



MENS REA ABSENTEEISM IN THE DEFENSE OF INSANITY: A MEDICO- LEGAL ANALYSIS

By *Sankalp Vijay & ShubhamMudgil*
From *School of Law, UPES, Dehradun*

ABSTRACT

Scientific theories of the brain endanger our assumption of intent and consequentially threaten our customary practices. With the advent of modern criminal law in the country the approach for a modernized ideology has evolved, criminology is not stagnant anymore, its evolving as the human brain expands. This article dives into the depths of insanity as a defense to a crime. The authors have tried to effectualize the medical and legal aspects of insanity as a defense and the absence of *mens-rea* in the same. The reader shall feel the implication of *mens-rea* absenteeism in the defence of insanity. The paper primarily focuses on varied concepts of legal and medical insanity, meaning of which has evolved with time and authority. The paper takes into account the interpretation of the provisions under the *Indian Penal Code*, with respect to defense available to an *insane accused* and the implications on the same through the *McNaughton's case*. The paper has been introduced through chapterization of the idea into Four aspects dealing in essentials of *mens-rea* criminal responsibility, insanity as a defence, relationship between *mens-rea* and insanity and finally the hypothesis as what needs to be done to clarify this fault in the legal system, of similarity between legal and medical

insanity, and their implications on incarceration of an accused.

KEY WORDS: *Criminology, Insanity as a Defence, Mens Rea, Legal Insanity, Medical Insanity, Indian Penal Code, McNaughton's case, Criminal Responsibility*

INTRODUCTION

Unsoundness of mind is an absolute defence to a criminal charge. It assumes that an insane person has no mind and thus cannot have the mandatory *mens rea* to be held guilty of a crime.¹

A mad man cannot control his will and regulate his conduct, thus is placed in an even worse condition than a child. Moreover, no court can correct the act of an insane man, being unintentional and involuntary, by way of punishment.² At the same time, in order to protect the people from being attacked by maniacs a provision under the code of Criminal Procedure 1973 has been made for the detention and care of persons of unsound mind.³

According to medical science, unsoundness of mind or insanity is a disease of the mind, which impairs the mental faculty of man. In law, insanity implies a malady of mind which debilitates the intellectual personnel, in particular, the thinking limit of a man to such a degree as to render him unequipped for understanding the nature and outcomes

¹ Singh, Hari, "*The Penal Law of India*", Vol I, 11thedn., 2000, pp 620-630.

²Hall, jerome, "*General principles of Criminal Law*", 2ndedn, 1960, p 499.

³The Code of Criminal procedure 1973, Ch XXV, ss 328-339.



of his acts. It avoided from its domain, the madness caused because of enthusiastic and volitional components. It is just craziness of a specific kind, which is viewed as madness at law that will pardon a man from criminal obligation. The lawful idea of craziness generally varies from that of restorative idea. A number of tests were laid down from time to time for the purpose. The definition of kind and degree of insanity available as a defence to a crime has been propounded many times. However the most appreciated of all is the right and wrong test proposed through the *McNaughton's case*. The principle presumed every man to be sane and to possess sufficient degree of reason to be held responsible for his criminal wrongdoings, until the contrary is proved; and to maintain a defence with insanity as the ground, it must be proved beyond doubt that, when the act was committed, the accused was harbouring such a defect of reason, from malady of the mind, as not to know the nature and the quality of the act he was doing, or of he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what was wrong.⁴

CHAPTER I

MENS REA IN CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

Section 84 of the IPC has been drafted in this regard. However, section 84 uses a more sophisticated term “unsoundness of mind” instead of “insanity” as stated by Huda:⁵

The use of the term 'unsoundness of mind' has the benefit of getting rid of the need of characterizing craziness and of falsely bringing inside its degree different

conditions and affections of the mind which conventionally don't come within its meaning, yet which in any case remain on a similar balance with respect to exclusion from criminal liability.

Section 84 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) embodies two different mental conditions to claim exceptions from criminal liability namely:

1. The accused was incapable of knowing the nature of the act, owing to unsoundness of mind.
2. The accused was precluded by reason of unsoundness of mind from understanding that what he was doing was either wrong or contrary to law.

The first case embodies two situations, namely involuntary actions and mistake of fact on account of unsoundness of mind. For instance, if a mad man cuts off the head of a person, whom he found sleeping on the road, because he thinks it would be fun to watch him looking about his head when he wakes up, the act shows that he did not know the nature and quality of his act.

The second case covers those situations where a man by reason of delusion is unable to appreciate the distinction between right and wrong.

Further in the case of *R v Holmes*⁶ doctor's opinion of insanity was upheld. The appellant committed a homicidal attack on his landlady. He then went to a police station, said that he was giving himself up for murder, and gave a fully detailed account of what he has done. He was charged upon indictment of murder. The only defence was

⁴R v McNaughton 8 E.R. 718 (1843).

⁵SS Huda, “Principles of law of Crimes in British India”, ILL, 1902, reprint 1982, p271.

⁶2 All ER 324(1953); 1 WLR 686(1953).



the plea of insanity. A doctor, called to give evidence on behalf of appellant was asked in cross examination whether in his opinion the appellant's conduct immediately after the murder would indicate;

1. That he knew the nature of the act he was committing.
2. That the appellant knew that his conduct was contrary to the law of the land.

The doctor answered both questions in affirmative. The appellant was convicted of murder. The principle ground of appeal against his conviction was that the judge was wrong in allowing the questions put to the doctor and his answers to be admitted in evidence. It was held by the court that the questions were admissible and the appeal was dismissed.

*Eric Michael Clark v. Arizona*⁷ was a landmark case which laid down the principle that irresistible impulse per se is no defence to charge of a crime. In this particular case the respondent shot the station manager on the head and was thus charged with the crime of murder. Insanity as a ground of acquittal was pleaded by the accused. The medical evidence showed that he has schizoid (mental disease) personality and that at the moment of shooting, even though he knew the nature and quality of the act, did not know that the act which he was doing was wrong. Consequentially, respondent was found guilty and was sentenced to death, and his first appeal was dismissed, he appealed to the High Court of Australia, who quashed the conviction and ordered a new trial. Lord Tucker in this case said that:

"The words true operation of uncontrollable impulse as a symptom of insanity of a required kind and degree in the above passage in the High Court's judgment implied erroneously that the law knew and recognized uncontrollable impulse as a symptom of legal insanity within the meaning of the McNaughton Rules, and that it was the judge's duty to instruct the jury as a matter of law.

Reduced liability is a defence to a charge of murder. It diminishes the criminal liability for murder to manslaughter.

MENTAL ELEMENT IN CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

Criminal responsibility as a concept is plain. Criminal wrongdoings are characterized by their "components," that dependably incorporate a precluded demonstration and as a rule a psychological express, a mensrea, for example, intent. According to the Due Process clause the prosecution must prove that all the elements defining a criminal offense beyond a reasonable doubt.⁸ Justice Jackson in *Morissette v. United States* established:

"The contention that an injury can amount to a crime only when inflicted by intention is no provincial or transient notion. It is as universal and persistent in mature systems of law as belief in freedom of the human will and a consequent ability and duty of the normal individual to choose between good and evil. A relation between some mental element and punishment for a harmful act is

⁷2 ALL ER 324.

⁸*In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 364 (1970); see also *Sandstrom v. Montana*, 442 U.S. 510 (1979).



almost as instinctive as the child's familiar exculpatory".⁹

Mens rea is a completely different aspect than the concept of legal insanity. It shall be understood that people with mens rea are not machines rather are individuals who act for some reason. They can be influenced by immoral and malicious beliefs and ideologies, but most of the times they do not have the requisite knowledge and the intention of what act they are doing. Therefore, it is difficult for mental disorder to negate mensrea.

CHAPTER II

INSANITY IN RESPONSIBILITY

Section 84 of the Indian Penal Code states that "Nothing is an offence which is done by a person, who at the time of doing it, by reason of unsoundness of mind, is incapable of knowing the nature of the act, or that he is doing, what is either wrong or contrary to law."

The relevant maxim in this regard is "*Actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea*". The Indian rule of rationale is based on the McNaughton rules. The basic principle of Section 84 as well as McNaughton rules is that "every man is presumed to be sane."¹⁰ However, it is not applicable to a man if he is being tried under section 84. This particular exemption is based on the principle that for a crime to have been done, a guilty intention must be present, the doer

not knowing the nature of the act or wrongfulness of the act or the illegality.¹¹

"Furiosus furore suo punier" -A mad man is best punished by his own madness. This is one of the reasons jurists have given for exemption of insane people from criminal responsibility. Further, the jurists also state that considering the lack of understanding of an insane person, he is said to break the mere language of law and not the law itself. However, the major reason is that the acts of the mad man are involuntary and unintentional. It is idle to talk of his possessing mens rea as he has no control whatsoever on his mind. In this regard, for protection against his acts, the Criminal Procedure Code provides for his act is detention which is not a punishment.

The Indian Penal Code, section 84 is entirely based on the deficiency of will due to no sense of intellect- "*furiosus nullavolutesest*." In this regard, the legal interpretation of insanity is poles apart from the medical interpretation in certain ways. Not every form of insanity is acknowledged and considered by the law as a valid defence. The Daniel McNaughton's case,¹² the judges stated that "Every man is to be presumed sane and with a sufficient degree of reason to be held responsible for crimes until the contrary is proved to the judges' satisfaction and moreover, to constitute a valid defence of insanity, it is essential to be established that at the time of commission of the act, the accused lacked the capability to reason due to disease in a way to not know the nature of the act he was

⁹342 U.S. 246, 250-51 (1952).

¹⁰Gaur, Hari Singh, '*Indian Penal Code*', 2009.

¹¹ Abhiram Kerketa v. State of Orissa (1) Cr. LJ. 296(1989).

¹²8 E.R. 718(1843).



doing or he did not know he was doing what was wrong.

Earlier it was believed it was on the accused to prove his insanity during commission of the act in order to not be liable to the punishment as a sane person. However lately, in *Woolmington v. Director of Public Prosecutions*¹³, 1935 now the accused only needs adduce evidence that raises a reasonable doubt in the minds of the jury.

In *Chankau v. Queen*¹⁴ the committee stated that in instances where evidence is a possible self-defence, the onus is throughout on prosecution to prove that the accused is guilty of murder and onus never shifts to prove his defence. This is also enlisted in India in Section 105 of the Evidence Act. In accordance with Section 105(a) of Indian Evidence Act, the onus to prove Section 84 rests on the accused. The burden of proof with relation to the presence of circumstances bringing the case under section 84 of the IPC is on the accused as well. Further, section 101 of the IP states that "the court shall presume the absence of such circumstances."¹⁵ A very essential element to prove section 84 is that the insane is so impaired that he was not aware of the nature of the act done or that his action is in contradiction with law.¹⁶

In *Ashiruddin Ahmed v. The King*¹⁷, Three elements were listed down by the Court to establish insanity:

1. That he did not know the nature of the act charged
2. That he did not know that it was contrary to law
3. That he did not know that it was wrong

These three elements must be proved to be present when the act is committed.

FORMS OF INSANITY THAT ARE NOT EXEMPTED

Section 84 distinguishes legal test of responsibility from medical test. The absence of will arises not because of absence of maturity but also the state of the mind. This state of the mind which leads to an exemption from criminal responsibility has two different forms- medical and legal form.

Medical science says that insanity is a synonym for abnormal state of mind. An involuntary impulse forcing a man to hurt or murder is within the ambit of such abnormality. The legal conception takes a separate path from here. Legal insanity does not envisage every form of insanity. The court is always concerned with the legal aspects of insanity. In cases where a history of insanity is established, the accused must be subjected to proper medical examination and the report of such examination must be produced in the court. In the absence of this, the benefit of doubt should be given to the accused. The exact time, in order to make a decision, whether the defence can be taken or not, is the time when the offence takes place. There is danger in believing the defence of insanity based on the arguments that are derived from the character of crime. Only unsoundness can impair the cognitive faculties, which in turn can be a valid exemption. The incapacity to realise the

¹³A.c. 462 at p. 481 (1935).

¹⁴A.C. 206 (1955).

¹⁵The Indian Evidence Act, s. 101.

¹⁶DigendraNath Roy v. State, Cr. L.J. 529, pp. 531-533(1970).

¹⁷AIR 1949, Cal. 182.



nature of the act is the only thing recognized by the Indian law and in cases where a man's faculties are clear, it is presumed that he was in a position to understand the consequences of his actions.

Thus, the mere absence of motive for crime cannot in the absence of proof of legal insanity, establishes a valid defence.

And therefore, every person who has a certain disease cannot be exempted from liability.¹⁸

- i. The fact that an accused is conceited, odd and his brain is not alright.¹⁹
- ii. The physical and mental diseases has made his intellect weak²⁰
- iii. He gets recurring fits²¹
- iv. He was subject to epileptic fits but no abnormality²²
- v. He committed certain weird acts
- vi. He quarrelled with his wife
- vii. The behaviour was queer²³

Have been held to not be sufficient to come under section 84 of the Indian Penal Code.

SUGGESTIONS WITH RELATION TO MEDICO LEGAL ANALYSIS OF INSANITY

Although it is deemed that every person related to the field of medical sciences has knowledge about unsoundness of mind, the examination of insanity is only assigned to a specialist. However, if medical opinion states that there is a mental disease, then

should the accused be held responsible?

There are certain opinions in this regard. Professor L. Vernon Bergs states that at first the law should state that no man shall be tried who is suffering from an incurable mental disease or a chronic mental disease, or that no man shall be tried who at the time of the commission of a crime was suffering from mental disease. We have somehow got to do away with the question of responsibility, which is the root of all evil in medical testimony. It cannot be determined by physicians in hospitals for mental diseases, for if these patients are responsible, they should be taken out and tried and punished which is never done because it is universally recognized that a patient suffering from mental disease in a hospital is not responsible for his acts. Therefore, why should a person suffering from mental disease outside of a hospital be any more responsible for his acts? If medical opinion is that a man who has broken the law or who has committed an overt act is suffering from mental disease, whether serious or not, that person should be committed to a hospital for mental diseases, and should not be tried, convicted and sentenced to prison or executed.²⁴

He has further gives an instance that – A person with dementia praecox, may have normal intelligence but abnormal emotional or affective characteristics which are registered in conduct. The person of normal affectivity does the right thing more because it is natural for him to do so than because he fears punishment. The type of dementia praecox with keen intelligence produces

¹⁸Barelal v. State of M.P. AIR M.P. 102(1960).

¹⁹Abdul Rashid v. Emperor AIR Lah 567(1927).

²⁰Ram Adhin V. Emperor Cr. LJ. 163(1932).

²¹Lakshmi v. State AIR All 534(1959).

²²In re RajuShethy AIR Mys. 48(1960).

²³In re KandeshwamiMudali AIR mad 316(1960).

²⁴Bergs, L. Vernon, 'Medico-Legal Insanity and the Hypothetical Question' (1923), *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 14.

²⁴Bergs, L. Vernon, 'Medico-Legal Insanity and the Hypothetical Question' (1923), *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 14.



burglars, automobile thieves, pickpockets, counterfeiters. The unfortunate individual who is both mentally and morally defective is almost certain to break down under the stresses imposed by modern competitive living. The dementia praecox type with defective emotions often gets a reputation for bravery. They get tried with no concerns. Every attempt at correction, which in the normal course is effective in inducing good behaviour as a habit, with them, is only another step downward. It does little good to hang them. The public undoubtedly expects hanging and they have little compunction about hanging one who has brutally taken a life, but we do not control this situation by hangings. The sense of security the public thus feels is wholly unwarranted. The present right and wrong test is of no practical value. It gets us nowhere in our fight for society's right to be saved. The difference between right and wrong, as obvious to the normal person as the difference between black and white, is entirely an acquired sense in the case of the mental defective-the person born without a conscience. Not much longer can we hang these degenerates and feel that we have done all that is necessary. It is possible now to identify them after the commission of a minor offense. The law will have to deal with them eventually, and the only effective way is to isolate them before they have had an opportunity to kill.

And therefore lists out how morally incorrect and ineffective trying a person with medical insanity is. It is important to notice here that the present of a criminal intention has no relevance since it will rarely be there with regard to medical insanity and

scholars have further suggested broadening the definition of unsoundness of mind.²⁵

CHAPTER III

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSANITY AND MENS REA

It is to be believed that in the general run of things, an act that is criminal in nature but lacks a criminal intent on the part of the defendant shall not constitute a crime. However, for liability to arise under criminal law the accused shall have a criminal mind. Basically, the fundamental elements of criminal sanctions are derived from the presence or absence of a given state of mind. The question arises that if mental illness or insanity affects the state of mind in a particular situation, is it necessary to have a special rule for insanity? One may perceive that this is a result of historical developments, because of the recognition that an insane person should not be held responsible for their acts, when no such distinct mental element was taken into picture. mens rea is described as that mental state, that includes the mental activity in performing the physical act, which results in a criminal liability for the given act.

Such a connection between mental disorder of the accused and the necessary mental element to constitute a crime has been recognized in the 'Diminished Responsibility or Subjective Liability' doctrine in the recent years. Psychiatric evidence as to the capability of the defendant to have the required mental state is used to negate the required mens rea, instead of proving insanity. Thus, no

²⁵Id. At 36.



specific rule for insanity would be necessary. Thus, an understanding of the relationship between mens rea and insanity is essential to any evaluation of bifurcation as a procedure for handling insanity pleas. Under the doctrine of subjective liability, the offender's mental health becomes relevant with elements to keep in mind like premeditation, malice or specific intent. For example, if a person is charged with assault with an intent to rape or kill will be convicted only for assault, if he/she can show his/her incapacity to formulate the specific intent. However, it is often feared that the doctrine, when taken to its conclusion, might lead to a complete acquittal of the mentally defected defendants.

COEXISTENCE OF MENS REA AND INSANITY

The notion that mens rea and insanity cannot coexist comes from the belief that mens rea always includes the element of moral culpability. The term possesses moral aspects, i.e. the most frequently used term "guilty mind". One must not forget the legal maxim, "Actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea" which in Blackstone's translation means that an unwarrantable act without a vicious will is no crime at all. The blameworthiness in criminal law solely depends on the "guilty mind" or the "vicious will" to device liability. Although, the insanity tests are thought to define a group of individuals who are so different from their fellows as not to merit criminal sanctions.²⁶ If those who possess mens rea are to be convicted and those who are inane

are not, then the conclusion that mens rea and insanity cannot coexist becomes unavoidable.

IRRESISTIBLE IMPULSE

One of the most necessary element for a criminal liability is the presence of "free will" and where it is absent, as in the case of compulsion, there is no crime. "The compulsion arising from a diseased state of mind affecting the "emotions" and "will" of offender is known as irresistible impulse or uncontrollable impulse and is treated as a part of the law of insanity. Sometimes the impulse to kill is sudden, instantaneous, unreflecting and uncontrollable. The act of homicide is perpetrated without interest, without motive and often on person who are most fondly loved by the perpetrator. This has been called impulsive insanity."

There have been instances where the impulses to cause criminal harm were felt and resisted. The point of discussion arises that whether such impulses can be raised in the administration of criminal justice and if the impulse was irresistible or unrevised. In a situation where a man were so irritated by a baby's cry that it induces the desire to kill, his act would be murder: It would not be less than murder if the same irritation and desire was produced by some internal disease. Eminent legal authorities and medical writers believe that even though a person may know the nature of his/her act to be morally wrongful or contrary to law, yet he/she may find themselves unable to restrain themselves from doing the act as they have lost the power to chose between right and wrong.²⁷ Their freedom of will is

²⁶Overholson v. Lynch 288 F.2D 388 [1961].

²⁷Gluek, Sheldon, "Ethics psychology and criminal responsibility of insane' Cr. L.J. 208.



destroyed completely by the mental disease. Such a person cannot be held liable.

In England, the law of insanity is guided by the McNaughton Rules thereby making no allowance for the defence of irresistible impulse. One of the reasons given by the judges was that generally where there is sufficient intelligence to distinguish between right and wrong, the mere existence of an irresistible impulse would not excuse liability.

In India, the penal code came into existence more than a century ago. It is observed that the Section 84 of Indian Penal Code was followed into the footsteps of the celebrated M'Naghten Rules. The section, however deals only with the type of insanity which impairs conscious faculties leaving emotions and will unaffected. Hence, in India the doctrine of Irresistible

Impulse finds itself inapplicable and not in favour under the Indian law.

The courts in India have rejected this defence in cases of *Queen Empress V. Lakshman Dagrus*,²⁸ *Queen Empress V. Kadar Naryer Shah*. In this case, accused neglected his house and field work and complained of frequent headaches and spoke to no one when the pain was severe. Ever since his house and property were destroyed by fire, he normally played and went about with children much more than in normal for man of his age. He was very fond of one boy in particular. Unaccountably he one day killed this boy. There was no motive for his action. However, there was proof that he observed some secrecy after committing the

murder. The court held that the behaviour of the accused did not prove that he was by reason of unsoundness of mind incapable of knowing the nature of the act and thus found him guilty but recommended to the government for indulgent consideration as, in its view, the accused was suffering from some kind of mental derangement.

The mere fact that the murder was committed by the accused due to a sudden impulse will not be sufficient to accept the plea of insanity under Section 84 of IPC.²⁹

MYTH OF ACQUITTAL IN CASE OF CRIME BY INSANITY

An accused does not go free by the reason that he/she has been proved not guilty of an offence by virtue of the defence of insanity. Ordinarily, states have necessities for treatment or systematization after such a finding. A few states require such containment for the time span the individual would have gotten whenever indicted as a minimum, so the person may wind up investing more energy bound than if the person did not raise such a resistance. Like different aspects of the law, this differs from state to state. The insanity defence is an important aspect at the nexus of law and psychiatry.

MEDICO- LEGAL ASPECT

The absence of will arises not only from the absence of maturity of understanding but also from the state of mind, whether temporary or permanent. This morbid condition of mind, which renders an exemption from criminal responsibility, differs in the medical and legal perspective.

²⁸Queen-Empress v Kader Nasyer Shah ILR 23 Cal 604(1896).

²⁹Ramedin v. State of M.P. Cr. L J 370 8(MP) (DB)(1996).



According to medical point of view, it is more or less correct to say that every man at the time of committing the act is insane and hence needs an exemption from criminal responsibility. While according to the legal point of view, a man must be held to be sane as long as he is able to distinguish between wrong and right, a test which has been established in McNaughton's case and incorporated in section 84 IPC. Not every mental affliction would give rise to a criminal obligation. All criminals are to some extent considerably mentally abnormal.

A clear distinction between medical and legal insanity exists, but the court's concern is only limited to the legal aspects of it. An accused person may be suffering from some form of insanity in the sense in which the term is used by a medical man, but may not be suffering from unsoundness of mind as contemplated under section 84. Legal insanity cannot exist without cognitive faculty of the mind to an extent that it renders the offender incapable of knowing the nature of the act or that what the offender is committing is contrary to law.³⁰ Every person who is therefore mentally unstable is not considered ipso facto exempted from criminal responsibility. The test of insanity as viewed from the legal point does not coincide with the medical idea, in many cases a man who is insane in the opinion of the medical expert cannot 'claim the benefit of section 84 of IPC'. A court of law commonly -looks for some clear and distinct proof of mental delusion or intellectual aberration existing previously to or at the time of, the perpetration of the

crime, a medical man recognizes that there may be delusion, spring up in the mind suddenly and not revealed by the previous conduct or conversation of the accused . To determine medical insanity, motive for an act is primary importance while motive is not conclusive to ascertain legal insanity. The law presumes every person of the age of discretion to be sane unless the contrary is proved.

BURDEN OF PROOF

When an accused raises the plea of insanity, it is not the prosecution's obligation to establish with certainty that the defendant was of the mental state to know the nature of the offence or of the knowledge that what he was doing was contrary to law. It is generally assumed that every person knows the consequences of his act. The prosecution in exercising its burden in the plea of insanity, has to prove a basic fact to rely upon the normal abovementioned presumptions. The accused is then called upon to rebut these presumptions and the inference in such manner as it would go with the plea.³¹ Therefore, the burden of proving that the particular case falls within the ambit of section 84 lies with the accused. However, the accused need not prove insanity beyond reasonable doubt. The Supreme Court has certain guidelines to adhere to:

The proof of insanity should be beyond reasonable doubt and it is the prosecution's duty to prove it from the beginning. The defendant may negate it by bringing it to the judge's notice by the presentation of

³⁰State of Kerala v. Ravi K.L.T. 177 1978.

³¹Vibhuti K.I., P S APillai's Criminal Law, 12thEdn. (2016).



evidence- oral, documentary or circumstantial.

If the accused is unable to establish his/her insanity at the time of the commission before the court, general burden of proof maintained by the evidence provided by the accused would be given consideration.

The standards to be applied, for ascertaining whether the accused was of unsound mind or not, according to the ordinary standards adopted by a reasonable man, was able to judge if his act was right or wrong.

However, it must be kept in mind that the courts in India have been very pertinent and cautious in accepting the plea of insanity.

CHAPTER IV DELUSIONAL INSANITY

Scientific theories of the brain endanger our assumption of intent and consequently threaten our customary practices.

In Phillip v. Ruler case the litigants entered a Roman Catholic Church and executed a pious devotee and a minister. After the occurrence the respondents asserted that they did as such because of their convictions and hearing voices. Master proof proposed that despite the fact that their convictions are antagonistic towards the Roman Catholic, the litigants were capricious.

The inquiry on bid was that how the madness arrangements ought to be translated. The craziness barrier had two angles. The first was the standard McNaughton rule. However, the second pardoned the litigant:

“if he did the act under the influence of a delusion of such nature as to render him, in the opinion of the jury or of the court, an unfit subject for punishment of any kind in respect of such act.”

So, the issue was whether the second angle was a free test or whether the delusional state needed to fulfill the structure of McNaughton, on the grounds that for this situation the respondent unmistakably realized that what they were doing was unlawful. Their demonstration can't be supported regardless of whether the social conditions that roused them were valid.

The jury gathering chose that the silly perspective was a free test that was intended to expand the craziness resistance past McNaughton's limits.

Anyway, we have to comprehend that toward the end we should have sensibly drafted meanings of mensrea and madness which is made in meeting with prominent members of the jury. The definition ought to be adequate to make frameworks of duty in the meantime it should likewise perceive rare special cases

Throughout the years in numerous decisions we have seen that the dialect of madness guard does not have any kind of effect to the result of craziness cases. The most essential factor that influences the judgment is the seriousness of the wrongdoer's issue.

CONCLUSION

"The possibility of commitment interfaces with our most essential emotions about human sense and pride and normal experience of fault and chastity and blame and order. Rebuffing an individual, who isn't in charge of the wrongdoing, is an



infringement of the essential human rights and crucial rights under the Constitution of India. It likewise brings the fair treatment of law, if that individual isn't in a situation to guard him in the official courtroom, inspiring the rule of normal equity. The positive guard of legitimate madness applies to this crucial guideline by pardoning those rationally cluttered wrongdoers whose scatter denied them of objective comprehension of their direct at the season of the wrongdoing. Subsequently, it is by and large conceded that insufficiency to carry out wrongdoings exempts the person from discipline. This is perceived by the enactment of the vast majority of the humanized countries. Indeed, even in India, Section 84 of Indian Penal Code (IPC) manages the "demonstration of an individual of unsound personality" and talks about madness safeguard. The current issue has raised justification for a genuine discussion among therapeutic, brain research and law experts over the globe."

Considering the idea of the evaluation and law presumes everybody is normal except if the opposite is demonstrated, it is reasonable to begin appraisal a similar way. The legitimate dialect is plainly all out in nature, either criminally capable or not capable. While a therapist is worried about restorative treatment of individual patients, courts are worried about the insurance of the general public from the conceivable peril from these patients. Mens Rea alludes to the circumstance in which the arraignment can demonstrate all the definitional components past a sensible uncertainty and the litigant neglects to build up a certifiable resistance. Under these conditions, the litigant is at last reprehensible or criminally dependable. The

defendant can avoid Mens rea in this broader sense, defeating any criminal blameworthiness, either by negating any element of the crime charged or by establishing an affirmative defence, although the burden of proof lies on the accused.

