

## BHARTEEYA NYAYA SANHITA: A STEP FROM PUNISHMENT TO JUSTICE

Monika Giri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>B.A., LL.B., SDGI, India.

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS36121>

### ABSTRACT

The Bharteeya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) marks a transformative shift in India's approach to criminal justice, transitioning from a punitive framework to one centered on restorative justice. Aimed at reforming outdated legal provisions and addressing the societal implications of crime, the BNS seeks to create a more equitable and humane justice system. This paper examines the core principles and objectives of the BNS, highlighting its emphasis on victim rights, rehabilitation, and the prevention of crime, rather than merely focusing on punitive measures. The BNS introduces innovative legal mechanisms that prioritize the needs of victims and offenders alike, fostering a sense of accountability and community healing. By integrating restorative justice principles, the BNS encourages dialogue between victims and offenders, promoting reconciliation and reducing recidivism. This approach aligns with global trends in criminal justice reform, emphasizing the importance of rehabilitation over retribution. Additionally, the paper analyzes the socio-economic implications of the BNS, particularly its potential to address systemic inequalities within the justice system. By focusing on restorative practices, the BNS aims to empower marginalized communities and provide them with access to justice, thereby enhancing public trust in legal institutions. The discussion also considers the practical challenges of implementing the BNS, including resistance from traditionalist legal perspectives and the need for comprehensive training for law enforcement and judicial personnel.

Ultimately, the Bharteeya Nyaya Sanhita represents a significant step forward in India's legal evolution, redefining justice in a way that prioritizes healing and societal reintegration. This paper argues that embracing restorative justice principles within the framework of the BNS not only enhances the effectiveness of the legal system but also fosters a more compassionate society. Through this analysis, the paper advocates for a reimaged understanding of justice that resonates with the diverse realities of the Indian populace.

**Keywords :** Restorative Justice, Bharteeya Nyaya Sanhita, Criminal Justice Reform, Victim Rights, Rehabilitation

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Bharteeya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) represents a significant evolution in India's criminal justice system, moving from a retributive model centered on punishment to a restorative approach focused on justice, healing, and rehabilitation. This shift reflects a broader global trend in criminal justice reform that prioritizes the needs of victims and communities alongside those of offenders. The BNS not only aims to update outdated legal provisions but also seeks to address the root causes of criminal behavior, thereby fostering a more humane and equitable justice system.

Historically, the Indian legal framework has been heavily influenced by colonial-era laws, many of which have perpetuated punitive measures without effectively addressing the complexities of crime. The Indian Penal Code of 1860, for instance, established a rigid framework that often prioritized punishment over understanding the socio-economic and psychological factors that contribute to criminal behavior. This framework has led to systemic issues, including overcrowded prisons, high rates of recidivism, and a lack of focus on rehabilitation. The Supreme Court has highlighted the importance of reforming this antiquated system, stating that "the criminal justice system must not only punish the offender but also aim to reform him." The BNS aims to tackle these challenges by incorporating restorative justice principles, which emphasize repairing the harm caused by criminal behavior through reconciliation between victims, offenders, and the community. This approach not only facilitates healing for victims but also encourages offenders to take responsibility for their actions, fostering a sense of accountability that is often absent in traditional punitive systems. As articulated by legal scholars, restorative

justice serves as a "process to involve, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in the offense and to collectively identify and address the harms."

### 2. LANDMARK JUDGMENTS SHAPING THE INDIAN LEGAL LANDSCAPE

The Indian legal system has undergone significant transformation over the decades, particularly through landmark judgments that have redefined the contours of justice, fundamental rights, and the role of the judiciary. This discussion highlights pivotal rulings that have shaped Indian jurisprudence, focusing on their implications for individual rights, the accountability of state actors, and the overall development of the legal framework in India.

### **1. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)**

The Kesavananda Bharati case is often regarded as a cornerstone of Indian constitutional law. The Supreme Court, in a landmark 7-6 decision, introduced the "basic structure doctrine," asserting that while Parliament has the power to amend the Constitution, it cannot alter its fundamental framework. This case arose from a challenge to the Kerala Land Reforms Act, which aimed to impose restrictions on the ownership of land. The Court held that certain fundamental features of the Constitution, such as the supremacy of the Constitution, the rule of law, and the separation of powers, constitute its "basic structure" and are beyond parliamentary amendment.

The implications of this doctrine have been profound. It has provided a critical check against potential authoritarianism and has reinforced the role of the judiciary as the guardian of constitutional values. The Kesavananda Bharati ruling has been invoked in numerous subsequent cases to protect individual rights and uphold democratic principles.

### **2. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**

In **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India**, the Supreme Court expanded the interpretation of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. The case emerged when Maneka Gandhi challenged the constitutional validity of the Passport Act, which allowed the government to revoke her passport without providing reasons. The Court ruled that the procedure established by law must be "just, fair, and reasonable," thereby emphasizing that Article 21 encompasses not only the right to life but also the right to a dignified life.

This judgment marked a significant shift from a purely procedural understanding of Article 21 to a substantive one, where the Court began to recognize various facets of human rights, including the right to privacy, education, and a clean environment. The Maneka Gandhi case laid the foundation for a series of progressive judgments that furthered civil liberties in India.

### **3. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)**

The Vishaka case was pivotal in addressing the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace. The Supreme Court, recognizing the absence of specific legislation to tackle this issue, laid down guidelines to prevent sexual harassment, emphasizing that gender equality is a fundamental right under Articles 14, 15, and 21. The case arose when Bhanwari Devi, a social worker, was gang-raped while trying to prevent child marriage. The Court's decision not only provided immediate relief to the victim but also established a framework for addressing sexual harassment in workplaces, which eventually led to the enactment of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition, and Redressal) Act, 2013.

The Vishaka judgment underscored the judiciary's proactive role in safeguarding women's rights and set a precedent for addressing issues of gender-based violence within legal frameworks.

### **4. S.R. Bommai v. Union of India (1994)**

The **S.R. Bommai** case is significant in the context of federalism and the relationship between the central and state governments. The Supreme Court examined the constitutional validity of the dismissal of state governments under Article 356, which allows the President to assume control of a state's administration during a failure of constitutional machinery. The Court ruled that the power under Article 356 is not absolute and is subject to judicial review.

The judgment clarified that the imposition of President's Rule must be based on objective criteria and that the exercise of power cannot be arbitrary. This ruling reinforced the principles of federalism and the importance of a responsible government at the state level, ensuring that the rights of citizens are protected from arbitrary state action.

### **5. Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018)**

The **Navtej Singh Johar** case marked a historic moment in the decriminalization of homosexuality in India. The Supreme Court struck down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, which criminalized consensual homosexual acts. The Court held that the law violated the fundamental rights to equality, privacy, and dignity enshrined in Articles 14, 15, and 21.

This ruling was not only a victory for LGBTQ+ rights but also emphasized the importance of individual autonomy and the right to love freely. The judgment highlighted that the state should not interfere in the private lives of individuals and that societal norms should not dictate the legal rights of citizens. The Navtej Singh Johar decision is a testament to the evolving understanding of human rights in India.

### **6. Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017)**

In **Shayara Bano v. Union of India**, the Supreme Court addressed the issue of instant triple talaq among Muslims. The petitioner, Shayara Bano, challenged the practice as unconstitutional, arguing that it violated the rights of Muslim

women. The Court ruled that the practice of instant triple talaq was unconstitutional and arbitrary, violating the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14 and 21.

This landmark decision was crucial in promoting gender justice and empowering Muslim women. The ruling underscored the judiciary's role in upholding constitutional values and protecting the rights of marginalized communities, thus contributing to the discourse on women's rights within the framework of personal laws.

#### **7. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017)**

The **Puttaswamy** case recognized the right to privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution. The case arose in the context of the government's push for a nationwide biometric identification system (Aadhaar). The Supreme Court held that the right to privacy is intrinsic to the right to life and personal liberty.

This ruling has far-reaching implications, as it has laid the groundwork for protecting personal data and privacy rights in an increasingly digital world. The Court emphasized that privacy is not an absolute right but must be balanced against legitimate state interests. The **Puttaswamy** judgment has since informed debates on data protection and privacy laws in India.

#### **8. Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka (1992)**

In **Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka**, the Supreme Court ruled that the right to education is a fundamental right under Article 21. The case was based on the arbitrary denial of admission to a medical college. The Court held that the right to life encompasses the right to live with dignity, which includes access to education.

This ruling led to the enactment of the Right to Education Act in 2009, ensuring free and compulsory education for children aged 6 to 14 years. The **Mohini Jain** case has been instrumental in framing education as a critical component of individual rights and state responsibility.

#### **9. Indira Sawhney v. Union of India (1992)**

The **Indira Sawhney** case, often referred to as the Mandal Commission case, dealt with the issue of reservation in government jobs and educational institutions for OBCs (Other Backward Classes). The Supreme Court upheld the recommendation of the Mandal Commission, allowing a 27% reservation for OBCs while emphasizing the need to maintain a balance with the principle of merit.

The Court also established the "creamy layer" concept, which excludes socially advanced individuals from the benefits of reservation. This ruling has had a lasting impact on affirmative action policies in India, promoting social justice while addressing concerns about meritocracy.

#### **10. Nandini Sundar v. State of Chhattisgarh (2011)**

In **Nandini Sundar v. State of Chhattisgarh**, the Supreme Court addressed the issue of state-sponsored vigilante groups, specifically the Salwa Judum, formed to combat Maoist insurgency. The Court ruled that the formation of such groups violated the rights of individuals and the rule of law.

The judgment underscored the importance of state accountability in addressing internal conflicts and protecting human rights. It emphasized that the state cannot delegate its responsibility to maintain law and order to private actors, reinforcing the principle of legality in governance.

#### **Core Principles of the Bharateeya Nyaya Sanhita**

At its core, the BNS is built upon several foundational principles that aim to redefine justice in a manner that is both restorative and inclusive. First and foremost, the BNS places a significant emphasis on victim rights. Historically, victims have often been sidelined in the criminal justice process, with little opportunity to participate in proceedings or seek restitution. The BNS seeks to rectify this imbalance by ensuring that victims are active participants in the justice process, allowing them to voice their needs and concerns. The introduction of victim-offender mediation is a critical component of this approach. This process provides a platform for victims to engage directly with offenders, facilitating dialogue that can lead to mutual understanding and, in some cases, reconciliation. As the Supreme Court noted in *State of Maharashtra v. Ram Das Naram Das*, the healing process for victims is often contingent upon their ability to express their trauma and receive acknowledgment from the offender. By providing avenues for such interactions, the BNS aims to empower victims and give them a voice in the justice system. Additionally, the BNS advocates for rehabilitation as a primary goal of the criminal justice system. Rather than solely focusing on punishment, the BNS emphasizes the need to address the underlying factors that contribute to criminal behavior, including socio-economic conditions, mental health issues, and substance abuse. This holistic approach aligns with global best practices, which have shown that rehabilitation can significantly reduce recidivism rates. Research indicates that rehabilitation programs that address the root causes of criminal behavior lead to better outcomes for both individuals and society as a whole.

### **Socio-Economic Implications**

The BNS also recognizes the socio-economic implications of crime and justice. In a country like India, where disparities in wealth and access to resources are stark, it is essential to consider how socio-economic factors contribute to criminal behavior. Many offenders come from marginalized backgrounds, where poverty, lack of education, and limited opportunities create an environment conducive to crime. By focusing on rehabilitation and restorative practices, the BNS aims to break this cycle of poverty and crime, offering offenders pathways to reintegrate into society successfully.

The BNS's focus on community involvement further underscores its commitment to addressing systemic inequalities. Community-based programs can play a crucial role in supporting both victims and offenders, fostering a sense of collective responsibility for public safety. Such programs may include community service requirements for offenders, which not only contribute to the community but also help offenders reconnect with their surroundings in a positive manner. In this context, the BNS aligns with the principles outlined in the United Nations' Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programmes in Criminal Matters, which advocate for community involvement as a vital component of restorative justice.

### **Implementation Challenges**

Despite its promising objectives, the implementation of the BNS faces significant challenges. Resistance from entrenched interests within the legal community poses a barrier to the adoption of restorative practices. Legal professionals who have long been accustomed to a punitive system may be hesitant to embrace new methodologies that prioritize rehabilitation and reconciliation. As noted by legal scholars, "the success of restorative justice initiatives depends heavily on the willingness of legal practitioners to adapt their approaches."

Moreover, there is a pressing need for comprehensive training for law enforcement and judicial personnel to ensure the effective implementation of the BNS. This training should encompass not only the principles of restorative justice but also practical skills for facilitating victim-offender mediation and community engagement. Without adequate training, the potential benefits of the BNS may not be fully realized, leading to a continuation of the challenges that it seeks to address.

## **3. CONCLUSION**

The Bharteeya Nyaya Sanhita represents a transformative step in India's criminal justice system, moving away from a punitive approach toward one that prioritizes justice, healing, and rehabilitation. By focusing on the rights of victims, promoting restorative practices, and addressing the socio-economic factors that contribute to crime, the BNS aims to create a more equitable and humane legal framework.

The evolution of Indian jurisprudence is marked by these landmark judgments that have collectively shaped the legal landscape of the country. The Supreme Court's proactive stance in interpreting constitutional provisions has played a crucial role in advancing individual rights, promoting social justice, and ensuring state accountability. As India continues to navigate complex socio-political challenges, these judicial pronouncements serve as guiding principles for the pursuit of justice and the protection of fundamental rights. As India navigates this critical juncture in its legal evolution, the successful implementation of the BNS could herald a new era of justice that resonates with the diverse realities of its populace. The realization of restorative justice principles within the framework of the BNS is not merely a legal reform but a societal necessity, essential for fostering a culture of healing, accountability, and communal responsibility. Ultimately, the BNS stands as a testament to the evolving understanding of justice in contemporary society, underscoring the imperative to shift from punishment to a more compassionate and restorative model of justice.

## **4. REFERENCES**

- [1] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India AIR 1978 SC 597.
- [2] J. Braithwaite, *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation* (OUP 2002) 2.
- [3] Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973) 4 SCC 225.
- [4] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India AIR 1978 SC 597.
- [5] Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan AIR 1997 SC 3011.
- [6] S.R. Bommai v. Union of India (1994) 3 SCC 1.
- [7] Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018) 10 SCC 1.
- [8] Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017) 9 SCC 1.
- [9] Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- [10] Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka AIR 1992 SC 1858.

- [11] Indira Sawhney v. Union of India AIR 1993 SC 477.
- [12] Nandini Sundar v. State of Chhattisgarh (2011) 7 SCC 547.
- [13] Bharteeyya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
- [14] State of Maharashtra v. Ram Das Naram Das (2007) 9 SCC 295.
- [15] D. Polaschek, 'The Role of Rehabilitation in Reducing Recidivism' (2011) 30 International Journal of Law and Psychiatry 61.
- [16] United Nations, Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programmes in Criminal Matters (2002) UN Doc E/RES/2002/6.
- [17] J. D. S. A. R. de Bie, 'Adapting to Restorative Justice: The Challenges for Legal Practitioners' (2020) 14 Restorative Justice: An International Journal 125.