

Judicial Interpretation of Due Process in Penal Jurisprudence in India

Ms. Arona Mumtaz¹, Prof. Dr. Shahnaz²

¹PhD Scholar, School of Law, Kashmir University

²Head and Dean, School of Law, Kashmir University

Abstract

Due process is a fundamental safeguard against the arbitrary exercise of state power in penal jurisprudence. In India, Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution, read with judicial decisions, statutory procedure and international human rights standards, guarantee fair procedure at every stage from arrest and detention to trial and custodial treatment. This paper undertakes a doctrinal study of how these layers of law together protect the dignity and rights of persons in custody. It examines the relevant provisions of international human rights instruments, the constitutional and statutory framework in India, the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court of India in landmark decisions, and the monitoring role of the National Human Rights Commission. The paper argues that although the legal framework governing due process is well developed, its protective value depends on faithful implementation, effective oversight and domestic legislation aligned with international obligations. It concludes with suggestions aimed at strengthening procedural compliance, institutional accountability and the protection of human dignity within the penal system.

Keywords: Due process; penal jurisprudence; Article 21; Article 22; arrest and detention; custodial rights; judicial guidelines; National Human Rights Commission; doctrinal research

1. Introduction

The state, as the supreme authority within its territory, holds a dual responsibility: maintaining law and order and safeguarding the dignity, liberty and basic rights of individuals under its jurisdiction. In a constitutional democracy, this responsibility extends beyond the control of crime or preservation of public order and encompasses fairness, procedural justice and respect for human life. In this context, the principle of due process assumes critical importance within penal jurisprudence.¹

Due process functions as a fundamental safeguard against the arbitrary exercise of state power. It ensures that no person is deprived of life or personal liberty except through a procedure that is fair, just and reasonable. Within penal jurisprudence, this principle applies at all stages—from arrest and detention to investigation, trial, sentencing and custodial treatment. The legitimacy of criminal justice thus rests not only on the enforcement of legal norms but equally on the fairness and transparency of procedures.²

¹Prakash Chandra Shukla, Human Rights and Enforced Disappearance in North-East India, NALSA Journal, Vol. IV, Issue 2, April 2008.

²Granville Austin, *Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience* (Oxford University Press 1999) p. 167.

The potential effects of state authority on individual freedom highlight the importance of procedural safeguards. Arbitrary arrest, prolonged detention, limitations on access to legal representation and deviations from prescribed procedures can affect individual experiences and public perceptions of the justice system. Due process safeguards are therefore essential to ensuring accountability, transparency and the protection of rights within the penal framework.³

International human rights instruments reinforce these principles. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) affirms the inherent dignity and equal rights of all persons,⁴ while the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) specifies protections such as fair trial rights, freedom from arbitrary detention and humane treatment of persons deprived of liberty.⁵ Together, these instruments provide a framework emphasising that justice should be guided by procedural fairness and respect for individuals.

In India, Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution provide the primary legal basis for due process. Article 21 guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. However, judicial interpretation has clarified that such procedure must not only exist in form but must also be substantively fair and reasonable. Article 22 sets out additional safeguards against arbitrary arrest and detention, including the rights to be informed of the grounds of arrest, to consult a legal practitioner, and to be produced before a magistrate within a prescribed period. Collectively, these provisions establish the constitutional framework for due process in India.⁶

The judiciary has further shaped the understanding of due process through landmark decisions. In *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*⁷, the Supreme Court held that procedure must be fair, just and reasonable. In *D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal*⁸, the Court outlined safeguards related to arrest and detention. Similarly, in *Sheela Barse v. State of Maharashtra*⁹ and *Raghubir Singh v. State of Haryana*¹⁰, the Court emphasised the need for humane treatment within custodial settings. These decisions illustrate the judiciary's role in reinforcing procedural protections and aligning them with constitutional values.

At the statutory level, laws regulating arrest, investigation, evidence and trial provide a legal framework for administering criminal justice. The effectiveness of these laws depends on their alignment with constitutional guarantees and judicial directions, including adherence to prescribed procedures, timely access to legal representation and equitable application of safeguards. Examining this alignment between statutory provisions, constitutional principles and judicial guidelines is a key component of doctrinal analysis.¹¹

1.1 The Problem

The protection of life, personal liberty, dignity and procedural fairness forms an essential component of a constitutional democracy. In India, these guarantees are primarily reflected in Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution and are further supported by statutory provisions, judicial decisions, procedural guidelines

³Id.

⁴Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, Art. 14, G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810, at 71.

⁵International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, Art. 7, G.A. Res. 2200A (XXI), 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

⁶D.D. Basu, *Shorter Constitution of India* (16th edn, LexisNexis 2021) 238.

⁷*Maneka Gandhi v Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248 : AIR 1978 SC 597.

⁸*D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal*, (1997) 1 SCC 416 : AIR 1997 SC 610.

⁹*Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra*, (1983) 2 SCC 96 : AIR 1983 SC 378.

¹⁰*Raghubir Singh v State of Haryana*, (1980) 3 SCC 152 : AIR 1980 SC 1087.

¹¹Sujata R. Choudhury, *Law and Human Rights in India* (Eastern Law House, 2017) p. 78.

and international human rights standards. The Supreme Court of India has consistently emphasised that arrest, detention, investigation, trial and custodial processes must be conducted in accordance with procedures that are fair, just, reasonable and uphold human dignity.

The legal framework provides safeguards such as protection against arbitrary arrest, communication of the grounds of arrest, access to legal representation, production before a magistrate within the prescribed period, and humane treatment during custody. These safeguards derive from several distinct sources—international instruments, the constitutional text, statutes, judicial guidelines and the directions of institutional bodies such as the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC). A careful doctrinal examination is required to understand how these sources relate to one another, what protection each affords to persons in custody, and whether together they form a coherent and sufficient framework.

Accordingly, the central problem of this paper is to examine how international human rights law, the Indian constitutional and statutory framework, and the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court and the NHRC collectively safeguard the dignity and rights of persons in custody, and to identify the areas in which this framework may be strengthened to promote fairness, accountability and respect for constitutional guarantees.

2. Methodology

2.1 Nature of the Research

This study is purely doctrinal in nature. Doctrinal research examines what the law is by systematically analysing legal rules, principles and authorities and the relationships among them. The study accordingly proceeds by analysing, interpreting and critically evaluating the legal provisions and judicial pronouncements that govern due process in arrest, detention and custody, without recourse to field data.

2.2 Sources

The study relies on primary and secondary legal sources. Primary sources include the Constitution of India, in particular Articles 21 and 22; the statutory provisions governing arrest, investigation and trial, including the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023; international instruments such as the UDHR and the ICCPR; and decisions of the Supreme Court of India. Institutional sources include the arrest and custody guidelines issued by the National Human Rights Commission. Secondary sources include books, commentaries and journal articles on constitutional law, criminal procedure and human rights.

2.3 Scope and Approach of Analysis

The analysis proceeds at three levels. First, at the international level, it examines the provisions of human rights instruments that promote and protect the dignity of persons in custody. Second, at the national level, it analyses the constitutional guarantees, statutory framework and judicial decisions that safeguard the rights of persons in custody and ensure humane treatment during custody, together with legislative measures for the protection of persons in custody and their relationship with international standards. Third, at the judicial and institutional level, it analyses the binding guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court of India to curb the misuse of arrest and detention powers by law enforcement agencies, and the role of the NHRC as an institutional watchdog monitoring police conduct. Throughout, the study adopts an analytical and critical approach, evaluating the coherence of these sources and identifying gaps between legal guarantees and the mechanisms for enforcing them.

3. Suggestions

On the basis of the doctrinal analysis, the following suggestions are offered to strengthen the protection

of due process for persons in custody.

1. **Ensure effective communication of rights.** The right of a person taken into custody to be informed of the grounds of arrest and of the right to consult a legal practitioner should be conveyed clearly, in a language the person understands, and recorded. Legal services authorities, legal aid clinics and educational institutions should support sustained public legal literacy initiatives on Articles 21 and 22 and the procedural safeguards in the BNSS.
2. **Give statutory force to judicial guidelines.** The safeguards laid down in *D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal*, including the preparation of arrest memos, medical examination of the person in custody, informing a relative or friend, and maintenance of custody records, should be reflected in statutory provisions and supervised through regular compliance audits.
3. **Guarantee early access to legal assistance.** Free legal aid should be available from the time of arrest and not merely at the stage of remand or trial, so that the constitutional right to consult a legal practitioner is meaningful in practice.
4. **Strengthen documentation and transparency.** Detention protocols, authorisation processes and custody records should be documented accurately and contemporaneously, in a form open to scrutiny by magistrates and oversight bodies, with arrest and detention records maintained in verifiable, including digital, form.
5. **Reinforce institutional oversight.** Magistrates should exercise vigilant scrutiny when persons in custody are produced before them, and the National and State Human Rights Commissions and the judiciary should conduct regular inspections of police lock-ups and detention facilities and ensure follow-up on their recommendations.
6. **Align domestic law with international standards.** India should consider comprehensive domestic legislation for the protection of persons in custody and for institutional accountability, giving fuller effect to its commitments under the ICCPR and other international human rights standards.
7. **Train and sensitise law enforcement personnel.** Regular training of police and custodial staff on constitutional safeguards, humane treatment of persons in custody and the legal consequences of procedural violations should be institutionalised.
8. **Provide effective remedies.** Accessible and time-bound grievance and compensation mechanisms should be available to persons who allege violation of procedural safeguards during arrest or detention.

4. Conclusion

Due process is the foundation of legitimate criminal justice. The constitutional guarantees in Articles 21 and 22, the guidelines developed by the Supreme Court of India, the work of the National Human Rights Commission and international instruments such as the UDHR and the ICCPR together provide a comprehensive framework for protecting the liberty and dignity of persons in custody. Through decisions such as *Maneka Gandhi*, *D.K. Basu*, *Sheela Barse* and *Raghbir Singh*, the judiciary has established that procedure established by law must be fair, just and reasonable and that custodial treatment must be humane.

Yet the existence of a well-developed legal framework does not by itself guarantee its effectiveness. Much of the protection available to persons in custody rests on judicial guidelines whose force depends on consistent compliance, and the absence of dedicated domestic legislation on the protection of persons in custody leaves a gap between India's international commitments and its municipal law. The real measure of due process therefore lies in how faithfully legal safeguards are implemented and enforced.

Strengthening the protection of persons in custody requires a combined effort of the legislature, the judiciary, law enforcement agencies and oversight institutions. By giving statutory force to judicial guidelines, ensuring early access to legal assistance, improving documentation and oversight, and aligning domestic law with international standards, the penal system can better realise the constitutional promise of fairness, dignity and respect for human rights.

References

Books and Articles

1. Austin G, Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience (Oxford University Press 1999).
2. Basu DD, Shorter Constitution of India (16th edn, LexisNexis 2021).
3. Choudhury SR, Law and Human Rights in India (Eastern Law House 2017).
4. Shukla PC, 'Human Rights and Enforced Disappearance in North-East India' (2008) 4(2) NALSA Journal.

Cases

1. D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal (1997) 1 SCC 416 : AIR 1997 SC 610.
2. Maneka Gandhi v Union of India (1978) 1 SCC 248 : AIR 1978 SC 597.
3. Raghubir Singh v State of Haryana (1980) 3 SCC 152 : AIR 1980 SC 1087.
4. Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra (1983) 2 SCC 96 : AIR 1983 SC 378.

Statutes and International Instruments

1. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (Act 46 of 2023).
2. Constitution of India 1950, arts 21 and 22.
3. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 23 March 1976) 999 UNTS 171.
4. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948) UNGA Res 217A (III).