



INTERNATIONAL LAW  
JOURNAL

---

**WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL LAW  
JOURNAL**  
**ISSN: 2581-  
8503**

*Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal*

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

[WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN](http://WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN)

## **DISCLAIMER**

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL

## **EDITORIAL TEAM**

### **Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS ) Indian Administrative Service officer**



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) ( with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a

professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

### **Dr. R. K. Upadhyay**

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.





## **Senior Editor**

### **Dr. Neha Mishra**



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

### **Ms. Sumiti Ahuja**

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



### **Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal**

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of Law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



### **Dr. Rinu Saraswat**

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur,  
M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

### **Dr. Nitesh Saraswat**

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



### **Subhrajit Chanda**

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

## ***ABOUT US***

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

# A DETAILED STUDY OF RIGHT TO PRIVATE DEFENCE UNDER IPC

AUTHORED BY - YADAV AJAY RAMCHANDRA

## ABSTRACT

The Indian Penal Code (IPC), in its Right of Private Defence, gives power to individuals to protect themselves, their property and others from imminent harm or unlawful aggression. This abstract offers a brief overview of the Indian Penal Code's legal tenets. Sections 96-106 of the IPC define the conditions for the exercise of this right by a person. In determining whether an act falls within the right of private defence, certain tests must be applied among them; imminence of danger, reasonableness of force used and nonexistence of other legitimate means. These provisions strike a balance between individualism and social needs thus ensuring legal protection towards both life and property.

Over time, changes in societal norms as well as judicial interpretations have impacted on the development of private defence rights. The dynamic nature of self-defence laws in India is explored using legal precedents and amendments. In this abstract, it is shown that justice may vary according to circumstances.

Some challenges experienced when dealing with such cases are evidential standards, burden of proof, judges' discretion etc. As a result, it is important for one to understand law more complexly allowing for just outcomes.

The exercise of the Right of Private defence entails several ethical issues that necessitate prevention of excessive use of force and adherence to the principle of sanctity of life. The abstract seeks to explore the legal, pragmatic, and moral aspects of the Right of Private defence with a view to comprehending this basic aspect in Indian criminal law more deeply.



## INTRODUCTION

The Right of Private defence is an important legal concept enshrined in the Indian Penal Code (IPC) which allows persons to protect themselves, their property and others from immediate danger or illegal aggression. This is a fundamental principle of Indian criminal law and reflects the inherent right people must defend their lives, liberties and properties when facing imminent threats. It introduces a detailed examination of the Right of Private defence within the IPC framework that examines its historical origins, legal basis, practical implications, and moral aspects.

The notion of private defence rights extends back to ancient jurisprudence as well as societal conventions where inhabitants had an inborn entitlement to safeguard themselves against external hostility or their possessions. This survival instinct then developed into different codes of law and customary practices across various societies.

The explicit recognition of the right to self-defence in the Indian context can be seen in the introduction of the IPC during the British colonial administration in the 1860s. The IPC was amended and reinterpreted as the inclusion of self-defence provisions reflected the need to regulate and regulate the exercise of this vested right in a legal framework outside the framework, but the essence of the right to personal defence remains the essence of Indian substantive criminal law

Sections 96 to 106 of the IPC lay down the statutory provisions for the right of self-defence. These sections describe situations in which individuals have the right to use force to protect themselves, their property, or others from immediate danger. The main criteria are the need for self-defence, the consistency of the response and the absence of any reasonable alternative.

Section 96 provides that everyone has the right to the protection of his person and property from any harm caused by a crime against human person or property. Section 97 extends this right to protect other persons, while section 98 provides guidance on the exercise of this right only in the face of threats to property Section 99 limits this right, specifying if it does not extend to more harm, they will be more than necessary to repel the attack. Sections 100 to 106 deal with specific circumstances in which the right to private defence, including assault resulting in death, kidnapping and arbitrary detention, may be invoked; and others, among others.

In practice, enforcement of the right to self-defence often presents serious challenges to legislators, prosecutors, and judicial authorities to recognize the nature of defence requires further investigation.



## OBJECTIVES

1. To undertake a comprehensive analysis of the legal framework surrounding the right to personal protection enshrined in the Indian Penal Code (IPC).
2. To examine the basic elements required to invoke the right to protection of the individual under the IPC.
3. To examine how the right to privacy has been invoked in important court cases to understand judicial interpretation and precedent.

## PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

- Literature Review:

Conduct an extensive review of legal textbooks, academic journals, and focus groups (IPC), examining the right to self-defense.

- Legal Databases:

Use statutory databases like India-Code to access a wide range of legal information and regulations Online.

- Legal Platforms:

Look for information on major online legal forums, legal blogs, and forums where legal professionals engage in discussions about the concept of the right to self-defence.

## OBSERVATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

### Right of Private Defence:

Today, personal safety and security has become increasingly important. With crime on the rise, it is important to protect yourself, yourself, yourself, and your loved ones from potential harm. The legal system recognizes this need and enacts policies to help people protect themselves and their property.

The right to self-defence is one such concept that is a cornerstone of criminal law. A person has the right to use force if necessary to protect himself, his property, and others from unlawful attack  
Relevant sections under the IPC

- **Section 96:** This section defines the right to self-defence as everyone having the right to defend

himself or others from any act involving fear of death or serious bodily injury, or theft, robbery, violence, or criminal involvement.

- **Section 97**: This section broadly defines the right to self-defence. It states that the right includes an act commensurate with the feared harm in retaliation for the attack.
- **Section 98**: This section includes the right of self-defence against the actions of a person who is insane, intoxicated, or in any other comparable state. Such a person had as much reasonable responsibility for their actions as they had a right to private defence.
- **Section 99**: This section defines activities other than personal protection. These include acts done in good faith, acts authorized by law and acts authorized by the affected person.
- **Section 100**: This section discusses the circumstances in which the right to the defence of a private body results in death. He believes that such action can be used if there is a threat of death or serious bodily harm and no other means of escape exercising the right to self-defence.
- **Section 101**: This section discusses the circumstances in which the right of self-defence extends to non-fatal harm. It states that such action may be invoked when there is a reasonable fear of serious harm and no recourse other than the right of self-defence.
- **Section 102**: This section includes the establishment and maintenance of the right to the protection of private property. The right begins with, and runs from, reasonable fear of theft, robbery, violence, or unlawful entry so throughout a problem.
- **Section 103**: This section discusses the circumstances in which the right to protect private property extends to death. It states that if there is a threat of death or serious bodily injury, such power may be used to prevent robbery, theft, violence, or unlawful entry.
- **Section 104**: This section discusses the circumstances in which the right to protect private property extends to non-fatal harm. It says such powers can be used to prevent robbery, theft, violence, or unlawful entry if there is a fear of injury.
- **Section 105**: This section deals with the establishment and maintenance of the right to privacy of person and property. *“The privilege begins when a person has a reasonable fear of assault or other crime and continues for the duration of the risk”<sup>1</sup>*
- **Section 106**: This section deals with the right to self-defence against a deadly attack when there is a risk of harm to an innocent person. It states that such power may be exercised when there is a

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://constitution.findlaw.com/amendment5/annotation04.html>

reasonable fear of death or suffering in an innocent person, and the security guard has no other means of preventing harm than the rightful owner is doing it and his work.

### LIMITATIONS TO RIGHT TO PRIVATE DEFENSE

Although the right to self-defence is fundamental to criminal justice, it is by no means an absolute right. To prevent the abuse of this right, there are restrictions imposed by law.

These limitations Understanding these limitations is essential to the judicious and responsible exercise of the right to privacy to ensure that the use of force for self-defence is reasonable, that is the threat they face is consistent, and innocent people will not be harmed in the process.

They are as follows:

- **The force used must be proportionate to the threat:** A defender must not use more force than necessary to repel the attack. For example, if one attacks another with a punch, the defender cannot respond with a lethal strategy because it would be too difficult
- **The right to self-defence applies only when the threat exists:** Once the threat passes, the right to self-defence expires. Consequently, if a person attacks another and the attack is repelled, the defender **cannot use force** against the attacker because the danger has passed
- **A person exercising the right to self-defence must have a reasonable belief that such force is necessary to protect themselves or others:** this means that force cannot be reasonably used simple suspicion or suspicion of assault. A reasonable suspicion that an attack is imminent or in progress is required.
- **The right to self-defence does not include the use of deadly force unless there is a threat of death or serious bodily injury:** This means that a person cannot use deadly force unless his life is in danger or he is seriously bodily injured
- **Except in cases of imminent death or serious bodily injury, the right to self-defence does not authorize deadly force:** This means that unless a person's life is in danger or they are seriously injured, he cannot use deadly force that could result in injury or death

### EXCEPTIONS TO THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE DEFENSE

- If the defendant or another is the perpetrator or instigator of the attack, The right of self-defence

cannot be invoked to remove using force in such cases tip

- If a person exercising the right of self-defence goes beyond the limits of his defence and causes more damage or injury than is necessary to resist the attack, under certain circumstances in such cases, the person may be liable for damages.
- If the exercise of the right of self-defence causes harm or injury to a third party who was not involved in the attack, he can recover damages caused to a third-party responsibility for the third
- If an exercise of the right to self-defence uses deadly force where it was not necessary to prevent an attack, that person may be liable for the use of excessive force

### RELATED CASE LAWS:

The protection of individual life and property is an axiom in any civilized society because it is impossible for the state to do so at any time because of its laws. Enforcement agencies cannot move around to come rescue an individual from the situation they are kicking that is why the law for individuals

The right to self-defence. Notably, the Framers commented on compliance with the personal protection provisions of the Penal Code: "We still leave it in a very imperfect state committed to think that it must always be one of the most unrealistic aspects of any criminal justice system." This suggests that judges have recognized the need to allow for latent ambiguity Flexibility in reading and implementing policies to ensure fairness.

#### **1. Rizan & Another vs State of Chhattisgarh Thru Chief on 21 January, 2003**

In the 2003(1) SCR 457 case, the accused challenged their convictions for assaulting the appellant and his family. Witnesses supported the prosecution, despite the accused's claims of perjury. The Court emphasized that family ties do not undermine the credibility of witnesses. denied the "false in uno false in omnibus" plea and sustained the conviction based on credible evidence. With respect to the right of private defence, the court ruled that the accused had failed to show that he lawfully exercised it. The sentence was considered fair. Appeal under Section 99 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 was dismissed on plea of guilty.

#### **2. Laxman Singh vs Poonam Singh & Ors on 10 September, 2003**



The appeal involves a land dispute that leads to a deadly confrontation. The accused alleged self-defence, which was supported by injury. The trial courts and the High Court considered the evidence and concluded that the accused had made a valid defence. Though the deceased party originally owned the land, the accused established its ownership through income records. Various statutory provisions including Sections 96, 100 and 105 of the Indian Penal Code were invoked to establish the legality of his defence. Considering the circumstances, the Supreme Court upheld the acquittal, emphasizing the contextual analysis of the right to self-defence. The appeal was dismissed.

### **3. Kamp sri vs Puttappa and Anr. on 21 October, 1943**

The petitioner sought reconsideration of the acquittal of two accused who were convicted by the Bench Court for the offense under Section 323 IPC under the Appellate Magistrate. The incident stemmed from an altercation on the street where the second accused punished a child by picking up dust, followed by an altercation involving verbal abuse and the accused's alleged eating the appellate magistrate acquitted the accused after finding inconsistencies in the evidence. The applicant contended that only the judgment and the record could be considered under section 263, and not the documentary evidence. However, they said the complaint could be examined as part of the record. The investigator declined to participate, considering the incident trivial and the evidence insufficient to convict. Notably, the conduct of the second accused was held to be capable of interfering with the right of self-defence.

### **4. Gangada vs The State of Rajasthan on 11 February, 1975**

In the appeal against conviction under Section 304 Part I IPC, Gangada claimed self-defence, alleging the deceased first attacked him. However, the evidence presented was unreliable, with inconsistencies and lack of injuries on Gangada's back. The court found no reasonable apprehension of danger justifying self-defence. Witness testimonies were deemed credible, establishing Gangada's culpability. Despite the absence of a fractured skull, medical evidence suggested the blow inflicted by Gangada was fatal. Consequently, Gangada's conviction was altered to Section 304 Part II IPC, reducing his sentence to four years' rigorous imprisonment, considering time served.

### **5. Basan Bhowmick vs State and Anr. on 27 March, 1962**

In this case Sections 147, 323 and 324 of IPC for disputes over boundary walls. The Sessions Judge

reversed the conviction under Sections 323 and 324 of the IPC but upheld the conviction under Section 147. The High Court, however, held that the common ground of the wall could not be proved, hence the conviction was reversed. It highlighted the moot nature of the alleged rights and along the way ordered a retrial under Section 147 to enforce the rights. A retrial would serve justice, allowing the accused to face the amended charge.

## CONCLUSION

The right to self-defense contained in the Indian Penal Code (IPC) is a fundamental legal concept that can protect individuals from imminent harm or unlawful attack on them, the property and others. IPC sections 96-106 define the conditions for exercising this right, including imminent danger, reasonable use of force, and other reasonable means of self-defense. A lack of it is. Changes in social norms and judicial interpretations over time have affected the evolution of the right to self-defense, reflecting the dynamic nature of Indian criminal law.

Challenges in handling cases involving individual security rights include standards of proof, burden of proof, and judicial discretion. However, it is important to understand the intricacies of the law to ensure a fair outcome. Constraints on control, such as the need for appropriate force and threat perception, help prevent its abuse.

Examining landmark court cases such as *Rizan v. State of Chhattisgarh* v. *Basan Bhowmick*. In *State*, it provides insight into how the right to self-defense is exercised in different circumstances. These cases emphasize the importance of contextual analysis and the need for a fair and just trial.

Overall, this paper has examined the legal, practical, and ethical aspects of the right to self-defense in Indian criminal law. By scrutinizing its legal framework, core features and application in court proceedings, this study contributes to a greater understanding of this fundamental area of criminal justice.

## REFERENCES

- <https://indiankanoon.org>
- <https://www.casemine.com>
- <https://www.lawctopus.com>
- <https://indiacode.nic.in>

- <https://www.studocu.com>
- N.H. JHABVALA (BOOK) IPC



W H I T E   B L A C K  
L E G A L