BLOGS

# IPC Notes- Criminal Intimidation, Insult and Annoyance

Samridhi M · 11 May 2023

**Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction Criminal Intimidation under Section 503 of the IPC Ingredients of Criminal Intimidation Section 504 under the Indian Penal Code Ingredients of Section 504 under IPC Section 505 under the IPC Ingredients of Section 505 under IPC Section 506 under the IPC Landmark Cases Conclusion**

## Introduction

The Indian Penal Code (IPC) encompasses a wide range of offences to maintain law and order in society. Among these offenses are Sections 503, 504, 505, and 506 deal with criminal intimidation, intentional insult with the intent to provoke a breach of the peace, and statements conducing to public mischief, respectively.

***In this article, we will analyze these sections along with the relevant case laws.***

## Criminal Intimidation under Section 503 of the IPC

Section 503 of the IPC addresses the crime of criminal intimidation. This section states that anyone who threatens another person with the intention of causing alarm or apprehension of harm to that person or someone in whom they have an interest commits the offence of criminal intimidation.

The offense of criminal intimidation is a non-bailable offence that is punishable with imprisonment for a term that may extend up to two years or with fine or both. If the threat is to cause death or grievous hurt, the punishment can be imprisonment for a term that may extend up to seven years or with fine or both.

Consider a situation where Person A owes a significant amount of money to Person B. Despite several reminders, Person A fails to repay the debt. Feeling frustrated, Person B confronts Person A and says, “If you don’t return the money by tomorrow, I will ensure that you lose your job and

face legal consequences!”

In this scenario, Person B’s statement falls under criminal intimidation as per Section 503 of the IPC. By threatening to harm Person A’s employment and well-being, Person B aims to instill fear and coerce Person A into repaying the debt. This act of making such threats, with the intention of causing alarm or apprehension, constitutes criminal intimidation.

It is important to note that the threat must be a credible one and must be sufficient to cause alarm to the person against whom the threat is made. Additionally, the threat must be made with the intention of causing alarm or to compel the person to do or omit to do something. Mere idle threats or empty bluster do not constitute the offense of criminal intimidation.

The **k**ey ingredients of this offence include making a threat, the intent to cause alarm or apprehension, and the knowledge that the threat is likely to cause such alarm or apprehension. They are listed below.

## Ingredients of Criminal Intimidation

1. Threat: The accused must make a threat to another person.
2. Intent: The accused should have the intention to cause alarm or apprehension in the person or someone in whom they have an interest.
3. Knowledge: The accused must have knowledge that their threat is likely to cause such alarm or apprehension.

## Section 504 under the Indian Penal Code

Moving on to Section 504 of the IPC, this section focuses on intentional insult with the intent to provoke a breach of the peace. According to this provision, if someone intentionally insults another person, intending to provoke a breach of the peace or knowing that such insult is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, they commit an offence.

Imagine a situation where Person A and Person B have a heated argument in a public place. In the midst of the argument, Person A, with the intention to provoke a breach of the peace, insults Person B using offensive language and gestures. The insults are aimed at making Person B react aggressively and disrupt public order.

In this scenario, Person A's intentional insult with the intent to provoke a breach of the peace falls under Section 504 of the IPC. By using offensive language and gestures, Person A intends to incite Person B to engage in a disturbance or breach of public peace. The act of deliberately insulting someone to instigate a breach of peace constitutes the offence under Section 504.

To constitute an offence under Section 504, the insult must be intentional, and the accused must have the intention of provoking the victim to break the public peace or to commit any offence or to cause them any harm. Mere insult without any intention of provoking a breach of peace or harm to the victim does not amount to an offense under this section.

The ingredients for this offense include intentionally insulting someone, having the intention to provoke a breach of the peace, or knowledge that the insult is likely to result in a breach of the peace. They are listed below.

## Ingredients of Section 504 under IPC

1. Intentional Insult: The accused intentionally insults another person.

2. **Intent:** The accused must have the specific intent to provoke a breach of the peace or should be aware that their insult is likely to result in a breach of the peace.

## Section 505 under the IPC

Section 505 of the IPC deals with statements conducing to public mischief. It states that anyone who makes, publishes, or circulates any statement, rumor, or report with the intent to incite or likely to incite any class or community of people to commit an offense against the state or public tranquility commits an offence.

Imagine a situation where Person A spreads false rumors or statements on social media targeting a specific religious or ethnic community. These false statements are intended to incite hatred, enmity, or provoke violence against that community, potentially causing fear and unrest among the public.

In this scenario, Person A's act of circulating statements conducing to public mischief falls under Section 505 of the IPC. By spreading false information that can disrupt public tranquility and incite offense, Person A commits an offense under Section 505.

The essential elements of this offense include making, publishing, or circulating a statement, rumor, or report, having the intention to incite or likely to incite a particular class or community, and the statement being capable of inciting an offense against the state or public tranquility. They are listed below.

## Ingredients of Section 505 under IPC

1. Making, Publishing, or Circulating: The accused must make, publish, or circulate a statement, rumor, or report.

2. **Intent:** The accused should have the intention to incite or likely to incite a particular class or community.

3. **Capable of Inciting Offence:** The statement, rumor, or report must be capable of inciting an offense against the state or public tranquility.

## Section 506 under the IPC

Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code deals with the punishment for the offense of criminal intimidation. This section states that whoever threatens another person with the intention to cause alarm or fear of harm to that person or to any other person in whom they have an interest, commits the offense of criminal intimidation. The punishment for this offense varies depending on the severity of the threat made.

If the threat involves causing death, grievous hurt, or other serious consequences, the accused may face more severe penalties. In such cases, the offense falls under the purview of Section 506 (Part 1), which is a non-bailable offense. The punishment for this offense can extend to imprisonment for a term which may extend to seven years, and the accused may also be liable to pay a fine.

According to Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the offense under Section 506 (part 2) cannot be legally compounded. This means that the victim and the accused cannot enter into a mutual agreement to settle or withdraw the case. However, in certain legitimate circumstances, the prosecution may allow for a withdrawal from the case.

If the accused is denied bail by a Magistrate of the First Class, the process of applying for bail can be initiated in the Sessions Court. If the bail application is unsuccessful at the Sessions Court, the

case can be further escalated to the High Court for consideration.

In summary, while compounding the offense under Section 506 (part 2) is not permitted, there may be instances where the prosecution allows for withdrawal. If bail is denied by a First Class Magistrate, the accused can seek bail in the Sessions Court, and if necessary, further appeal can be made to the High Court.

## Landmark Case Laws

In the case of *Amulya Kumar Behara v. Nabaghana Behara Alias Nabina*, the Orissa High Court made a statement regarding the impact of threats on individuals. According to the court, threats can result in significant mental anxiety and stress for a person, and although they may be alarming, the level of alarm can vary from person to person. The court emphasized that the alarm caused by the intimidator should be substantial enough to unsettle the threatened person to the point where they lose control over their free voluntary actions. In assessing the severity of the threat, the court considered the response of an individual who possesses ordinary firmness, reason, and prudence.

The next case is of *Vikram Johar v. State of Uttar Pradesh*. In this particular case, the Supreme Court made an observation regarding the requirements for establishing criminal intimidation. The accusation involved the defendant visiting the plaintiff's home, using foul language, and even brandishing a gun while insulting the plaintiff. Additionally, the defendant threatened to physically harm the plaintiff. However, when the neighbors arrived, the defendant managed to escape from the scene. Upon considering the facts of the case, the court bench concluded that the allegations mentioned above, on a preliminary examination, do not fulfill the criteria for constituting an offense of criminal intimidation. The court indicated that the mere use of offensive language, in this instance, did not meet the essential elements necessary to establish criminal intimidation.

In the case of *Manik Taneja v. State of Karnataka*, the Supreme Court made a determination that written statements posted on a person's Facebook page, expressing concerns about unfair treatment by the police, would not amount to criminal intimidation. The case involved an appellant who had been involved in a road accident with an auto rickshaw. Upon learning that the passenger of the auto-rickshaw was injured, the appellant took responsibility for the expenses of the passenger's medical treatment, and the injured party was subsequently admitted to a hospital

without filing an FIR.

However, despite this, the appellant was asked to report to the police station where she allegedly faced threats from the police. Feeling aggrieved and with no other recourse, the appellant posted comments on the Facebook page of the Bangalore Traffic Police, highlighting the harsh treatment and harassment she had experienced. Consequently, the police filed an FIR and registered a case against the appellant under Sections 353 and 506 of the IPC.

Nonetheless, the Supreme Court bench concluded that the actions of the appellant did not constitute criminal intimidation. They held that the appellant's act of expressing her grievances on social media did not amount to a clear instance of criminal intimidation under the law.

This ruling emphasizes the importance of differentiating between expressions of dissatisfaction or criticism and actual criminal acts such as intimidation. It recognizes the right to freedom of expression and the significance of allowing individuals to voice their concerns or grievances, even if directed at authorities, as long as they do not cross the line into criminal behavior.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, Sections 503-506 of the Indian Penal Code deal with the offences of criminal intimidation, intentional insult with intent to provoke breach of the peace, and statements conducing to public mischief. These sections aim to safeguard individuals' rights and protect them from threats, insults, and false allegations that may harm their reputation, safety, or well-being.

## Liked this post? Click here to read more such posts!