the death penalty primarily from the perspective of constitutional morality and international human rights norms. Academic literature frequently argues that capital punishment violates the right to life and human dignity guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. Issues such as prolonged delays in execution, psychological suffering of prisoners on death row, and the risk of wrongful convictions have been discussed extensively.

Scholars assert that the irreversible nature of the death penalty makes it incompatible with a justice system that recognizes the possibility of error and emphasizes reformative justice.

Comparative and international scholarship further strengthens the abolitionist argument by highlighting global trends against capital punishment. Many academics note that a majority of countries have abolished the death penalty either in law or in practice, viewing it as inconsistent with modern human rights standards. Studies referencing international instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) emphasize the global movement towards protection of the right to life. Comparative literature urges India to reconsider its retentionist stance in light of evolving international

norms and its constitutional commitment to justice, dignity, and fairness.

IX. KEY LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution guarantees that no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. This provision forms the constitutional foundation for the debate surrounding the death penalty in India. While Article 21 protects the right to life, the Supreme Court has interpreted it to allow capital punishment when imposed through a fair, just, and reasonable legal procedure. Thus, the death penalty is not considered unconstitutional *per se*, provided it satisfies the requirements of due process.

Judicial interpretation of Article 21 has significantly influenced the application of the death penalty. In landmark cases such as *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of capital punishment but restricted its application to the “rarest of rare” cases. Article 21 has also been invoked in cases addressing delay in execution, mental health of prisoners, and the death row phenomenon, emphasizing that even condemned prisoners are entitled to dignity and humane treatment. Therefore, Article 21 serves both as a justification and a limitation on the imposition of the death penalty.

The interpretation of Article 21 has evolved substantially through judicial activism, transforming it from a narrow procedural guarantee into a broad source of substantive rights. In the context of the death penalty, courts have emphasized that the “procedure established by law” must be fair, just, and reasonable. This interpretation has allowed constitutional scrutiny over not just the sentence of death itself, but also the manner in which it is imposed, delayed, or executed. As a result, issues such as mental illness of the convict, inordinate delay in execution, and prison conditions have been brought within the protective ambit of Article 21.

Indian Penal Code (Sections Providing Capital Punishment)

The Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) provides the substantive legal framework for capital punishment in India. Section 302 IPC prescribes the death penalty or

life imprisonment for the offence of murder, making it one of the most commonly invoked provisions in death sentence cases. Other provisions such as Section 121 (waging war against the Government of India), Section 364A (kidnapping for ransom), and certain offences involving terrorism also permit capital punishment under specific circumstances.

The IPC reflects the legislative intent to reserve the death penalty for serious offences that threaten public safety, national security, and social order. However, the IPC itself does not make the death penalty mandatory in most cases, allowing judicial discretion between death and life imprisonment. This discretion has been shaped by judicial interpretations to ensure proportionality and fairness. The IPC provisions thus provide the statutory basis for capital punishment while leaving its actual application to judicial evaluation.

In recent years, debates surrounding IPC provisions prescribing capital punishment have intensified, especially in cases involving sexual offences and terrorism. Amendments introducing harsher punishments have often been driven by public sentiment and demands for justice. However, legal scholars caution that increasing the number of death-punishable offences does not necessarily enhance deterrence and may increase the risk of misuse. Therefore, while the IPC provides the substantive basis for capital punishment, its application remains deeply dependent on judicial discretion and constitutional principles.

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973

The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC) lays down the procedural safeguards governing the imposition and execution of the death penalty. Section 235(2) CrPC mandates that the accused must be heard separately on the question of sentence, ensuring that mitigating circumstances are considered before awarding the death penalty. Additionally, Section 354(3) CrPC requires courts to record “special reasons” for imposing a death sentence, reinforcing the principle that capital punishment should be an exception rather than the rule.

The CrPC also provides important appellate and executive safeguards. Under Section 366, every death sentence passed by a Sessions Court must be confirmed by the High Court before execution. The Code further ensures the availability of appeals to higher courts and

recognizes the constitutional power of mercy petitions under Articles 72 and 161. These procedural protections demonstrate the legislature's intent to minimize arbitrariness and prevent miscarriage of justice in capital punishment cases, making the CrPC a crucial component of the legal framework governing the death penalty.

Additionally, the CrPC works in conjunction with constitutional provisions relating to executive clemency. Mercy petitions under Articles 72 and 161, though executive in nature, are an extension of procedural protection recognized within the criminal justice process. Judicial decisions have clarified that unreasonable delay in deciding such petitions may render execution unconstitutional. Hence, the CrPC, together with constitutional remedies, establishes a framework aimed at ensuring heightened procedural caution, reinforcing the principle that the death penalty must be imposed only after exhaustive legal scrutiny.

X. LANDMARK CASES

1. *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab* (1980) Established the "rarest of rare" doctrine

The landmark judgment in *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab* (AIR 1980 SC 898) is considered the cornerstone of death penalty jurisprudence in India. In this case, the constitutional validity of the death penalty under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code was challenged on the ground that it violated Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution. A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court upheld the validity of capital punishment, holding that the death penalty is not unconstitutional per se if imposed according to a fair, just, and reasonable procedure established by law.

While upholding its constitutionality, the Court significantly restricted the scope of the death penalty by introducing the "rarest of rare" doctrine. The Court ruled that life imprisonment should be the rule and death penalty should be imposed only in exceptional cases where life imprisonment is unquestionably foreclosed. The judgment emphasized that courts must weigh aggravating and mitigating circumstances and consider both the nature of the crime and the circumstances of the offender before awarding the death sentence.

The *Bachan Singh* judgment is significant because it attempted to balance society's demand for justice with the constitutional mandate of protecting the right to

life. It marked a shift from a punishment-centric approach to a rights-oriented sentencing framework. The doctrine laid down in this case continues to guide courts in capital sentencing and serves as a constitutional safeguard against arbitrary and excessive use of the death penalty in India.

2. *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab* (1983) Guidelines for applying the death penalty

The Supreme Court further clarified and elaborated the "rarest of rare" doctrine in *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab* (AIR 1983 SC 957). This case came as a follow-up to *Bachan Singh* and sought to provide clearer guidelines for determining when a case could be considered rarest of rare. The Court recognized the difficulty faced by judges in applying the doctrine and attempted to reduce subjectivity in sentencing.

In *Machhi Singh*, the Court identified five categories of cases where the death penalty may be justified: (i) the manner of commission of the crime, (ii) motive for crime, (iii) anti-social or socially abhorrent nature of the crime, (iv) magnitude of the crime, and (v) personality of the victim. These guidelines were intended to help courts assess the gravity of offences and ensure consistency in capital sentencing.

Despite providing structured guidelines, legal scholars and courts have observed that the application of *Machhi Singh* principles remains subjective. Different courts have interpreted similar facts differently, leading to inconsistency in sentencing. Nevertheless, the case remains an important judicial attempt to operationalize the "rarest of rare" doctrine and continues to be frequently cited in death penalty cases.

3. *Shatrughan Chauhan v. Union of India* (2014) Rights of death row prisoners

The judgment in *Shatrughan Chauhan v. Union of India* ((2014) 3 SCC 1) marked a significant development in the recognition of the rights of death row prisoners. The Supreme Court addressed the issue of inordinate delay in execution of death sentences, particularly delays caused in deciding mercy petitions filed before the President or Governor. The Court held that unexplained and unreasonable delay in execution amounts to a violation of Article 21 of the Constitution. The Court recognized that prolonged uncertainty and psychological suffering faced by death row prisoners, often referred to as the "death row phenomenon," constitutes cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. It

ruled that such delay could be valid grounds for commuting a death sentence to life imprisonment. The judgment emphasized that even condemned prisoners retain their fundamental rights and cannot be deprived of human dignity.

The *Shatrughan Chauhan* case significantly strengthened procedural and human rights protections in death penalty cases. It underscored that constitutional safeguards do not end with conviction and sentencing but extend until the execution of the sentence. This judgment reinforced the humanitarian approach toward capital punishment and reaffirmed the principle that the right to life and dignity under Article 21 applies even to death row prisoners.

XI. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study holds significant academic value as it contributes to ongoing debates surrounding criminal justice reform in India, particularly in relation to the continued use of the death penalty. By critically examining the deterrent effect, judicial application, and constitutional validity of capital punishment, the research enhances understanding of how punishment theory operates in practice. It provides a structured legal analysis that is useful for students, researchers, and scholars interested in criminal law, constitutional law, and penology. The study

also adds to existing literature by synthesizing judicial, legislative, and scholarly perspectives on the death penalty within the Indian legal framework.

The research is also significant from a human rights perspective, as it evaluates whether capital punishment aligns with the right to life and dignity guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. By analyzing issues such as arbitrariness in sentencing, the “rarest of rare” doctrine, and the treatment of death row prisoners, the study highlights gaps and challenges in the current legal system. This focus is particularly relevant in the context of India’s constitutional commitment to justice, fairness, and equality before law. The study contributes to the broader discourse on constitutional morality and the evolving interpretation of fundamental rights in a democratic society.

Further, the study has practical and policy-oriented significance. It offers reasoned insights that may assist lawmakers, judges, and policy makers in reconsidering the future of the death penalty in India. By engaging with Law Commission reports, judicial

precedents, and international human rights standards, the research provides a basis for informed policy recommendations on whether the death penalty should be retained, reformed, or abolished. In this sense, the study aims not only to analyze existing law but also to contribute constructively to discussions on legal reform and the development of a more humane and consistent criminal justice system.

XII. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

12.1 Concept and Meaning of the Death Penalty

The death penalty, also known as capital punishment, refers to the legally sanctioned execution of a convicted offender for the gravest crimes. It is considered the most extreme form of penal sanction because it permanently deprives an individual of life. Unlike other punishments such as imprisonment or fines, the death penalty is irreversible, making its consequences absolute and final. Due to its extreme nature, capital punishment occupies a unique and contentious position within criminal jurisprudence.

From a theoretical perspective, the death penalty is justified on grounds of deterrence, retribution, and incapacitation. Supporters argue that execution serves as a powerful deterrent against heinous crimes and reflects the moral condemnation of society. It is also seen as a means to permanently remove dangerous criminals from society. However, critics argue that justice cannot be achieved through state-sanctioned killing, particularly in a system vulnerable to human error.

The moral legitimacy of the death penalty remains deeply contested. While some view it as necessary for maintaining law and order, others consider it incompatible with the principles of human dignity and the right to life. This fundamental tension between punishment and humanity forms the core of the ongoing debate surrounding capital punishment.

12.2 Historical Evolution of Capital Punishment

Capital punishment has existed since ancient times and was widely practiced in early civilizations across the world. In ancient India, legal texts such as the *Manusmriti* endorsed severe punishments, including death, as a tool for preserving social order and moral discipline. Punishment was often determined by caste, status, and nature of the offence, reflecting a

hierarchical justice system.

During the British colonial period, the death penalty became codified under formal legal frameworks, particularly through the Indian Penal Code, 1860. The colonial administration extensively used capital punishment not only to punish crimes but also to suppress dissent and resistance. This period witnessed a broad application of the death penalty without significant procedural safeguards.

After independence, India inherited the colonial criminal justice system but subjected it to constitutional scrutiny. The adoption of the Constitution in 1950 marked a shift toward the protection of fundamental rights. Over time, judicial interpretation led to a narrowing of the scope of capital punishment, reflecting a gradual transition from retributive justice to a more restrained and rights-based approach.

12.3 Constitutional Context and Modern Debate

The Constitution of India guarantees the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21, subject to procedure established by law. This provision creates a constitutional paradox, as it permits the State to lawfully deprive an individual of life through capital punishment. The judiciary has played a crucial role in interpreting this provision to ensure that deprivation of life occurs only through a fair, just, and reasonable procedure.

Judicial interpretation has expanded Article 21 beyond a mere procedural safeguard to include substantive due process, dignity, and humane treatment. This has significantly influenced death penalty jurisprudence by imposing constitutional limitations on its imposition. Courts have repeatedly emphasized that the death penalty should be an exception rather than a rule.

In modern India, the debate on the death penalty is shaped by constitutional morality, public sentiment, and human rights discourse. While public outrage in heinous cases often demands capital punishment, courts remain cautious due to its irreversible nature. This conflict between popular demand and constitutional principles makes the issue highly relevant and complex.

12.4 Need and Relevance of the Study

The continued existence of the death penalty in India raises critical legal and ethical questions. Concerns

regarding wrongful convictions, judicial inconsistency, and lack of empirical evidence on deterrence necessitate a comprehensive examination of capital punishment. This study seeks to address these concerns through a detailed legal and analytical inquiry.

The relevance of this study is further enhanced by global trends toward abolition and India's obligations under international human rights law. As a constitutional democracy committed to justice and dignity, India must evaluate whether capital punishment aligns with its foundational values.

By examining statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, criminological theories, and human rights perspectives, the study aims to contribute meaningfully to academic discourse and policy debates on the future of the death penalty in India.

XIII. LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND JUDICIAL TRENDS IN INDIA

13.1 Constitutional Provisions Governing the Death Penalty

The Constitution does not expressly mention the death penalty, but Article 21 permits deprivation of life according to procedure established by law. The Supreme Court has clarified that such procedure must be just, fair, and reasonable. This interpretation has ensured that capital punishment is subjected to strict constitutional scrutiny.

Article 14 further strengthens protection against arbitrariness by mandating equality before law. Sentencing decisions must therefore be consistent and free from discrimination. Together, Articles 14 and 21 form the constitutional safeguards governing capital punishment.

Judicial decisions have interpreted these provisions to limit the scope of the death penalty and ensure proportionality. Constitutional jurisprudence thus acts as both a validator and a restrainer of capital punishment.

Indian Penal Code: Substantive Law

The Indian Penal Code prescribes the death penalty for offences such as murder, waging war against the state, kidnapping for ransom, and terrorism-related crimes. Importantly, most provisions provide death as an alternative to life imprisonment rather than a

mandatory punishment.

This discretionary framework reflects legislative intent to individualize punishment based on the facts and circumstances of each case. It allows courts to consider the degree of culpability, nature of the crime, and circumstances of the offender.

However, excessive discretion without clear standards has resulted in inconsistent sentencing. While the IPC provides the legal basis, its application depends heavily on judicial interpretation.

Procedural Safeguards under the Code of Criminal Procedure

The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 lays down comprehensive safeguards for death penalty cases. Section 235(2) mandates a separate sentencing hearing, giving the accused an opportunity to present mitigating circumstances.

Section 354(3) requires courts to record special reasons for imposing the death penalty, reinforcing the principle that life imprisonment is the rule. Additionally, all death sentences awarded by a Sessions Court must be confirmed by the High Court. Multiple layers of appeal and review ensure heightened scrutiny. These safeguards reflect the recognition that capital punishment demands exceptional procedural care.

Judicial Trends and the “Rarest of Rare” Doctrine

The Supreme Court in *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab* introduced the “rarest of rare” doctrine to restrict the imposition of the death penalty. The Court held that life imprisonment should be the norm and death penalty an exception.

Courts are required to balance aggravating and mitigating factors and consider both the nature of the crime and the circumstances of the offender. This individualized sentencing approach aims to prevent mechanical imposition of death sentences.

Despite its intent, the doctrine has been criticized for vagueness. Its subjective application has resulted in inconsistency across cases.

Evaluation of Judicial Approach

Recent judicial trends reflect increasing sensitivity toward human rights concerns, particularly in cases involving delay, mental illness, and procedural lapses. Courts have commuted death sentences where constitutional violations were established.

However, inconsistency remains a major issue. Similar cases often receive different sentences, raising concerns regarding equality before law.

This chapter demonstrates that while safeguards exist in theory, their practical implementation remains uneven.

XIV. DETERRENCE THEORY AND HUMAN RIGHTS PERSPECTIVE

Deterrence Theory: Conceptual Understanding

The deterrence theory rests on the belief that severe punishment prevents crime by instilling fear. Capital punishment is regarded as the strongest deterrent due to its finality.

Supporters argue that execution sends a strong message to society that certain crimes will not be tolerated. It is believed to act as both general and specific deterrence.

However, deterrence presupposes rational decision-making, an assumption often absent in violent crimes.

Empirical Assessment of Deterrent Effect

Empirical studies across jurisdictions have failed to establish a clear link between the death penalty and reduction in crime rates. Crime trends in abolitionist countries do not show a rise in violent crimes after abolition.

In India, crime data does not conclusively demonstrate deterrence attributable to executions. Judicial observations acknowledge the absence of reliable empirical support.

This weakens the principal justification for retaining capital punishment.

Psychological and Social Realities of Crime

Many crimes punishable by death arise from emotional impulses, provocation, substance abuse, or ideological extremism. In such situations, rational calculation of punishment plays little role.

Socio-economic factors such as poverty, lack of education, and marginalization often influence criminal behavior more than fear of punishment.

Thus, deterrence theory fails to account for real-world social dynamics.

Human Rights Implications

The death penalty implicates the fundamental right to life and dignity. Human rights advocates argue that no

justice system can guarantee error-free convictions. Wrongful executions permanently undermine faith in the rule of law. The irreversible nature of capital punishment magnifies the consequences of error. International human rights discourse increasingly views the death penalty as incompatible with modern standards of justice.

Death Row Phenomenon

Prolonged confinement under the constant threat of death causes severe psychological trauma. Prisoners often suffer anxiety, depression, and mental breakdown.

The Supreme Court has held that unreasonable delay in execution violates Article 21 and justifies commutation.

This phenomenon further reinforces the argument against capital punishment.

XV. COMPARATIVE INTERNATIONAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Global Abolitionist Movement

A majority of countries have abolished the death penalty in law or practice. Abolition is widely regarded as consistent with respect for human dignity. Countries retaining capital punishment are increasingly isolated in global human rights forums. The global trend reflects a shift toward reformatory justice.

International Conventions and Norms

The ICCPR restricts the use of the death penalty and encourages abolition. Optional Protocols aim for complete elimination.

Global institutions view capital punishment as a violation of human rights. India's continued retention raises concerns regarding treaty commitments.

India in the Global Context

India justifies retention based on domestic conditions such as population size and crime patterns. However, comparative studies challenge this rationale.

Other populous nations have abolished capital punishment without compromising public safety. India's stance increasingly diverges from global norms.

Law Commission's Findings

The 262nd Law Commission Report concluded that

deterrence claims lack empirical support. It highlighted arbitrariness and socio-economic bias. The Commission recommended abolition except for terrorism-related offences. This report significantly influenced academic and judicial discourse.

Key Findings of the Study

The research finds that:

- No conclusive deterrent effect exists
- Sentencing remains inconsistent
- Human rights violations are evident
- Global consensus favors abolition

XVI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Overall Conclusions

The death penalty remains legally valid but ethically and practically problematic. Judicial restraint reflects doubt rather than endorsement.

Reconsidering Retention

Given weak deterrence evidence and strong human rights objections, continued retention is difficult to justify.

Suggested Reforms

- Abolish death penalty for non-terror offences
- Replace with life imprisonment without remission
- Establish clearer sentencing guidelines

Balancing Justice and Humanity

Justice must uphold social order while preserving constitutional values. Vengeance cannot substitute fairness.

Final Observations

India must align its criminal justice policy with dignity, equality, and human rights. Abolition represents a progressive step toward constitutional morality.

XVII. EXPECTED FINDINGS

The study is expected to reveal that the death penalty does not function as a consistently effective deterrent to crime in India. While capital punishment is often justified on the assumption that fear of execution discourages potential offenders, the research is likely

to demonstrate that such deterrent effects are largely speculative. Judicial observations, criminological studies, and comparative data suggest that the existence of the death penalty has not resulted in a significant or sustained reduction in crimes for which it is prescribed. These findings challenge one of the primary justifications for retaining capital punishment. The study is also expected to find that the nature and circumstances of crimes punishable by death weaken the deterrence argument. Many such crimes are committed impulsively, under emotional distress, extreme provocation, intoxication, or ideological influence. In these situations, offenders are unlikely to rationally evaluate the consequences of punishment before acting. As a result, the research may conclude that the deterrence theory fails to reflect the psychological and social realities underlying serious criminal behavior.

Another significant expected finding is the presence of arbitrariness and inconsistency in the application of the death penalty. Despite judicial safeguards such as the “rarest of rare” doctrine, sentencing patterns reveal

variations across similar cases. The study is likely to find that judicial discretion, lack of uniform sentencing criteria, and differing judicial philosophies contribute to unequal outcomes. This inconsistency undermines the principle of equality before law enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution and raises concerns about fairness in capital sentencing.

The research is further expected to highlight the impact of socio-economic factors on death penalty sentencing. Existing literature and case analysis indicate that individuals from economically weaker and socially marginalized backgrounds are disproportionately represented among death row prisoners. Limited access to effective legal representation, lack of awareness of legal rights, and systemic disadvantages significantly affect trial outcomes. This expected finding raises concerns about whether the death penalty is applied equitably or disproportionately burdens vulnerable sections of society.

From a constitutional perspective, the study is expected to find that capital punishment poses serious challenges to the right to life and human dignity under Article 21. Although the death penalty has been held constitutionally valid, its application often results in prolonged incarceration under the constant threat of

execution. The research is likely to conclude that such conditions cause severe psychological suffering, commonly referred to as the “death row phenomenon,” which has been recognized by courts as violative of human dignity.

The study is also expected to emphasize the risk of irreversible judicial error as a critical concern associated with the death penalty. Given the fallibility of investigative and judicial processes, the possibility of wrongful convictions cannot be entirely eliminated. Unlike life imprisonment, execution removes any scope for rectification once carried out. The research is likely to identify this irreversibility as one of the strongest arguments against the continued use of capital punishment in a constitutional democracy.

Finally, the study is expected to conclude that the cumulative effect of weak deterrence, arbitrariness, socio-economic bias, and human rights concerns seriously undermines the justification for retaining the death penalty. While acknowledging the gravity of certain crimes and the need for public safety, the research is likely to indicate that alternative punishments—such as life imprisonment without remission—may serve the objectives of justice more effectively. These expected findings aim to support informed discussion on reforming or abolishing the death penalty in alignment with constitutional values and evolving human rights standards.

XVIII. CONCLUSION (PROPOSAL STAGE)

This research project proposes to critically examine the continued relevance of the death penalty within India’s criminal justice system against the backdrop of constitutional values and evolving human rights standards. While capital punishment remains legally valid in India, its moral, practical, and constitutional justification has become increasingly contested. The project aims to assess whether retaining such an irreversible form of punishment aligns with the principles of justice, fairness, and human dignity that form the foundation of a democratic legal order.

At the proposal stage, this study intends to analyze whether the death penalty effectively achieves its claimed objectives, particularly deterrence and societal protection. By engaging with judicial decisions, criminological theories, and empirical research, the project seeks to evaluate whether capital punishment genuinely contributes to crime prevention

or whether its deterrent value is largely assumed. This inquiry is particularly significant given the lack of conclusive evidence supporting the effectiveness of the death penalty over alternative punishments such as life imprisonment.

The project also proposes to assess the consistency and fairness of the death penalty's application in India. Judicial safeguards such as the "rarest of rare" doctrine have been developed to limit arbitrariness; however, concerns regarding inconsistent sentencing, excessive discretion, and socio-economic bias persist. The study aims to examine whether current sentencing practices sufficiently protect the constitutional guarantee of equality before law, or whether they undermine public confidence in the justice system.

From a human rights perspective, this research intends to explore whether capital punishment is compatible with the right to life and human dignity under Article 21 of the Constitution. The proposal recognizes that issues such as wrongful convictions, prolonged delays in execution, and psychological suffering of death row prisoners raise serious ethical and constitutional concerns. By examining India's obligations under international human rights law and global abolitionist trends, the project seeks to position India's death penalty framework within a broader international context.

Ultimately, the proposed study aims to contribute to informed academic and policy discourse on whether India should continue retaining the death penalty or move toward gradual abolition in line with global human rights standards. Without presuming a predetermined outcome, the project seeks to provide a balanced, critical analysis that may assist lawmakers, courts, and scholars in re-evaluating the future of capital punishment in India. The conclusion of the research is expected to emerge from a careful synthesis of legal principles, judicial reasoning, and human rights considerations.

In addition, the proposed research seeks to examine the broader social and ethical implications of retaining capital punishment in a pluralistic and democratic society like India. Public opinion often favors the death penalty in response to emotionally charged and heinous crimes; however, this study proposes to critically assess whether criminal justice policy should be guided by public sentiment or by constitutional values and principled reasoning. The project aims to explore the tension

between retributive impulses and the constitutional commitment to fairness, proportionality, and reformative justice.

The study also proposes to analyze whether existing alternatives to the death penalty, particularly life imprisonment without remission, can adequately fulfill the objectives of punishment. The research intends to examine whether such alternatives can address societal concerns regarding public safety and justice for victims while avoiding the irreversible consequences associated with execution. This inquiry is significant in evaluating whether abolition of the death penalty would weaken the criminal justice system or, instead, strengthen it by promoting certainty, consistency, and respect for human life.

Further, the proposed research aims to contribute constructively to ongoing discussions on criminal justice reform in India. By drawing upon judicial trends, Law Commission recommendations, and international human rights developments, the study hopes to provide a reasoned framework for future legal and policy decisions. At the proposal stage, the research does not seek to impose a definitive conclusion but aspires to facilitate an informed and balanced evaluation of capital punishment, ultimately aligning criminal justice practices with constitutional morality and contemporary human rights standards.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1980 SC 898.
- [2] *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1983 SC 957.
- [3] *Shatrughan Chauhan v. Union of India*, (2014) 3 SCC 1.
- [4] Law Commission of India, *262nd Report on the Death Penalty*, 2015.
- [5] *The Constitution of India*, arts. 14, 21, 72, and 161.
- [6] *Indian Penal Code*, No. 45 of 1860.
- [7] *Code of Criminal Procedure*, No. 2 of 1974.
- [8] *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, United Nations, 1948.
- [9] *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, United Nations, 1966.
- [10] Annexure I: List of Landmark Cases Referenced
- [11] *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1980 SC 898.

- [12] *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1983 SC 957.
- [13] *Shatrughan Chauhan v. Union of India*, (2014) 3 SCC 1.
- [14] Annexure II: List of Statutory Provisions Referred
- [15] *The Constitution of India*, art. 14.
- [16] *The Constitution of India*, art. 21.
- [17] *The Constitution of India*, art. 72.
- [18] *The Constitution of India*, art. 161.
- [19] *Indian Penal Code*, No. 45 of 1860, § 302.
- [20] *Indian Penal Code*, No. 45 of 1860, § 121.
- [21] Annexure III: International Human Rights Instruments Referenced
- [22] *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, United Nations, 1948.
- [23] *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, United Nations, 1966.