

A

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

v.

SANTOSH KUMAR

JULY 14, 2006

B

[ARIJIT PASAYAT AND LOKESHWAR SINGH PANTA, JJ.]

Penal Code, 1860; Ss. 342, 375 and 376 with Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1983:

C

Rape of a minor—Trial Court found accused guilty of offences under Sections 342, 376(2)(f) and sentenced him to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 10 years—High Court reducing sentence to 5 years—On appeal, Held: Law frowns upon acts constituting rape and provides for more stringent sentence to accused—Protection of society by stamping out criminal proclivity

D

must be the object of law which could be acknowledged by imposing appropriate sentence—Sentencing process must be stern where it should be tempered with mercy where it warrants to be—It is the duty of the Court to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of the offence and the manner in which it was committed—Proportion between crime and punishment is a goal respected in principle and follows in determining sentences—

E

Disproportionate punishment has some very undesirable practical consequences—Aggravating and mitigating factors need to be delicately balanced in terms of relevant circumstances in a dispassionate manner by the Court—In terms of provisions of Section 376, though the Court has discretion to impose sentence less than prescribed by assigning adequate and special

F

reasons, High Court has failed to indicate such reasons—Besides, provisions of law under Section 376(2) provide for more stringent punishment to accused when the victim is under 12 years of age—The High Court erred in reducing the sentence since it failed to record any special and adequate reasons therefor—Sentencing.

G

The question which arose for determination in this appeal before this Court was as to whether the High Court was right in reducing the sentence of rigorous imprisonment against the accused of rape of a minor without assigning any special reasons thereof.

H

Allowing the appeal, the Court

A

HELD: 1.1. Sections 375 and 376 IPC have been substantially changed by Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1983, and several new sections were introduced by the new Act. The fact that sweeping changes were introduced reflects the legislative intent to curb with iron hand, the offence of rape which affects the dignity of a woman. [552-E-F]

B

Criminal Law (Ninth Edition) by Stephen and Halsbury's Statutes of England and Wales (Fourth Edition) Volume 12, referred to.

1.2. When a woman is ravished, what is inflicted is not merely physical injury but the deep sense of some deathless shame. The offender robs the victim of her most valuable and priceless possession that is dignity.

C

[553-B-C]

2.1. Undoubtedly, there is a cross cultural conflict where living law must find answer to the new challenges and the courts are required to mould the sentencing system to meet the challenges. The contagion of lawlessness would undermine social order and lay it in ruins. Protection of society and stamping out criminal proclivity must be the object of law. [553-D-E]

D

"Law in Changing Society" by Friedman, referred to.

2.2. By deft modulation sentencing process be stern where it should be, and tempered with mercy where it warrants to be. The facts and given circumstances in each case, the nature of the crime, the manner in which it was planned and committed, the motive for commission of the crime, the conduct of the accused, the nature of weapons used and all other attending circumstances are relevant facts which would enter into the area of consideration. [553-F-G]

E

F

Mahesh v. State of M.P., [1987] 2 SCR 710, relied on.

2.3. Undue sympathy to impose inadequate sentence would do more harm to the justice system to undermine the public confidence in the efficacy of law and society could not long endure under such serious threats. It is, therefore, the duty of every court to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of the offence and the manner in which it was executed. [554-B-C]

G

Sevaka Perumal etc. v. State of Tamil Nadu, AIR (1991) SC 1463, relied on.

H

A 2.4. The criminal law adheres in general to the principle of proportionality in prescribing liability according to the culpability of each kind of criminal conduct. It ordinarily allows some significant discretion to the Judge in arriving at a sentence in each case, presumably to permit sentences that reflect more subtle considerations of culpability that are raised by the special facts of each case. Judges in essence affirm that punishment ought always to fit the crime; yet in practice sentences are determined largely by other considerations. These considerations cause a departure from just desert as the basis of punishment and create cases of apparent injustice that are serious and widespread. [554-D-E]

C 3.1. Proportion between crime and punishment is a goal respected in principle, and in spite of errant notions, it remains a strong influence in the determination of sentences. [554-F]

D 3.2. In fact, quite apart from those considerations that make punishment unjustifiable when it is out of proportion to the crime, uniformly disproportionate punishment has some very undesirable practical consequences. [554-H]

E 3.3. After giving due consideration to the facts and circumstances of each case, for deciding just and appropriate sentence to be awarded for an offence, the aggravating and mitigating factors and circumstances in which a crime has been committed are to be delicately balanced on the basis of really relevant circumstances in a dispassionate manner by the Court. [555-A-B]

Jashubha Bharatsinh Gohil v. State of Gujarat, [1994] 4 SCC 353, relied on.

F *Dennis Councle MCGDautha v. State of Callifornia*: 402 US 183: 28 L.D. 2d 711, referred to.

G 4.1. Imposition of sentence without considering its effect on the social order in many cases may be in reality a futile exercise. The social impact of the crime where it relates to offences against women, more particularly against a child of tender age, which have great impact on social order, and public interest, cannot be lost sight of and *per se* require exemplary treatment. Any liberal attitude by imposing meagre sentences or taking too sympathetic view merely on account of lapse of time in respect of such offences will be result-wise counter productive in the long run and against societal interest which needs to be cared for and strengthened by string of deterrence inbuilt

in the sentencing system. [555-F-G-H]

A

Dhananjoy Chatterjee v. State of W.B., [1994] 2 SCC 220; *Ravji v. State of Rajasthan*, [1996] 2 SCC 175 and *State of M.P. v. Babbu Barkare alia Dalap Singh*, [2005] 5 SCC 413, relied on.

4.2. In order to exercise the discretion of reducing the sentence the statutory requirement is that the Court has to record "adequate and special reasons" in the judgment and not "fanciful reasons" which would permit the Court to impose a sentence less than the prescribed minimum. The only reason indicated by the High Court in the instant case is the young age of the accused and the fact that he belongs to a Scheduled Tribe. The same can by no stretch of imagination be considered either adequate or special reasons. The requirement in law is cumulative. The victim is a child who was about 6 years of age at the time of commission of offence. Sub section (2) of Section 376 IPC provides for a more stringent punishment when the victim is under 12 years of age. Hence, the High Court was clearly in error in reducing the sentence without recording any adequate and special reason in imposing lesser sentence. [556-G-H; 557-A-B-C]

B

C

D

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Criminal Appeal No. 762 of 2006.

From the Judgment and Order dated 7.2.2004 of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur in Criminal Appeal No. 776/2002.

E

G.D. Singh for the Appellant.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

ARIJIT PASAYAT, J. Leave granted.

F

A six years old child was subjected to sexual abuse by the respondent. He faced trial for alleged commission of offences punishable under Section 376(2)(f) and Section 342 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short the 'IPC'). The trial court found respondent guilty of the offences for the offence punishable under Section 376(2)(f) IPC. respondent was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 10 years R.I. with a fine of Rs. 500/- with default stipulation. He was further sentenced to undergo imprisonment of three months for the offence punishable in terms of Section, 342 IPC. Both the substantive sentences of imprisonment were ordered to run concurrently. In the appeal filed before the High Court the accused did not question the conviction, but prayed for

G

H

A reduction in sentence. The High Court reduced the sentence for the offence punishable under Section 376(2)(f) IPC to 5 years, while maintaining the sentence in respect of other offence. The State of Madhya Pradesh has questioned correctness of the judgment on the ground that the reduction in sentence was clearly uncalled for. The only ground indicated by the High Court to reduce the sentence was the young age of the accused and he being member of the Scheduled Tribe. Learned counsel for the appellant-State submitted that the reduction of sentence as done by learned Single Judge is contrary to law as laid down by this Court in several cases. While dealing with the offence of rape which was established, the direction for reduction of sentence should not have been given on the specious reasonings indicated above.

There is no appearance on behalf of the respondent in spite of service of notice.

The crucial question which needs to be decided is the proper sentence and acceptability of reasons which weighed with learned Single Judge.

The offence of rape occurs in Chapter XVI of IPC. It is an offence affecting the human body. In that Chapter, there is a separate heading for 'Sexual offence', which encompasses Sections 375, 376, 376-A, 376-B, 376-C, and 376-D. 'Rape' is defined in Section 375. Sections 375 and 376 have been substantially changed by Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1983, and several new sections were introduced by the new Act, i.e. 376-A, 376-B, 376-C and 376-D. The fact that sweeping changes were introduced reflects the legislative intent to curb with iron hand, the offence of rape which affects the dignity of a woman. The offence of rape in its simplest term is 'the ravishment of a woman, without her consent, by force, fear or fraud', or as 'the carnal knowledge of a woman by force against her will'. 'Rape' or 'Raptus' is when a man hath carnal knowledge of a woman by force and against her will (Co. Litt. 123-b); or as expressed more fully, 'rape is the carnal knowledge of any woman, above the age of particular years, against her will; or of a woman child, under that age, with or against her will' (Hale PC 628). The essential words in an indictment for rape are rapuit and carnaliter cognovit; but carnaliter cognovit, nor any other circumlocution without the word rapuit, are not sufficient in a legal sense to express rape; 1 Hon.6, 1a, 9 Edw. 4, 26 a (Hale PC 628). In the crime of rape, 'carnal knowledge' means the penetration to any the slightest degree of the organ alleged to have been carnally known by the male organ of generation (Stephen's "Criminal Law" 9th Ed. p.262). In 'Encyclopedia of Crime

and Justice' (Volume 4, page 1356) it is stated ".....even slight penetration is sufficient and emission is unnecessary". In Halsbury's Statutes of England and Wales (Fourth Edition) Volume 12, it is stated that even the slightest degree of penetration is sufficient to prove sexual intercourse. It is violation with violence of the private person of a woman-an-outrage by all means. By the very nature of the offence it is an obnoxious act of the highest order.

The physical scar may heal up, but the mental scar will always remain. When a woman is ravished, what is inflicted is not merely physical injury but the deep sense of some deathless shame. The offender robs the victim of her most valuable and priceless possession that is dignity. In the instant case a child aged about 6 years is the victim. Law frowns upon such acts and provides for more stringent sentence as shall be dealt with *infra*.

The law regulates social interests, arbitrates conflicting claims and demands. Security of persons and property of the people is an essential function of the State. It could be achieved through instrumentality of criminal law. Undoubtedly, there is a cross cultural conflict where living law must find answer to the new challenges and the courts are required to mould the sentencing system to meet the challenges. The contagion of lawlessness would undermine social order and lay it in ruins. Protection of society and stamping out criminal proclivity must be the object of law which must be achieved by imposing appropriate sentence. Therefore, law as a corner-stone of the edifice of "order" should meet the challenges confronting the society. Friedman in his "Law in Changing Society" stated that, "State of criminal law continues to be—as it should be - a decisive reflection of social consciousness of society". Therefore, in operating the sentencing system, law should adopt the corrective machinery or the deterrence based on factual matrix. By deft modulation sentencing process be stern where it should be, and tempered with mercy where it warrants to be. The facts and given circumstances in each case, the nature of the crime, the manner in which it was planned and committed, the motive for commission of the crime, the conduct of the accused, the nature of weapons used and all other attending circumstances are relevant facts which would enter into the area of consideration. For instance a murder committed due to deep-seated mutual and personal rivalry may not call for penalty of death. But an organized crime or mass murders of innocent people would call for imposition of death sentence as deterrence. In *Mahesh v. State of M.P.*, [1987] 2 SCR 710, this Court while refusing to reduce the death sentence observed thus:

"It will be a mockery of justice to permit the accused to escape

A the extreme penalty of law when faced with such evidence and such cruel acts. To give the lesser punishment for the accused would be to render the justicing system of the country suspect. The common man will lose faith in courts. In such cases, he understands and appreciates the language of deterrence more than the reformatory jargon.”

B Therefore, undue sympathy to impose inadequate sentence would do more harm to the justice system to undermine the public confidence in the efficacy of law and society could not long endure under such serious threats. It is, therefore, the duty of every court to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of the offence and the manner in which it was executed or committed etc. This position was illuminatingly stated by this Court in *Sevaka Perumal etc. v. State of Tamil Nadu*, AIR (1991) SC 1463.

C The criminal law adheres in general to the principle of proportionality in prescribing liability according to the culpability of each kind of criminal conduct. It ordinarily allows some significant discretion to the Judge in arriving at a sentence in each case, presumably to permit sentences that reflect more subtle considerations of culpability that are raised by the special facts of each case. Judges in essence affirm that punishment ought always to fit the crime; yet in practice sentences are determined largely by other considerations. Sometimes it is the correctional needs of the perpetrator that are offered to justify a sentence. Sometimes the desirability of keeping him out of circulation, and sometimes even the tragic results of his crime. Inevitably these considerations cause a departure from just desert as the basis of punishment and create cases of apparent injustice that are serious and widespread.

F Proportion between crime and punishment is a goal respected in principle, and in spite of errant notions, it remains a strong influence in the determination of sentences. The practice of punishing all serious crimes with equal severity is now unknown in civilized societies, but such a radical departure from the principle of proportionality has disappeared from the law only in recent times.

G Even now for a single grave infraction drastic sentences are imposed. Anything less than a penalty of greatest severity for any serious crime is thought then to be a measure of toleration that is unwarranted and unwise. But in fact, quite apart from those considerations that make punishment unjustifiable when it is out of proportion to the crime, uniformly disproportionate punishment has some very undesirable practical consequences.

H

After giving due consideration to the facts and circumstances of each case, for deciding just and appropriate sentence to be awarded for an offence, the aggravating and mitigating factors and circumstances in which a crime has been committed are to be delicately balanced on the basis of really relevant circumstances in a dispassionate manner by the Court. Such act of balancing is indeed a difficult task. It has been very aptly indicated in *Dennis Councle MCGDautha v. State of Callifornia*: 402 US 183: 28 L.D. 2d 711 that no formula of a foolproof nature is possible that would provide a reasonable criterion in determining a just and appropriate punishment in the infinite variety of circumstances that may affect the gravity of the crime. In the absence of any foolproof formula which may provide any basis for reasonable criteria to correctly assess various circumstances germane to the consideration of gravity of crime, the discretionary judgment in the facts of each case, is the only way in which such judgment may be equitably distinguished.

In *Jashubha Bharatsinh Gohil v. State of Gujarat*, [1994] 4 SCC 353, it has been held by this Court that in the matter of death sentence, the Courts are required to answer new challenges and mould the sentencing system to meet these challenges. The object should be to protect the society and to deter the criminal in achieving the avowed object to law by imposing appropriate sentence. It is expected that the Courts would operate the sentencing system so as to impose such sentence which reflects the conscience of the society and the sentencing process has to be stern where it should be. Even though the principles were indicated in the background of death sentence and life sentence, the logic applies to all cases where appropriate sentence is the issue.

Imposition of sentence without considering its effect on the social order in many cases may be in reality a futile exercise. The social impact of the crime, e.g. where it relates to offences against women, (more particularly a child of tender age) dacoity, kidnapping, misappropriation of public money, treason and other offences involving moral turpitude or moral delinquency which have great impact on social order, and public interest, cannot be lost sight of and *per se* require exemplary treatment. Any liberal attitude by imposing meager sentences or taking too sympathetic view merely on account of lapse of time in respect of such offences will be result-wise counter productive in the long run and against societal interest which needs to be cared for and strengthened by string of deterrence inbuilt in the sentencing system.

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

A In *Dhananjay Chatterjee v. State of W.B.*, [1994] 2 SCC 220, this Court has observed that shockingly large number of criminals go unpunished thereby increasingly, encouraging the criminals and in the ultimate making justice suffer by weakening the system's creditability. The imposition of appropriate punishment is the manner in which the Court responds to the society's cry for justice against the criminal. Justice demands that Courts should impose punishment befitting the crime so that the Courts reflect public abhorrence of the crime. The Court must not only keep in view the rights of the criminal but also the rights of the victim of the crime and the society at large while considering the imposition of appropriate punishment.

C Similar view has also been expressed in *Ravji v. State of Rajasthan*, [1996] 2 SCC 175. It has been held in the said case that it is the nature and gravity of the crime but not the criminal, which are germane for consideration of appropriate punishment in a criminal trial. The Court will be failing in its duty if appropriate punishment is not awarded for a crime which has been committed not only against the individual victim but also against the society to which the criminal and victim belong. The punishment to be awarded for a crime must not be irrelevant but it should conform to and be consistent with the atrocity and brutality with which the crime has been perpetrated, the enormity of the crime warranting public abhorrence and it should "respond to the society's cry for justice against the criminal". If for extremely heinous crime of murder perpetrated in a very brutal manner without any provocation, most deterrent punishment is not given, the case of deterrent punishment will lose its relevance.

E These aspects have been elaborated in *State of M.P. v. Babbu Barkare alia Dalap Singh*, [2005] 5 SCC 413.

F Both in cases of sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 376 the Court has the discretion to impose a sentence of imprisonment less than the prescribed minimum for 'adequate and special reasons'. If the Court does not mention such reasons in the judgment there is no scope for awarding a sentence lesser than the prescribed minimum.

G In order to exercise the discretion of reducing the sentence the statutory requirement is that the Court has to record "adequate and special reasons" in the judgment and not fanciful reasons which would permit the Court to impose a sentence less than the prescribed minimum. The reason has not only to be adequate but also special. What is adequate and special would depend upon several factors and no strait-jacket formula can be indicated. What is

applicable to trial Courts regarding recording reasons for a departure from minimum sentence is equally applicable to the High Court. The only reason indicated by the High Court is the young age of the accused and the fact that he belongs to a Scheduled Tribe. The same can by no stretch of imagination be considered either adequate or special. The requirement in law is cumulative. A

It is to be noted that the victim in the instant case is a child who was about 6 years of age at the time of commission of offence. Sub section (2) of Section 376 IPC provides for a more stringent punishment when the victim is under 12 years of age. B

In the instant case the High Court was clearly in error in reducing the sentence without recording any adequate and special reason in imposing lesser sentence. C

Considering the legal position as indicated above the High Court's order is clearly unsustainable.

Accordingly, the judgment of the High Court is set aside and that of the trial court is restored. D

Appeal is allowed.

S.K.S.

Appeal allowed.