BLOGS

Learn in a Minute: Rarest of the Rare Doctrine

Ruchika Mohapatra · 18 Sep 2024

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction Origin and Evolution of the Rarest of Rare Doctrine When can the Rarest of Rare Doctrine be Applied? Cases on Death Penalty Conclusion

Introduction

In legal theory and practice, few doctrines carry as much weight and controversy as India's "rarest of rare" doctrine. This principle, emerging from the domain of criminal law, particularly in cases of capital punishment, has evolved significantly since its inception. It serves as a critical benchmark in determining whether a convict deserves the most severe penalty under Indian law – the death penalty.

Origin and Evolution of the Rarest of Rare Doctrine

The origin of the "rarest of rare" doctrine can be traced back to the landmark decision of the Indian Supreme Court in ***Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab***. This case was a watershed moment in Indian jurisprudence, where the court laid down guidelines for the application of the death penalty.

The court acknowledged the irreversibility of the death penalty and emphasized the need for its exceptional and restricted use. It introduced the concept that the death penalty should be imposed only in "the rarest of rare" cases, where society's collective conscience is so shocked that leniency would be inappropriate.

Over the years, subsequent cases and judgments have further refined and interpreted this doctrine. The Supreme Court has deliberated extensively on what constitutes the "rarest of rare" circumstances, setting out factors such as the brutality of the crime, its motive, impact on society, and the criminal's potential for rehabilitation. These criteria aim to ensure that the death penalty is reserved for cases where no other punishment is sufficient to address the enormity of the crime.

When can the Rarest of Rare Doctrine be Applied?

According to the principles set forth in Bachan Singh and subsequent cases, the “rarest of rare” doctrine is applied under the following circumstances:

1. The crime must be of an exceptionally brutal, depraved, or heinous nature. Factors such as extreme brutality, premeditation, and the manner in which the crime was committed are considered.
2. The crime should have an impact that goes beyond the immediate victim and affects society at large. This could include crimes that cause widespread fear, terror, or outrage among the public.
3. The presence of aggravating factors such as the involvement of vulnerable victims (like children or elderly), betrayal of trust, or repeated offenses can weigh in favor of applying the death penalty.
4. Conversely, the absence of significant mitigating factors that could justify a lesser sentence, such as the offender’s background, age, mental state, or potential for reform, may strengthen the case for imposing the death penalty.
5. The judiciary must consider whether any punishment other than death would be adequate and proportionate given the gravity of the offense and its impact on society.

Cases on Death Penalty

The application of the “rarest of rare” doctrine in Indian law has been both contentious and consequential. Several high-profile cases have shaped its application:

Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab: This case exemplifies the Supreme Court’s meticulous examination of aggravating and mitigating circumstances. The court upheld the death penalty, emphasizing the gruesome nature of the crime and its impact on society. It underscored the need for a balanced approach in sentencing, considering both the severity of the offense and the potential for reform.

Ajmal Kasab v. State of Maharashtra: In a landmark decision, the Supreme Court affirmed the death penalty for Ajmal Kasab, one of the perpetrators of the 2008 Mumbai terrorist attacks. The court emphasized the exceptional nature of the crime, which resulted in numerous casualties and shook the nation’s conscience. The case highlighted the doctrine’s application in cases of

terrorism and mass violence.

Conclusion

Despite its significance, the “rarest of rare” doctrine has not been without criticism. Critics argue that the doctrine’s application can be subjective, leading to inconsistent sentencing across different cases. There are concerns about the possibility of judicial error and the disproportionate impact of the death penalty on marginalized groups.

However, the doctrine’s evolution reflects ongoing societal debates and changing perspectives on punishment and justice. Over time, there has been a global trend towards abolition or restriction of the death penalty, reflecting evolving international norms and human rights standards.

Also Read: Death Penalty in India