

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT vis-à-vis EXPANDING HORIZON OF RIGHT TO LIFE IN INDIA: A STUDY

Divyanshu Kumar,

Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India

Anshika Singh,

Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India

Prof. (Dr.) Anil Kumar Dixit,

Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India

Dr. Vaibhav Uniyal,

Assistant Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India

Amit Kumar,

Assistant Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India

ABSTRACT

The motivation for upholding sanctions against criminals in India is divided into two parts: the first is that the responsible party should stick to it and the second is to deter others from doing mistakes by granting authorizations to thieves. Among the several types of capital punishment, the media focuses on India's capital punishment, sometimes known as the death penalty which the adjudicator grants in the best possible circumstances. (Sharma & Vipul, 2018)

The principal point of this article is to furnish the peruser with a total comprehension of the circumstance in the Indian courts in regards to the burden of life detainment. The Indian legal executive has condemned 1,303 individuals to no end in the beyond a decade, yet simply four have been hanged to execution. Numerous basic liberties activists in India show that capital punishment is indecent in light of the fact that it abuses the desire of a group.

KEYWORD: -Sanctions, Capital Punishment, Execution, Contentions, Exempt

INTRODUCTION

India, while being a democratic country, is still in the process of evolving. Simultaneously time, India's crime rate is growing at a faster rate. In India, there is a plethora of regulations in place to prevent and regulate violence, despite the fact that crime levels are rising because sanctions are insufficient. To minimize crime, the penalty should be harsh. All sanctions are motivated by the same goal: to penalize the criminal. In India, there are several forms of actions available, including the death penalty, life in prison, and confinement, among others. (Saha, 2015)

Death sentence, sometimes known as the capital punishment or killing, is a kind of execution. Somebody is sentenced to death if they are executed in this method. Heinous crimes or deadly offences are acts that can result in the death sentence. The think in terms comes from the Latin capitalist, which means "concerning the head" (referring to execution by beheading).

Historically, most countries used death sentences as a penalty for offenders and political or religious rebels. Traditionally, the execution of a capital punishment was commonly accompanied by suffering, and killings were frequently carried out in public.

36 countries actually utilize capital punishment, 103 have dispensed with altogether it by law for all abominations, 6 have canceled it for conventional wrongdoings just (while holding it for unique conditions like equipped struggles), 50 have eliminated it de facto (have not used it for at least ten years and/or are under federal ban. Almost every country in the world forbids the death of anyone under the age of 18 years of age when they committed the offence; only Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan have carried out such killings since 2009. Such assassinations are illegal under international law.

Capital punishment is a widely discussed topic in many nations and governments, and opinions might differ even within a single political philosophy or regional territory. Art2 of the "European Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights" forbids awarding death sentence in EU countries. The Council of Europe, which has 47 participating nations, likewise forbids its countries from using the death sentence.

CONCEPT OF DEATH SENTENCE

Punishment is the use of coercion to enforce national law. The govt. holds a responsibility to manage discipline in terms of maintaining law and security. In the time immemorial, there was no strict precedent or command for such misdemeanors, and the amount and maximum penalty was somewhat decided by the Ruler. Contemporary concepts of punishment changed over the years, and we willingly returned our rights and authority to the government to maintain law and harmony.

The most horrible or, to put it another way, the toughest prison term now available is capital punishment. The death penalty is the execution of a person who has committed a specific legal crime (Costa-Gavras, 2012)The death penalty sometimes known as the death sentence, is a government approved punishment.

Along these lines, the attitude behind the idea of imprisonment isn't just to give equity to the violated, yet additionally to safeguard security and steadiness in local area; to rebuff a culprit isn't just to protect brutality or disparage him, yet there is a raised focal goal, and that is to make a lenient world. In current law, the thought of Punishment is for the most part related with the law of offenses.

Violence has never been absent from civilization at any point of its development. Since some infraction of the authorized code of conduct is unavoidable, it is unavoidable. Violence is ubiquitous and essential part of society. A civilization that does not penalize generates one that is inadequate of preserving civil order and citizen security. As a result, those who break the law must face consequences. The purpose of the law is to bring the society together. It is independent and cannot be infringed without repercussions. "Law is the corpus of concepts acknowledged or imposed by public and regular courts in the administration of justice," writes Roscoe Pound.

A WORLDWIDE HISTORY OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A portion of the essential issues that contemporary crime analysts banter incorporate whether the death penalty or capital punishment ought to be killed. There are sure states which are significantly more prone to pronounce capital punishment in comparison. For instance, nations like China, India, and the U.S.A like to involve the death penalty for explicit offenses, while the United Kingdom and Canada have dispensed with it completely.

Prior to digging into the subject, characterizing the term is "punishment." Penalty is determined by the offense done, and the goal of imposing a penalty is to prevent him or her from repeating the very same act twice. (Dunham, 2015)

Before breaking free from British rule, India rarely had access to equity. (Bahuguna, 2011) The death sentences were issued on the impulses and convictions of the British rulers. In 1932, Babu Gaya Prasad Singh, who was Bihar's elected party in the Central Legislative Assembly, petitioned for a bill to cancel the death punishment for violent acts under the IPC (India's official criminal code covering every one of the parties to the offence regulation). The movement by the flow was crushed. After a couple of days, on March 24, 1931, three political dissidents, Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhdev, received capital punishment for the Lahore Conspiracy case

(for boycotting the British Simon Commission and besieging the Delhi Assembly). Shortly thereafter, Congress called for the death penalty to be overturned. However, it remained unchanged.

During 1947 and 1949, the Constituent Assembly discussed the presence of capital punishment and Baba Sahib Ambedkar (the Father of the Indian Constitution) approved the final decision to be made by parliament. Be that as it may, he was not in favor of continuing the punishment. He accepted that India follows the standards of peace and that having such discipline is contrary to those standards.

Somewhere between 1952 and 1962, the discipline of capital punishment was examined and discussed in parliament several times and discarded every time. Prithvi Raj Kapoor, an appointed party, moved the main goal in the year 1958. Fourteen deputies (members of parliament) participated in the discussion. While nine agreed with India's capital punishment strategy, only six people favored nullification.

The next target was proposed in the Upper House by Savitri Devi Nigam in 1961. Nineteen MPs took part in the discussion and only six leaned towards annulment of capital punishment. There have been several situations where capital punishment has been scoffed at in parliament.

In 2012, a clinical student was mugged on a moving transport in the country's capital, Delhi. After the scare, the public authority reported that the death penalty would be material for those accused of aggression caused by death. Smash Singh, Mukesh Singh, Vinay Gupta, Pawan Gupta, Akshay Thakur and a teenager were the criminals. In 2013, all of them received the death penalty, with the exception of the adolescent litigant. Following this, the adolescent respondent surrendered for the situation. (Alanp, 2020)

THE LAWS GOVERNING CAPITAL PENALTY IN INDIA:

Since prehistoric days, India's laws have included the death penalty as retribution. 'Gungarao' was a peculiar type of death punishment that involved being squashed by an elephant. (Goran, 2016)The Manusmriti established the execution murder charge in order to deter individuals from killing a man and to avoid chaos. Wrongdoers were made to wear cow skin and constrained to remain in the heat during the Mughal time frame; the contracting skin at long last prompted the guilty party's destruction, who died in outrageous torment.

All of these techniques were prohibited by British law, with hanging being the exclusive method of administering lethal sentence. (Paranjape, 2011)During the colonial period, the IPC of 1860 compulsory death penalty for a variety of offences. The question of death penalty was not mentioned in the Legislative Assembly until 1931. Shri Gaya Prasad Singh did this in order to remove the death punishment for IPC offenses. His motion, though, was not adopted. The discussions in the Drafting Committee fixed the issue of the death penalty, testing its jury direction, the effect of the sentence on unfortunate families, the chance of error, and its shamefulness. (Constituent Assembly Debates On 3 June, 1949 Part II, 1949)

The head of the Constituent Assembly's Draft Committee, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, supported the repeal of punishment to death. He added that in order to settle this issue, the capital punishment must be abolished, as well as the country's long-held concept of peacefulness. (Law Commission of INDIA, 1968, 1968)

Following independence, death sentence was reinstated for a range of offenses mostly around of the Cr.P.C., also, courts were viewed as important to state clarifications in their decisions assuming that they forced a jail sentence other than the death penalty for offenses for which death sentence was an awarded under Sec 367(5). (Pillai, 2022)The aforementioned provision was later abolished. The IPC was further revised by the 1955 Amendment Act, which replaced the sentence of "removal for life" with "rigorous detention." This Amendment was significant because it signified that the death penalty was not the standard.

Another revision in the death penalty statutes was brought about by the re-enactment of the Cr.P.C in 1973. The courts were now required to declare extraordinary grounds for issuing a death sentence under the modified Section 354(3). As a result, there has been a shift in public opinion on the use of the death sentence. The judgments of India's courts provide us with information into the path that India is headed with respect to its capital punishment statutes.

CRIMINOLOGICAL APPROACH

The Capital punishment theories are as follows:

1. Reformatory theory
2. Preventive theory:

REFORMATIVE THEORY- *“an eye for an eye turn the whole world blind”* by Mahatma Gandhi.

This is the central issue in reformatory discipline theory. As published in the Published In journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics Special Matter 915, all considerations are arranged out on continuing to work on the held responsible party. The overarching goal of these hypotheses is to alter the admonished person through standard treatment. The primary goal of discovery is to educate or restore the held responsible party on their own. A miscreant is rebuffed to his benefit. (Sue Rex, 2016) This notion has received support from a variety of sources. Criminology is supported by reformatory theory. According to criminology, each offense is a disordered phenomenon, a weak sort of lunacy. Reformatory theory is supported by criminal culture, criminal sociology, and psychoanalysis. This philosophy seeks to reform criminal brains so that they can live regular lives as citizens. This viewpoint condemns all forms of disciplinary actions. (Bachan singh v State of Punjab, 1980)

1. **Criminal Culture**: According to current criminal anthropology, crime is an illness. According to criminal anthropology, rather than punishing a criminal, it is vital to cure him. Clinics and welfare shelters are better places to adopt than prisons for reducing crime. Some crimes are committed by ordinary people owing to purposeful violations of moral law. Crimes are often committed as a result of a psychological or physical defect.
2. **Criminal sociology**: According to criminal sociology, it is more necessary to strengthen economic circumstances in order to eliminate inequities than to punish the criminal. Crimes cannot be altered by punishment, but they may be changed by fairness and equality.
3. **Psychoanalysis**: Criminal anthropology and criminal sociology are both connected to psychoanalysis. Reformatory theory is supported by psychoanalysis. Rather than penalty, education and psychoanalysis therapy are required to reduce violence.

Among penalty systems, reformatory theory is best. Some crimes are more beneficial to preventative theory than others.

PREVENTIVE THEORY- *“prevention is better than cure”*

Main purpose of this theory is to send the lawbreaker out of society. As indicated by preventive hypothesis, the essential objective of rebuffing is to show others how it's done for every other person and stop them from participating in crime. As per this view, lawbreakers are condemned to death or life in a correctional facility. Numerous legislators inclined toward safeguard hypothesis since it has acculturated criminal regulation. As indicated by numerous reformers, the deterrent hypothesis seriously affects crooks. The primary goal of precautionary assertion is to take steps to ensure that the faulted person does not repeat the mistake after receiving Sentence. As per this view, capital punishment is the most cruel sort of punishment due to its unfriendly effect. A man took another person's life. Thus, he bears liability regarding his demise. In India, the protection hypothesis is followed.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF DEATH PENALTY

Some contend that it also violates article 245, because it contains the too much and unsteady delegation of assertive powers to the legal executive. The main point of contention is that the council neither provided a foundation for the court to distinguish between the two subject areas nor founded any guidelines by which the actual Court might end up making such a distinction. The issue of discipline has been left open-concluded by the legislative body. (Sharma D. , 2020)

On occasion, the courts have imposed capital punishment on the convict, while in different situations where the convict has committed a similar crime, the court has enforced life imprisonment. (Ayyathurai, 2000)

Also, it is assumed that the designated authorities, by the idea of their vocation, choose cases impartially. Consequently, there will be no assertion in the granting of the sentences. IPC Sec. 354(3) further provides that the Court must refer to extraordinary reasons when awarding capital punishment.

“RAREST OF RARE”

In the case of “**Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab**”, The Apex bench ruled its position on the punishment to be hanged, declaring that it should be applied only in the most extreme cases. The Apex bench's point of view became more widely accepted as it sought to reduce the misuse of the death penalty.

In the case of Bachan Singh, the bench's Ratio Decidenti, or Rule of Law, states that the punishment to die is legal as long as it replaces imprisonment. A similar one will also extend to the most outrageous limit of situations where the other decision is clearly denied.

Furthermore, in the case of *Santosh Kumar Bariyar v. State of Maharashtra*, "the rarest of the rarest sentence simply acts as a direction in the application of the norms indicated in Section 354 (3) of the Cr.P.C. and entrenches the doctrine that life imprisonment is the rule and death penalty is an extraordinary measure only applicable in exceptional cases", added the Supreme Court.

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution provides that no one else's 'Right to Life' can be taken away unless due process is followed. The ability to introduce fresh facts or legislation into a case where capital penalty is used equally constrained. If the sentence has been completed, it is irreversible.

THE CHANGING MENTALITY OF INDIAN JUDICIARY ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

In **Jagmohan Singh v. State of U.P.** matter he primarily discussed India's demise discipline regulation. The fact that capital discipline attacked workmanship makes it guaranteed. 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India. It was additionally contended that the assigned specialists acted arbitrarily in endorsing the demise. It is superb that the candidates have additionally referred to a decision of the US Apex Court panel, **Furman v. Georgia** case.

The issue of what are the "remarkable grounds" for approving capital punishment under Section 354(3) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 emerged on account of, **Rajendra Prasad v. UP.** (1973) The Court concluded that the specific grounds of Section 354 (3) apply to the guilty party instead of the real wrongdoing. He likewise said that the possibility of reprisal isn't attainable at this point and that counteraction thinks about taking life. The matter of *Dalbir Singh v. Punjab State* depended upon Rajendra Prasad's preliminary to maintain capital punishment for two offenders who shot and killed three individuals.

However, around the same time, 1979, another Supreme Court board commented in **Bachan Singh v. Punjab Province** that the Rajendra Prasad case was contradictory to the Jagmohan case.

This case is seen as a turning point on the grounds that the Court, in the first absolute example, enunciated and raised the possibility that capital punishment should be reserved for the "rarest of the intriguing" events. He is reported to have said:

In the case of **Deena v. U.O.I** (1983), the authenticity of capital punishment was addressed, and on second thought and simply addressing this issue, the court focused on whether discipline by hanging was lawful. The court rejected the incentive established for the form of hanging, expressing that it does not include criticism, barbarism, or languishing.

In **T.V. Vatheeswaran v. State of Tamil Nadu**, the Supreme Court decided that delaying the execution of the death penalty for more than 2 years violates article 21. However, in *Sher Singh v. Punjab Province*, the court further noted that an overwhelming stay of a death sentence did not commit or sentence a stay of execution.

The Legal Commission Report 35 in 1967 called for capital punishment to be spared, stating that India could not risk exploring different avenues to eliminate capital punishment. This study was referenced in the “**Shashi Nayar v. U.O.I**” took pains to challenge Bachan Singh's confidence in the 1967 report, calling for the death sentence to be overturned. However, due to the problematic circumstances of legality in the country in 1991, the Supreme Court did not want to know more about the matter.

Consequently, the issue was expected to be delayed somewhat longer, and future models followed Bachan Singh's decision. The death penalty is compulsory under the IPC for 12 specific violations going from inappropriate behavior to equivocation that causes the homicide of an honest individual. Section 364A determines that any individual who seizes or holds somebody for blackmail by open power will deal with capital repercussion. In light of *Vikram Singh versus U.O.I*, addressed whether Section 364A is unlawful, because Sec. 364A commands capital punishment for a non-maniacal wrongdoing that shouldn't legitimacy such outrageous discipline. Nonetheless, the SC denied the applicant's cases and, maintaining Sec. 364A, stated that the death sentence is only applied in the most extraordinary of exceptional matters.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AGAINST THE NOTION OF RIGHT TO LIFE

Right to Life and Personal Liberty According to Article 21: "Insurance of Life and Personal Liberty: No individual will be denied of his life or individual freedom besides as indicated by methodology laid out by regulation."

- This essential right is accessible to each individual, residents and outsiders the same.
- Article 21 gives two rights:
 1. Right to life
 2. Right to individual freedom
- The essential right given by Article 21 is one of the main privileges that the Constitution ensures.
- The Supreme Court of India has portrayed this right as the 'Core of Fundamental Rights'.
- The right explicitly makes reference to that no individual will be denied of life and freedom besides according to the method laid out by regulation. This suggests that this right has been given against the State as it were. State here incorporates the public authority, yet additionally, government offices, neighborhood bodies, the Legislatures, and so forth.
- Any confidential individual infringing on these privileges of another individual doesn't add up to an infringement of Article 21. The solution for the person in question, for this situation, would be under Article 226 or under broad regulation.
- The right to life isn't just about the option to get by. It likewise involves having the option to carry on with a total existence of nobility and importance.
- The main objective of Article 21 is that when the right to life or freedom of an individual is removed by the State, it ought to simply be as per the recommended methodology of regulation.

In the case of *Vatheeswaran V. State of Tamil Nadu*, The inquiry for the situation was whether deferring the execution of the death penalty disregarded Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, and assuming capital punishment may be subbed with life detainment on that premise. The Court decided that postponing the execution of capital punishment is shameful, out of line, unreasonable, and savage, denying the detainee of fundamental common freedoms safeguarded by Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, specifically the right to life and individual freedom. That's what the Court held, subsequent to considering the time expected for allure and reevaluation, we accept that a defer in the execution of a capital punishment of over two years ought to be viewed as adequate to qualifies the individual condemned for death to conjure Article 21 of the Constitution and look for the nullification of capital punishment.

MERCY PETITIONS

The Ministry of Home Affairs of the Indian government has coordinated a "Technique for Clemency Petitions in Death Penalty Cases" to assist with communicating states and jail specialists manage petitions for benevolence put together by death row prisoners. According to *Shatrughan Chauhan v. U.O.I* (1947), the Supreme Court expressed that prior to settling on generosity demands, the Ministry of the Interior thinks about the accompanying components:

- The personality of the blamed (like age, sex or mental lack) or the states of the case (like induction or relative authenticity);
- Cases in which the Court of Appeals imparted questions about the unwavering quality of the proof and yet settled through a conviction;
- Situations where the new test is professed to be reasonable essentially to choose if another test is justified;
- Cases in which the National High Court switched the absolution.
- Is there an assessment qualification between Superior Court judges that requires a reference to a bigger seat?
- Thought test in the choice of obligation for a situation of gathering murder.
- Expanded application and fundamental, etc.

While taking a gander at the genuine exercises of the Ministry of the Interior (whose ideas petitions for kindness are contemplated), clearly these rules were not maintained more often than not. In different conditions, the auto courts have explored how the pioneer offers how he took care of solicitations for grace. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court considered 11 composed petitions testing the main's disavowal of the altruism demand as a component of the Shatrughan Chauhan case.

NECESSITY OF DEATH PENALTY:

The death penalty has been in need for a long time, and numerous civilizations all through the world have acknowledged it to create a prevention discernment in the existences of individuals. The principal objective of capital punishment was to ingrain fear in the personalities of people while additionally killing guiltiness.

In the present reparative period, the retributive thought of 'blow for blow' fills compelling reason need; rather, it urges people to look for retaliation, which prompts wrongdoing consistently. For instance, a land has a place with a parent, yet after his memorial service, two siblings fight over it inferable from lopsided property appropriation. Accordingly, vengeance can bring more damage than benefit for society.

The global treaties against Torture, violent, Inhuman or Degrading behavior and other heinous forms of torture does not consider capital punishment to be brutal. India has signed the global treaties on Civil and Political Rights and is a signatory, but not a ratified, of the Torture Convention. Capital punishment was carried out in India before freedom and was maintained even after India gained independence from provincial power.

ABOLITION OF DEATH PENALTY:

Execution of blameless individuals

Individuals who have done nothing wrong have been killed in the past and will continue to be executed in the future. Regardless of how good a general set of rules is, it is frequently vulnerable to human error. Between 2000 and 2014, the S.C. Justified a 5 of those sentenced to death by foundational tribunals. That is 443 people who were sentenced to death and are still waiting to be confronted with all of the allegations.

Discretion

The likelihood that death penalty is applied arbitrarily can't be precluded. The death penalty is consistently abused on needy individuals, minorities, and people from severe racial, ethnic, political organizations. As per the 2016 Delhi NLU India Death Penalty Report (DPIR), (capital punishment, 1967) around 75% of all culpable waiting for capital punishment in India have a place with socio-fiscally mistreated orders like Dalits, OBCs and severe minorities.

Obtuse

Normal liberties and respectability are opposed to the sentence to die. The death penalty violates the right to life, which is the strong base of all standard chance. It also disregards the right not to be tortured or subjected to other severe or humiliating treatment or discipline. Furthermore, the death penalty undermines everyone's fundamental equilibrium.

Discouragement

The death sentence does not have the deterrent effect that its supporters claim. "There is no strong affirmation of the assessed impediment of the death sentence," the UN General Assembly (Resolution 65/206 of the General Assembly of the UN) has stated. To be clear, the ability of death sentence to deter crime is vital.

General evaluation

Public support for capital punishment is not warranted to infer that the state has the power to take a person's life. There are undeniable and verifiable benchmarks where the dominant parts of individuals upheld horrible barbarities of basic freedoms, only to be fully denounced later on. Individual promoters and legislators have the obligation to accentuate the contradiction of the death penalty with common freedoms and poise. It is essential to underline that the famous support for capital punishment is naturally linked to the desire of individuals to be freed from evil. There are, however, more powerful techniques to prevent wrongdoing.

CONCLUSION:

A few appointed authorities, both Indian and obscure, have chastised the death penalty, calling it incomprehensible. Value Bhagwati and J.Krishna Iyer have repeatedly expressed their opposition to the dying sentence in their races, while former Chief Justice of India Y.V. Chandrachud, who was involved in much of the Bachan Singh case, retracted his statement about the sentence to death after his retiring, stating that generally offenses are not avoided and instilling risk in the minds of hooligans for violating a regulation is worth the effort of death.

We can all benefit from the way the European Union deals with states that actually use capital punishment to put them on notice that the death penalty is an establishment that is past its end date. The EU does not allow the exchange of items that can be used to kill or endure people.

It has loudly communicated its resistance to capital punishment in global associations such as the United Nations. We have seen why capital punishment is absurd as it is an irreversible and ferocious display of retaliation. Spilling the blood of one more man does not in the least ignore how the activities of public authority end up leading to the development of new losses for legitimately authorized crimes. We all need to remember that executing a wrongdoer will not end the evil and rape in this world.

References

1. SCC 646 (Supreme Court 1973).
2. SCC 645 (Supreme Court 1983).
3. Alanp. (2020). *Abolishment of Capital Punishment in India*. Retrieved from Indians 4 Social Change: <https://indians4sc.org/2020/04/24/abolishment-of-capital-punishment-in-india/#.YpHdhKjMJPY>
4. Ayyathurai, S. (2000). should death penalty go . *CRIMINAL LAW JOURNAL* .
5. Bachan singh v State of Punjab, 898 (Supreme Court 1980).
6. Bahuguna, R. (2011). Plea Bargaining- Yet to be adapted in Indian Criminal Justice System. *Dehradun Law Review* , 3 (1), 60-72.
7. (1967). *capital punishment*. Law commission report.
8. *Constituent Assembly Debates On 3 June, 1949 Part II*. (1949, 06 03). Retrieved from Indian Kanoon.org: <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/348883/>
9. Costa-Gavras. (2012). *Capital*. Retrieved from Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Capital>
10. Dunham, R. (2015). *Early History of the Death Penalty*. Retrieved from Death Penalty Information Center: <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/facts-and-research/history-of-the-death-penalty/early-history-of-the-death-penalty>

11. Goran, D. (2016). *Execution by Elephant: A strange method of capital punishment in ancient India*. Retrieved from the vintage news: https://www.thevintagenews.com/2016/08/14/execution-by-elephant-a-strange-method-of-capital-punishment-in-ancient-india/?csplit=header&cmp_ab=quantcast&&chrome=1
12. (1968). *Law Commission of INDIA, 1968*. Government of India 39th report.
13. Paranjape, N. (2011). *Criminology and Penology* (12th ed.). Central Law Publication.
14. Pillai, K. C. (2022). *R.V. Kelkar's Criminal Procedure*. Delhi: Eastern Book Company.
15. Rajendra Prasad v State of U.P, SCC 646 (Supreme Court 1973).
16. Saha, C. M. (2015). *In 10 years, 1,303 death sentences but only 3 executions*. Retrieved from Business Standard: https://www.business-standard.com/article/specials/in-10-years-1-303-death-sentences-but-only-3-executions-115072900276_1.html
17. Sharma, D. (2020). Capital Punishments: Analysing the Need of it. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION*, 2 (1).
18. Sharma, S., & Vipul, S. (2018). Death under Penal Law and Life under Constitution. *Dehradun Law Review*, 10 (1), 1-14.
19. Sue Rex, M. T. (2016). *Reform and Punishment* (1st ed.). Willan.