



Capital Punishment In India And Constitutional Validity For Capital Punishment

By: Shreyaa Patnaik

Abstract

Capital punishment remains one of the most divisive aspects of criminal justice in democratic societies. In India, it raises particularly challenging questions due to its coexistence with a constitution that guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. This paper explores the historical, legal, and constitutional dimensions of the death penalty in India, with a special focus on Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. Through an analysis of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, international obligations, and socio-political trends, the research evaluates the compatibility of capital punishment with the Indian constitutional framework. The paper also considers whether the 'rarest of rare' doctrine provides sufficient safeguards or whether a shift toward complete abolition is warranted.

1. Introduction

Capital punishment, or the death penalty, refers to the state-sanctioned execution of an individual for a crime deemed so grievous that it warrants the ultimate punishment. While its application has been curtailed in many parts of the world, India continues to retain the death penalty, albeit under restrictive circumstances. The primary legal justification stems from statutes like the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and procedural safeguards under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. However, the practice has increasingly come under scrutiny for its potential violation of Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to a procedure established by law.

This juxtaposition creates a legal and ethical conundrum: can the state, under a Constitution that emphasizes human dignity and due process, legitimately take a life? The answer is far from straightforward and necessitates a deep dive into the jurisprudential developments, legislative framework, and international human rights discourse surrounding capital punishment.

2. Historical Context of Capital Punishment in India

2.1 Ancient and Colonial Origins

Historically, India's approach to capital punishment can be traced back to ancient legal texts such as the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra, which prescribed death for crimes like treason, murder, and theft. The Manusmriti prescribed capital punishment for those who threatened social order, while Kautilya's Arthashastra advocated for strict penalties to protect the state. However, these ancient systems allowed for the exercise of discretion and proportionality.

The modern statutory framework emerged during the British colonial era. The Indian Penal Code, enacted in 1860, codified several capital offenses including murder (Section 302), dacoity with murder (Section 396), and waging war against the state (Section 121). The British rationale emphasized deterrence and retribution, values that continued to influence post-independence legal structures. Importantly, the colonial state used the death penalty not just for criminal offenses but as a tool of political suppression, especially during the nationalist struggle.

2.2 Post-Independence Developments

Following independence in 1947, the Constituent Assembly debated the moral and legal tenability of capital punishment but did not abolish it. Instead, the punishment remained entrenched within the legal system, albeit subject to procedural rigor. Notably, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, introduced Section 354(3), which requires judges to record special reasons for awarding a death sentence, thereby shifting the norm in favor of life imprisonment.

Furthermore, Law Commission Reports, such as the 35th (1967), 187th (2003), and the 262nd (2015), have successively revisited the question of the death penalty. The 262nd Report notably recommended the abolition of the death penalty for all crimes except terrorism-related offenses, citing its arbitrary application and lack of deterrent value.

3. Constitutional Framework and the Right to Life

3.1 Text and Interpretation of Article 21

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution reads: "No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law." Initially interpreted narrowly in *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 27, the scope of Article 21 underwent a paradigm shift with the decision in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, 1978 SCR (2) 621, where the Supreme Court held that the procedure must be "just, fair and reasonable."

This interpretation significantly expanded the protective umbrella of Article 21, bringing within its ambit a host of rights necessary for a dignified existence. The jurisprudence post-*Maneka Gandhi* has rendered Article 21 one of the most litigated and evolving provisions of the Constitution.

3.2 Judicial Recognition of Human Dignity

The judiciary has repeatedly underscored that the right to life includes the right to live with dignity. In *Francis Coralie Mullin v. The Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi*, (1981) 1 SCC 608, the Supreme Court held that the right to life is not merely the right to animal existence but includes the right to live with human dignity.

This raises a fundamental question: can capital punishment, with its finality and irrevocability, coexist with a Constitution committed to the protection of dignity and life?

Additionally, in *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration*, (1978) 4 SCC 494, the Court emphasized humane treatment for prisoners and reiterated that fundamental rights do not cease at the prison gate. Such precedents reflect a growing concern within the judiciary regarding the compatibility of the death penalty with constitutional morality.

4. The ‘Rarest of Rare’ Doctrine: Evolution and Judicial Trends

4.1 Bachan Singh: The Judicial Compromise

In *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 684, the Supreme Court faced the monumental question of whether the death penalty was constitutionally valid. The Court held by a 4:1 majority that capital punishment was not unconstitutional per se, provided it was imposed in the “rarest of rare” cases. The judgment laid down a balancing test, where aggravating circumstances had to significantly outweigh mitigating ones.

4.2 Machhi Singh and the Fourfold Test

The doctrine was further elucidated in *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab*, (1983) 3 SCC 470. Justice Thakkar outlined five categories to help assess whether a case deserved capital punishment: (1) manner of commission of murder, (2) motive, (3) anti-social or socially abhorrent nature of the crime, (4) magnitude of the crime, and (5) personality of the victim. Despite these guidelines, critics argue that the categories remain broad and allow judicial subjectivity.

4.3 Arbitrariness and Disproportionate Impact

A study by Project 39A at NLU Delhi (2016) concluded that judicial interpretations of the “rarest of rare” doctrine have often led to inconsistencies and arbitrariness. Courts have imposed the death penalty for similar crimes in one instance and life imprisonment in another, without sufficient justification. This has raised questions about whether capital sentencing in India meets the constitutional standards of fairness and equality.

4.4 The Mental Health and Delay Factors

In *Shatrughan Chauhan v. Union of India*, (2014) 3 SCC 1, the Supreme Court commuted the death sentence of several convicts on the ground of inordinate delay in deciding mercy petitions. It emphasized that executing a person after prolonged incarceration on death row amounts to torture and is against Article 21. The judgment also considered mental illness and solitary confinement as factors against the execution of a convict, thereby expanding the “rarest of rare” test to include procedural lapses and humanitarian grounds.

5. Socio-Economic Dimensions of Capital Punishment

5.1 Class, Caste, and Economic Disparities

Empirical research reveals that the burden of the death penalty disproportionately falls upon the marginalized. A comprehensive study by Project 39A, National Law University Delhi, titled *Death Penalty India Report* (2016), found that 76% of those sentenced to death were from lower castes or religious minorities. Many lacked formal education or sustainable means of income, highlighting the intersection between socio-economic disadvantage and the likelihood of receiving a death sentence.

This systemic imbalance raises fundamental concerns about access to justice. The legal process is often too complex and resource-intensive for those lacking financial or educational support. Wealthier accused individuals, on the other hand, are more likely to afford competent legal counsel, expert witnesses, and appeal strategies that reduce their chances of receiving or retaining a death sentence.

5.2 Legal Representation and Access to Counsel

Under Article 39A of the Constitution, the State is obligated to provide free legal aid to those unable to afford it. However, implementation remains uneven. In *Rupee Lal v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2005) 1 SCC 492, the Supreme Court acknowledged that inadequate defense during the trial stage significantly undermines the fairness of criminal proceedings. Many convicts on death row have been represented by legal aid lawyers with limited experience in handling capital cases, often resulting in failure to present mitigating circumstances during sentencing.

5.3 Death Row Conditions and Psychological Trauma

The experience of living under the constant threat of death has a severe psychological impact. Scholars refer to this phenomenon as the "death row phenomenon"—a state of perpetual anguish, mental deterioration, and emotional instability. The Supreme Court in *Triveniben v. State of Gujarat*, (1989) 1 SCC 678, recognized that prolonged delay in execution could be a valid ground for commuting death sentences. Despite this, many convicts continue to languish for years without clarity about their fate.

6. International Law and India's Human Rights Obligations

6.1 Global Norms on Capital Punishment

Globally, the trend has been toward abolition or minimal use of capital punishment. Over 140 countries have abolished the death penalty in law or practice. International law, through the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), restricts the use of the death penalty to the "most serious crimes" and mandates procedural safeguards.

The UN General Assembly has passed several resolutions calling for a moratorium on the death penalty, most recently in 2022, which India opposed. Although not binding, these resolutions reflect an emerging consensus in international law.

6.2 India's Reservations and Compliance

India is a party to the ICCPR but has not ratified its Second Optional Protocol aimed at the abolition of the death penalty. However, in cases like *People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India*, AIR 2005 SC 2419, the judiciary has shown a willingness to align domestic jurisprudence with international standards, particularly in terms of procedural fairness and the humane treatment of prisoners.

India's retentionist stance has drawn criticism from human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, which argue that India's use of the death penalty often falls short of international safeguards.

7. Recent Legislative and Judicial Developments

7.1 Legislative Amendments

In response to high-profile crimes, Parliament has enacted stricter laws, some of which expand the scope of capital punishment:

- **The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2013** introduced the death penalty for repeat offenders in rape cases causing death or persistent vegetative state.
- **The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2018** imposed the death penalty for rape of a girl below 12 years.

While these changes were driven by public outrage, many experts argue they reflect a retributive approach rather than a holistic solution to systemic failures like police inaction, poor evidence collection, and survivor intimidation.

7.2 Judicial Trends and Evolving Jurisprudence

Indian courts have recently demonstrated a trend toward commutation and restraint:

- In *Yakub Memon v. State of Maharashtra*, (2015) 9 SCC 552, the Court upheld his execution but sparked debate on whether due process was adequately followed in emergency proceedings.
- In *Mohd. Arif v. Supreme Court of India*, (2014) 9 SCC 737, the Court ruled that review petitions in death penalty cases must be heard in open court by a three-judge bench.

These developments indicate a growing concern within the judiciary regarding the irreversible nature of capital punishment and the need for heightened procedural fairness.

8. Policy Recommendations and the Way Forward

8.1 Toward a Moratorium and Eventual Abolition

India should consider following the lead of several constitutional democracies by adopting a formal moratorium on executions. A de facto moratorium would allow for greater public dialogue, data collection, and policy refinement without abruptly dismantling the legal framework.

8.2 Sentencing Reform and Procedural Safeguards

Establishing a sentencing commission could promote consistency in capital sentencing. Uniform guidelines for courts, incorporating psychological evaluations, socio-economic background, and rehabilitative potential, would bring more coherence and fairness.

8.3 Strengthening Legal Aid and Trial Quality

The quality of legal representation for indigent accused must be significantly improved. Specialized training for public defenders and mandatory review of defense performance in capital cases could address existing deficits.

8.4 Prison Reform and Humane Treatment

Even for convicts awaiting execution, the standards of detention must reflect India's constitutional commitment to dignity. Psychological counseling, family access, and clarity on the legal process are basic humane requirements that must be met.

9. Philosophical and Ethical Dimensions of Capital Punishment

9.1 Retributivism vs. Reformatory Justice

One of the foundational ethical justifications for capital punishment is the theory of retributivism—the idea that punishment should be proportionate to the gravity of the offense. This perspective holds that the death penalty serves as moral vengeance for heinous crimes such as murder or terrorism. The Old Testament notion of "an eye for an eye" often underpins this theory.

However, the Indian Constitution, especially in light of Article 21, has embraced a more humane and reformatory approach to justice. The Supreme Court has consistently stressed that punishment should aim at reformation, not mere retribution. In *Mohd. Giasuddin v. State of Andhra Pradesh*, (1977) 3 SCC 287, Justice Krishna Iyer emphasized that rehabilitation of the offender is a constitutionally preferred goal.

9.2 The Sanctity of Life and State Morality

Opponents of capital punishment argue that taking a life—even of a criminal—undermines the state's moral authority and violates the sanctity of human life. If the state, which must be held to the highest standards of justice and morality, engages in execution, it sends a contradictory message about the value of life and dignity.

In modern democratic societies, the trend has increasingly leaned towards protecting life, even in the face of heinous crimes. The principle of non-retrogression in human rights law also discourages taking regressive steps that curtail basic rights. Thus, abolition is often viewed as the morally superior stance.

9.3 Public Opinion and Populist Pressure

Public sentiment plays a significant role in shaping legislation and judicial attitudes toward the death penalty. In high-profile cases like the Nirbhaya gang rape (2012), public outrage and media pressure led to swift legislative changes expanding the scope of capital punishment. While democratic governments must be responsive to citizens' concerns, there is an inherent danger in allowing populist sentiment to drive penal policy.

Justice must remain a product of reasoned deliberation, not reactionary politics. The challenge lies in balancing public demands for justice with constitutional commitments to human rights.

10. Comparative Constitutional Jurisprudence

10.1 United States

The U.S. remains one of the few democracies to retain the death penalty. However, constitutional challenges under the Eighth Amendment (prohibiting cruel and unusual punishment) have led to a significant reduction in its application. Cases like *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), temporarily suspended the death penalty, citing arbitrariness. Although reinstated in *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976), the number of executions has declined, and several states have abolished it altogether.

10.2 United Kingdom and European Union

The U.K. abolished capital punishment for murder in 1965 and for all crimes by 1998. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and Protocol 13 now prohibit the death penalty in all circumstances. The ECHR jurisprudence has played a critical role in embedding abolition as a human rights norm across Europe.

10.3 South Africa

In *State v. Makwanyane*, 1995 (3) SA 391 (CC), the South African Constitutional Court held that capital punishment violated the right to life and dignity under the post-apartheid Constitution. The judgment is widely celebrated for its moral clarity and commitment to human rights.

10.4 Lessons for India

These global examples show that constitutional democracies have found ways to ensure justice without resorting to the death penalty. India can draw upon this comparative jurisprudence to evolve a more humane and constitutionally consistent penal policy.

11. Final Reflections

Capital punishment tests the moral fabric of a nation. While it purports to deliver justice, its implementation in India has exposed deep-rooted flaws—arbitrariness, socio-economic bias, inadequate legal representation, and mental trauma.

In a Constitution that enshrines the right to life as its core, it is difficult to reconcile the irreversible finality of execution with the principles of due process and human dignity. The time may be ripe for India to shift from a retributive model of justice to one that truly reflects constitutional morality and international human rights commitments.

Ultimately, the question India must answer is not just whether the death penalty deters crime, but whether it is compatible with the values of a just, humane, and democratic society.