Punishment: Forms, Theory and Practice

Salim Javed Akhtar, Department of Law,
Galgotias University, Yamuna Expressway
Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh
Email ID: salimjaved35@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: ***Punishment is an evil levied on a wrongdoer, described by Oppenheimer as a wrongdoer on behalf of and at the whim of society, in its corporate capacity of which he is a permanent or temporary member." Punishment often runs with crime and originates as private retribution. To satisfy the sense of retribution, only the perpetrator carries out the punishment. The right to pardon the convict was only given to the aggrieved party and no other right was vested in public jurisdiction. The purpose of the punishment was to inflict "hurt." Punishment is often known to be a form of social order and of crime prevention. In line with the shift in social psychology, the goal of retribution has changed. It deals with punishment and prevention of criminals and is now working towards recovery. The sentencing framework under the Indian Penal Code is still not unchanged, but has been modified by law and also by the understanding of the Honorable Courts to fulfill society's needs and demands. With traditional crime, modern development gives rise to new types and modes of crime such as cyber-crime, financial crime, etc. which entail reform in the degree of punishment and its execution. By now, it has become very clear that while the notion of retribution is as old as humanity, the overall shift has been enormous. Therefore, it is pertinent to discuss the same briefly and henceforth, this paper gives a brief discussion on the punishment***

Keywords: Crime, Forms, Practice, Punishment, Society, Theory, Conviction.

INTRODUCTION

The attitude and temper of the people with respect to the prosecution of crime and criminals is also said to be one of the unfailing indicators of every nation's society. Over the years, opinions on deterrence have undergone a sea shift and today it is seen as a measure to protect society, done in part by changing the criminal and in part by stopping him and others from committing similar offences. The idea of punishment is rather complex and is intrinsically associated with the definition of guilt or crime. The behavior that is prohibited by statute is a felony or violation, plainly put, and of which such penalties, called punishment, will apply on the occasion of the conditions stated and during the procedure stated. Punishment is as ancient as punishment, maybe. Oppenheimer describes retribution as "Punishment is an evil inflicted on a wrongdoer, as a wrongdoer on behalf of and at the discretion of society, in its corporate capacity of which he is a permanent or temporary member" [1].

The principle of punishment has undoubtedly existed as long as man himself, and a sense of the need for it in some cases. Each kid learns how to act by a series of incentives and punishments. Thus, from time immemorial, retribution has been the experience of any one of us, and of humanity in general. It has entered our imagination profoundly, and we are accustomed to the notion, even to the anticipation of it. It may also be claimed that the basic reaction to crime and abuse in all cultures is retribution. As such, different types are needed. State officials are allocating and dispensing judicial penalties such as detention and death sentences. Such formal sanctions include civil litigation and disciplinary decrees to reconcile or improve relations between the parties, to compensate for personal injury and to deter future wrongdoing by limiting existing activities. For specific reasons, various forms of penalties are used. Crime sentences help to reinforce valuable principles and ideals, incapacitate and discourage those who may perceive criminal wrongdoing and also work to preserve power dynamics in a community and remove threats to the established social order. Punishment has its roots in private retribution. Then it transforms into collective revenge, where the answer to a crime comes not from an entity, but from society. In the next stage of punishment creation, the Will of the Rulers gains primacy. This is the moment when the responsibility for punishment is taken over by the state. Common ways of punishment such as incarceration or the grant of capital punishment do not cause any difficulty, because even with the mainstream mind, they would be readily recognized as qualifying the concept of punishment. Yet there are

other kinds of punishments levied under criminal law that make it a herculean challenge to determine punishment. For e.g. punishments such as the expulsion of a foreign enemy, the suspension of the driver's license, the involuntary hospitalization of a mentally ill person, the payment of penalties for violation of behaviour, etc., where problems which occur because a specific classification will not be involved [2].

The conduct has acquired a lot of help from people who are equipped for affecting the public strategy like therapists, sociologists, post-trial supervisors, and so on who are chipping away at zones identified with culpability and treatment of hoodlums. Another prominent change that has occurred in the new year's is the individualization of discipline, come about by examination in to wrongdoing causation, by the exploration in with the impacts of various types of discipline, by the improvement of sociologies, mental investigations and current insights. This change has been achieved likewise by the philanthropic powers, and hypotheses of individualization of discipline. The view has made progress that the law should glance in to the crook and not just in to the wrongdoing [3].

A prominently fluctuated arrangement of approvals is presently applied so as to adjust the discipline to every specific classification of crooks. Correspondingly the conventional disposition with respect to the duty has gone through a change. Various approvals are currently applied to youngsters and teenagers instead of grown-ups, to intellectually anomalous people as against the rational people, to the main wrongdoers as against the recidivists. In all these general public is attempting to use each logical technique for self-security against ruinous components in its middle. This demeanor has made expanded acknowledgment the hypothesis of reorganization and restoration. The Supreme Court of India has been giving accentuation on renewal in contra to its prior adherence to revenge [4]. In Rajendra Prasad v. Province of U.P, disavowing the hypothesis of requital the court mentioned the accompanying objective facts "the retributive hypothesis has had its day and is not, at this point legitimate prevention and reconstructions are the essential social objectives which make hardship of life and freedom sensible as correctional panacea." The accentuation on the various parts of disciplines relying upon the requirements of the case being referred to can be found in the different choices of the peak court.

The court stressed discouragement for middle class violations in Mohammed Giassuddin v. Province of A.P. While managing sex wrongdoers and adolescent guilty parties, Phul Singh v. Territory of Haryana: noticed. For condemning viability in instances of desire stacked guiltiness can't be straightforwardly expected by grant of long imprisonment, for regularly that cure irritates the illness. Correctional therapeutics should be more edified than the visually impaired methodology of jail seriousness where all that happens is sex starvation, abuse, criminal friendship, flexible indecencies through bioenvironmental contamination, dehumanized cell-drill under zoological conditions and rise at the hour of delivery, of a disenthralled foe of its general public and qualities with a permanent disgrace as convict stepped on him-a possibly decent individual 'effectively' prepared with a solidified delinquent gratitude to the reformatory lack of education of the jail framework [5].

The court should reestablish the man." Emphasizing the remedial part of discipline court saw in Satto v. Territory of U.P, "adjustment educated by empathy not detainment prompting degeneration, is the essential point of this field of criminal equity. Adolescent equity has established roots in the articles 15(3) and 39 (e), and the inescapable humanism which bespeaks the super-parental worry of the state for its youngster residents including adolescent deadbeats. The corrective pharmacopeia of India in time with the reformatory technique as of now common in enlightened criminology needs to move toward the youngster wrongdoer not as focus of cruel discipline but rather of empathetic sustenance that is the focal issue of condemning strategy when adolescents are seen as blameworthy of misconduct." But in instances of wrongdoings of a genuine sort, the Indian Supreme Court has not left from the retributive hypothesis of discipline [6].

In Dhanajoy Chatterjee v. Province of West Bengal court held that 'equity requests that courts ought to force discipline befitting the wrongdoing so the courts reflect public extreme aversion of the wrongdoing. The courts should not just keep in view the privileges of the criminal as well as the privileges of the person in question and society everywhere while thinking about the burden of proper discipline.' accordingly, it tends to be seen

that however every overall set of laws hold fast basically to one hypothesis of discipline, different perspectives can't be disregarded totally. Inconvenience of just discipline fulfilling the retributive senses of the general public, simultaneously obliging its drawn out requirements like decrease in the rate of wrongdoings and reorganization of crooks requests a blend of different methodologies, contingent upon what each case requests [7].

UNDER THE INDIAN PENAL CODE

The Indian Penal Code mirrors the impact of Benthamites comparable to corrective enactment. Evaluating of different offenses depends on their gravity as perceived by the council and the gravity of offense is for the most part perceived regarding social peril presented by the offense. Determinants of evaluating of offenses depend on social peril, caution to the likely casualty and others, social dissatisfaction with regards to certain demonstrations, premise on damage confronted, more prominent evil should convey more noteworthy discipline. Discipline under the code includes various standards of criminal condemning. Tenet of proportionality discovers place with scope being given to judges to decide a proper sentence. Area 53 of the Indian Penal Code depicts the sorts of disciplines accommodated the different offenses. They are, passing, detainment forever, detainment which is of two portrayals, specifically, rigourous, and straightforward, relinquishment of property and fine. There are two classes of detainment that are given under the Code-detainment to life and detainment, which is of two portrayals in particular thorough and straightforward. Thorough detainment implies detainment with hard work, while basic detainment doesn't include any work. Areas 53 to 75 of the Indian Penal code set out the plan of discipline. Five areas for example 56, 58, 59, 61 and 62 have just been canceled. Code as initially ordered contained one more sort of discipline known as "transportation forever". This has now been subbed by detainment for life by the Code of technique Amendment Act, 1955 and another part 53-A was embedded. According to area 53-A now any place there is any reference to "transportation forever" it will be interpreted as a source of perspective to detainment forever. Transportation was feared. Clarifying the penology of transportation Macaulay stated: "The agony which is brought about by discipline is unmixed insidiousness. It is by the fear which it motivates that it creates great; and maybe no discipline moves such a lot of dread in relation to the genuine torment which it causes as the discipline of transportation in this country. Delayed discipline might be more agonizing in the real perseverance; however it isn't such a lot of feared heretofore; nor does a sentence of detainment strike either the guilty party or the spectators with much awfulness as a sentence of outcast past what they call the dark water" [8].

In Bantu v. Territory of U.P. Court said that "inconvenience of sentence without considering its impact on the social request by and large might be in all actuality a vain exercise. The social effect of the wrongdoing for example where it identifies with offenses against a ladies, dacoity, grabbing, misappropriation of public cash, treachery and different offenses including moral turpitude which have incredible effect on social request ,and public premium can't be dismissed and in essence require commendable discipline." Till 1983, all the above offenses aside from murder submitted by a daily existence convict (for example Area 303) accommodated elective discipline of detainment forever. In this manner capital punishment was required distinctly if there should be an occurrence of offense falling under Section 303, I.P.C. Yet, the Supreme Court in Mithu v. Province of Punjab, saw that Section 303 I.P.C. was unlawful and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the constitution of India. Ensuing to this decision, Section 303 presently for all intents and purposes stands canceled and all instances of homicide are currently to be culpable under Section 302, I.P.C. Preceding the revision made in the Code of Criminal Procedure in 1955, it was required for the courts to grant capital punishment for the offense of homicide and in the event that they settled on any tolerance, they needed to record explanations behind it.

Yet, this position was switched by the Amendment Act of 1955 and now the court is needed to record explanations behind granting capital punishment. Legitimacy of capital punishment being violative of articles 14, 19 and 21 of the constitution was tested without precedent for Jagmohan Singh v. Province of U.P.31The

court maintained the sacred legitimacy of the segment 302 of the code. Meanwhile new arrangements were added to Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 and according to area 354(3) judges should state extraordinary reasons in the judgment for delivering capital punishment. In Bachan Singh v. Punjab32 in 1980 has finished the discussion by giving that capital punishment ought to be sparingly utilized in most extraordinary of uncommon cases. A scrutiny of few more Supreme Court choices including capital punishment would uncover that abrupt drive or incitement, wild contempt emerging out of sex-extravagance, family fight or land-debate, disloyalty of spouse or the sentence of death looming over the head of blamed as uncontrollable issues at hand supporting mercy and compensation of capital punishment to that of detainment forever. Equity Krishna Iyer made it clear on account of Rajendra Prasad v. Territory of U.P.33 that where the homicide is purposeful, planned, merciless and frightful and there are no special conditions, the wrongdoer should be condemned to death as a proportion of social protection.

On the off chance that offense is culpable with fine just, the detainment in default of installment of fine will be basic which will be not over multi month upto Rs. 50, under multi month upto Rs100 and if there should arise an occurrence of more than Rs. 100 fine it won't be over a half year. Fine forced by the court can be acknowledged inside six years or during detainment when the term of the equivalent is longer than six years. The passing of a detainee doesn't release him from risk and this property will be obligated for his obligation. It has been set somewhere around the Supreme Court that limit of six years recommended under area 70 doesn't make a difference to fine forced for hatred of high court. Segment 326A of Indian Penal Code which is identified with the wrongdoing of Acid assault and area 376. Related to wrongdoing of assault indicates that fine will be simply and sensible to meet the clinical cost for the treatment of casualty. With the difference in reason for discipline the focal point of legal executive has been moved not exclusively to restore the lawbreaker yet in addition reestablish the person in question. In numerous decisions Courts articulated remuneration instead of fine or with fine to limit the impact of wrongdoing. High Court has built up a compensatory statute through different decisions. Under Article 21 of the constitution Supreme Court pay to the people in question. High Court guided the state to pay remuneration and gave rules for the reason for unlawful detainment, for custodial torment and assault casualties and so forth which in actuality built up the ground towards creating remedial equity in our criminal equity framework [9].

Under segment 357 of Criminal Procedure Code it is obligation of Court in condemning to remunerate the casualty with entire or part of the fine. In Baldev singh v condition of punjab high court mentioned the observable fact that the pretender of the courts to grant the remuneration to casualties under area 357 is certifiably not a subordinate to different sentences yet is moreover thereto. It is a proportion of reacting fittingly to wrongdoing and of accommodating the casualty with guilty party. Hence all courts complimented this force generously in order to meet the closures of equity in a superior manner. In 2008 another part is added as casualty remuneration plot for giving assets to the reason for pay to the person in question or his wards who have endured misfortune or injury because of the wrongdoing and who require restoration. By the Criminal Law Amendment Act 2013 as fine remuneration is presented straightforwardly in segment 326A and 376D [10].

CONCLUSION

By now, it has become very clear that while the definition of punishment is as old as humanity, the general form of punishment and its acceptance in the penal system of various countries has evolved considerably. Whereas the original focus on retribution was on retaliation, there was a time when the focus turned to the offender's spiritual penance. Through the passing of time penalty, however, it is viewed from the viewpoint of the perpetrator's recovery, which means that it is the intention of the justice system that the criminal is adequately rehabilitated by the punishment process. The need for the hour is to humanize the method of execution of punishment.

REFERENCES

[1] Crimes and theories of punishment available at http://shodhganga.inflibnet. ac.in/bitstream/10603/45012/9/09_chapter%204.pdf
[2] Book on Jurisprudence by Dr. B.N.Mani tripathi
[3] Theories of Punishment by Aviral Umrao, research associate updated on Febraury 7, 2014 available at http://lexwarrier.in/2014/02/theories-punishment-overview/
[4] Retributive Theory of Punishment: A Critical Analysis, Updated on January 15, 2015 By hariharan By Abhishek Mohanty, WBNUJS available at https://www. lawctopus.com/academike/retributive-theory-of-punishment-acritical-analysis/
[5] CURATED COLLECTIONS OF THE MOST USEFUL FACTS, Curated by BROSHAN SCHWARMA available at https://www.citelighter.com/philosophy/philosophy/ knowledgecards/retributivist-theory-of-punishment
[6] Theories of Punishment available at https://www.lawnotes.in/Theories_of_Punishment
[7] Mohammad Ghiasuddin v. State of Andhra Pradesh (1977)3SCC287 18 (1987) 3 SCC 80
19 Paper on "Criminal Judicial System" Module 'Sentencing: Theory and Practise' available at http://epgp.inflibnet.ac.in/epgpdata/uploads/epgp_content/law/05._criminal_ justice_administration/17._sentencing__theory_and_practice/et/8182_et_et.pdf