



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

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

NECROPHILIA IN INDIA

AUTHORED BY - TARUNA NAYYAR & MADHAV ANAND

ABSTRACT

Necrophilia, defined as the sexual attraction to or engagement in sexual activities with a deceased body, is one of the most disturbing and morally reprehensible paraphilic disorders known to humankind. It is an offense that not only violates the dignity of the dead but also raises serious ethical, legal, and psychological concerns. Despite its horrifying nature, necrophilia remains inadequately addressed within India's legal framework, leaving significant loopholes that allow perpetrators to escape prosecution. This research paper delves into the complexities surrounding necrophilia, examining it through a legal, psychological, and comparative lens, while advocating for comprehensive legal reforms in India to address this grave issue.

INTRODUCTION

Necrophilia is classified as a paraphilia under psychiatric literature, often associated with severe mental disorders and deviant sexual behavior. Psychological studies suggest that individuals who engage in necrophilic acts often suffer from psychosexual disorders, with motivations ranging from feelings of control and dominance to an inability to engage in normal human relationships. Some offenders exhibit a compulsive need to desecrate the deceased, driven by deeply rooted pathological urges. This paper explores the various classifications of necrophilia, ranging from opportunistic necrophiles who engage in the act when the opportunity presents itself, to homicidal necrophiles who commit murder for the explicit purpose of sexually violating the corpse.

Necrophilia is often linked to power dynamics, control, and the absence of consent, making it fundamentally exploitative. It has also been connected to sadistic behaviors and serial offenses, as seen in several criminal cases worldwide. The psychological aspects of necrophilia indicate that it is not merely a disorder but a significant threat to public morality and human dignity, necessitating an appropriate legal response.

Necrophilia is a rare but deeply disturbing phenomenon that has existed across cultures and time periods. Ancient Egyptian records suggest that embalmers were sometimes known to engage in necrophilic acts, prompting authorities to delay embalming procedures for attractive women until decomposition had set in. Greek mythology contains references to necrophilic tendencies, with characters like Pygmalion showing fascination with lifeless but beautiful figures. Similarly, in medieval Europe, cases of grave robbing often included necrophilic acts, demonstrating that this behavior has persisted throughout history.

In modern times, necrophilia has been documented in criminal cases across various countries, including India. The infamous *Nithari case* (2006) brought necrophilia to national attention when it was discovered that one of the accused had engaged in sexual activities with the corpses of his victims. Other instances in India, such as the *Palghar mortuary case* (2020) and the *Tumakuru case* (2015), highlight the continued presence of necrophilic crimes, often facilitated by weak legal provisions and lack of preventive measures. Although these cases are not widespread, their horrific nature demands serious legal scrutiny.

The legal implications of necrophilia are complex due to the lack of a living victim who can testify or provide consent. Traditional sexual assault laws are designed to protect individuals from harm, but they assume that the victim is alive and capable of resisting or reporting the crime. In the case of necrophilia, the victim is deceased, making it difficult to frame such acts within the existing definitions of sexual offenses.

Despite the existence of legal provisions in India that uphold the dignity of the deceased, the country's criminal framework lacks an explicit provision criminalizing necrophilia as a standalone offense. The Indian Penal Code (IPC), prior to its replacement by the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) in 2024, did not contain a dedicated section addressing necrophilia. Instead, offenses such as Section 297 (trespassing on burial sites) and Section 377 (unnatural offenses) were applied in a piecemeal manner. However, these provisions often failed to ensure justice, leaving victims' families without proper legal recourse.

The landmark judgment in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018) significantly altered the interpretation of Section 377, decriminalizing consensual homosexual activity between adults. While Section 377 previously covered "carnal intercourse against the order of nature

with any man, woman, or animal," its decriminalization in the context of consensual relationships created a legal vacuum regarding non-consensual acts involving corpses.

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), introduced as a comprehensive replacement for the IPC, continues this legislative gap. It does not provide a specific provision criminalizing necrophilia, thereby failing to address an egregious violation of human dignity. Given that a deceased individual cannot provide consent, the absence of a penal provision against necrophilia raises serious concerns about the adequacy of existing laws in protecting the deceased from posthumous abuse.

Notably, Section 301 of the BNS criminalizes trespassing in burial places, imposing penalties on individuals who unlawfully enter burial grounds, places of interment, or depositories for the remains of the dead with the intent to commit an offense. While this provision strengthens protections for the sanctity of burial sites, it does not directly address sexual offenses against corpses.

Judicial pronouncements have also highlighted this legal void. In *Rangaraju v. State of Karnataka*, the Karnataka High Court acknowledged necrophilia as one of the most heinous crimes but noted that it does not legally constitute rape under Section 376 of the IPC. Similarly, in *Parmanand Katara v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court upheld the right to dignity of the dead, yet no specific legal provision exists for prosecuting sexual offenses against corpses.

Given these legal shortcomings, there is an urgent need for legislative intervention. The absence of an explicit law against necrophilia leaves perpetrators unpunished and compromises the fundamental right to dignity, which extends even after death. This paper critically examines these legal ambiguities and argues for the inclusion of a dedicated provision in the BNS to criminalize necrophilia, ensuring comprehensive protection of human dignity beyond life.

Given the inadequacies in the current legal framework, there is an urgent need to introduce specific provisions criminalizing necrophilia in India. This paper proposes multiple legal and policy recommendations to address the issue effectively. One such recommendation is amending the BNS to include a distinct provision that criminalizes necrophilia with stringent penalties. The expansion of Section 297 to include sexual violations of corpses is another necessary step in ensuring justice for victims and their families.

CASE STUDIES OF NECROPHILIA IN INDIA: IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Necrophilia, though a rare crime, has been reported in some horrific cases in India, exposing severe gaps in the legal system. Below is an in-depth analysis of some of the most significant cases, focusing on their judicial responses and legal shortcomings.

1. THE NITHARI CASE (2006),

SURENDRA KOLI V. STATE OF U.P. & ORS.

Facts of the Case

The Nithari killings, also known as the Noida serial murders, involved the brutal rape, murder, and alleged necrophilic activities committed by **Surinder Koli**, a domestic servant working for businessman **Moninder Singh Pandher** in Noida, Uttar Pradesh. The case came to light when police discovered **skulls, bones, and body parts of children and women in a drain near Pandher's house in Nithari**. Investigation revealed that Koli had lured young children into the house, where he **raped, murdered, and engaged in necrophilic acts** with their corpses before disposing of them.

Legal Proceedings

- Koli was arrested in December 2006, and the case was handed over to the **Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)**.
- He was charged with **murder (Section 302 IPC)**, **kidnapping (Section 364 IPC)**, and **destruction of evidence (Section 201 IPC)**.
- However, necrophilia was **not explicitly recognized** as an offense under Indian law, which meant he could not be convicted for it.
- The trial court sentenced Koli to **death**, a decision upheld by the **Allahabad High Court and the Supreme Court**.
- His death sentence was later **commuted to life imprisonment in 2014** on the grounds of inordinate delay in deciding his mercy plea.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The courts focused on Koli's crimes of **murder and sexual offenses** against the living victims, while his necrophilic acts were **not separately considered** due to the absence of a legal provision criminalizing necrophilia.
- The case highlighted **the lack of specific penal provisions** for necrophilia in Indian law.

- While forensic reports confirmed post-mortem sexual assault, courts **could not charge Koli under any specific section for necrophilia.**

Legal Gap Identified

- Since necrophilia was not separately defined as a crime, Koli could not be punished specifically for **sexual offenses committed on dead bodies.**
- Had a law been in place, Koli's conviction would have explicitly addressed his necrophilic acts, setting a **stronger precedent** for future cases.
-

2. THE TUMAKURU CASE (2015)

RANGARAJU V. STATE OF KARNATAKA

Facts of the Case

- In Tumakuru district, Karnataka, a **21-year-old woman** was brutally murdered while returning home from college.
- After slitting her throat, the accused **raped her dead body.**
- The Sessions Court convicted him for **murder and rape under Sections 302 and 376 of the IPC.**

Appeal Before the Karnataka High Court

- The accused appealed before a **Division Bench of the Karnataka High Court.**
- The High Court upheld his **murder conviction but acquitted him of the rape charge**, stating that **rape, as defined under Section 375 IPC, applies only to a living person.**
- The court ruled that since **the victim was already dead at the time of sexual assault, the crime did not qualify as rape under Indian law.**
- The court observed that necrophilia was a **horrendous crime but was not punishable under existing provisions** of the IPC.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The court acknowledged that **necrophilia is a serious and inhumane act** but found that existing laws were **inadequate to punish the offense separately.**
- The judges noted that the accused **could not be convicted for rape** since the **definition of rape under Section 375 IPC requires a living victim.**
- The **court urged lawmakers to introduce legal provisions to criminalize necrophilia explicitly.**

Legal Gap Identified

- This case reinforced the **legal loophole in India's criminal law** regarding necrophilia.
- **Lack of an explicit provision** allowed the accused to **escape punishment for sexual assault** committed on a corpse.
- The Karnataka High Court recommended **legislative amendments to criminalize necrophilia as a standalone offense**.

Significance of the Ruling

- This case triggered widespread **legal and media debates** on the need for **statutory recognition of necrophilia**.
- It prompted discussions about **whether a deceased person should be granted bodily autonomy and dignity under Indian law**.

3. THE PALGHAR MORTUARY CASE (2020)

Facts of the Case

- In Palghar, Maharashtra, a mortuary attendant was arrested for sexually assaulting a woman's dead body inside a hospital mortuary.
- He was **caught red-handed** when hospital staff walked in on him.
- The case was registered under **Section 297 IPC (Trespassing on burial places and offering indignity to a corpse)**.

Judicial Response and Observations

- Despite the shocking nature of the crime, the accused was **only booked under Section 297 IPC**, which prescribes **a maximum punishment of one year**.
- Since necrophilia is **not separately defined under Indian law**, the accused could not be charged with a **more severe offense**.
- The case sparked **public outrage**, with legal experts demanding **stronger laws to prevent such incidents** in morgues and hospitals.

Legal Gap Identified

- Section 297 IPC is **grossly inadequate**, as it **only applies to acts committed in burial places, not mortuaries or hospitals**.
- The punishment of **one year is disproportionately low** for such a grave act.
- There are **no laws ensuring security measures** (e.g., CCTV, background checks on mortuary workers) to prevent necrophilic crimes.

Significance of the Case

- This case demonstrated **how hospitals and morgues are vulnerable places** for necrophilic crimes.
- It **raised concerns about security protocols in medical institutions** and called for **legal and administrative reforms** to prevent such incidents.

4. THE JALANDHAR CASE (2015)

Facts of the Case

- A **hospital worker in Jalandhar, Punjab**, was **caught engaging in necrophilic acts** with a **female corpse in a morgue**.
- The incident came to light when a **hospital staff member walked in on the act** and **reported it to authorities**.

Legal Proceedings

- The accused was **booked under Section 297 IPC** (Trespassing on burial grounds and indignity to a corpse).
- **No rape or sexual offense charges** were applied since **Indian law does not recognize necrophilia as a separate crime**.
- The maximum punishment under **Section 297 IPC is only one year of imprisonment**.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The **court acknowledged the moral depravity** of the crime but stated that **the existing laws were inadequate to deal with necrophilia**.
- The **accused received a minor sentence**, leading to **public outrage** and demands for stricter laws.
- The **case once again exposed the legal loopholes** in addressing **sexual crimes against the dead**.

Legal Gap Identified

- **Section 297 IPC only applies to burial grounds** and does not cover **morgues, hospitals, or funeral homes** where such crimes often take place.
- There is **no provision in the IPC/BNS that punishes sexual acts with corpses**, allowing perpetrators to escape with **minor penalties**.

5. THE KARIM GANJ HOSPITAL CASE (2016)

Facts of the Case

- A hospital employee in Assam's Karim Ganj district was caught red-handed engaging in sexual acts with a deceased woman's body inside the hospital mortuary.
- The incident was recorded on CCTV and led to the employee's immediate arrest.

Legal Proceedings

- The accused was charged under Section 297 IPC (trespassing and indignity to a corpse).
- Since necrophilia is not explicitly defined in the IPC, no additional sexual offense charges were levied.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The court ruled that the accused could not be charged under sexual offense laws, as the victim was already dead.
- The judge expressed the need for legal reforms, stating that such heinous acts should attract harsher punishments.
- Public outrage led to demands for security measures in mortuaries, including mandatory CCTV cameras and better vetting of hospital staff.

Legal Gap Identified

- Existing laws focus on crimes against the living, but there are no specific provisions to protect the dignity of the deceased from sexual offenses.
- No severe penalties exist for necrophilia, leading to light sentences that fail to act as a deterrent.

6. THE UDALGURI CASE (2022)

Facts of the Case

- In Assam's Udalguri district, a 23-year-old man stalked a woman who was bathing in a stream.
- He hacked her to death with a sharp weapon and then raped her corpse.
- The case was reported by locals, who found the mutilated body and alerted authorities.

Legal Proceedings

- The accused was charged with murder (Section 302 IPC) and destruction of evidence (Section 201 IPC).

- However, the **necrophilic act was not separately prosecuted** due to the **lack of explicit provisions** in the IPC.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The **court convicted the accused for murder**, sentencing him to **life imprisonment**.
- **No punishment was assigned for necrophilia**, reinforcing the **legal vacuum in addressing post-mortem sexual assault**.
- The case added **further weight to calls for criminalizing necrophilia** as a **distinct offense**.

Legal Gap Identified

- **Laws recognize rape only when committed against a living person**, leaving necrophilia **unpunished**.
- **No existing legal provision explicitly addresses sexual assault on a deceased body**.

7. THE GHAZIABAD GRAVEYARD CASE (2015)

Facts of the Case

- In **Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh**, three men **dug up the grave of a 26-year-old woman and gang-raped her corpse**.
- The **incident was discovered when the victim's family found the disturbed grave and reported it to the police**.

Legal Proceedings

- The accused were **arrested but were only booked under Section 297 IPC**.
- Since the **IPC did not criminalize necrophilia separately**, they **escaped harsh punishment**.

Judicial Response and Observations

- The **court criticized the lack of legal provisions dealing with grave violations such as necrophilia**.
- The **judges recommended amending the IPC to specifically criminalize post-mortem sexual assault**.
- The **lenient punishment led to public outcry**, with demands for **stricter laws to protect the dignity of the dead**.

Legal Gap Identified

- Section 297 IPC is **limited to burial places**, meaning **necrophilic acts in morgues, hospitals, or crime scenes are not covered**.
- **No strong deterrence** exists against grave violations, leading to **repeat offenses**.

8. CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT CASE:

NEELU NAGESH V. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH

Facts of the Case

- The case involved **Neelu Nagesh**, who was accused of **raping the dead body of a minor girl**.
- He was initially **convicted by the trial court** under **Sections 363, 376(3) IPC, Section 6 of POCSO Act, and Section 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST Act**.
- On appeal, the **Chhattisgarh High Court upheld his conviction for some offenses** but **acquitted him of the rape charge** because the crime was committed against a **dead body**.

Judicial Response

- The court **acknowledged that necrophilia is one of the most horrendous crimes** but noted that **rape laws in India apply only to living persons**.
- The **bench ruled that a dead body is not a 'person' under Section 375 IPC**, and therefore, **rape charges could not be upheld**.
- However, the court **expressed concern over the lack of laws criminalizing necrophilia**, stating that **such acts must be explicitly penalized in Indian law**.

Legal Gaps Identified

- **Rape laws in India (Section 375 IPC) only apply to living persons**, leaving **necrophilia outside its scope**.
- **No specific provision in the IPC or BNS criminalizes necrophilia**, resulting in **judicial helplessness** despite the crime being morally repugnant.
- The court **recommended legal reforms** to introduce **a specific offense for necrophilia**.

9. SUPREME COURT OF INDIA:

PARAMANAND KATARA V. UNION OF INDIA (1995)

Facts of the Case

- The case **dealt with the dignity of the deceased**, particularly **the right to a proper burial and protection against desecration**.
- The Supreme Court ruled that **the right to dignity and fair treatment under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution extends even after death**.

Judicial Observations

- The **Supreme Court recognized the rights of the deceased**, stating that **dignity must be maintained even after death**.
- The court's ruling supports the argument that **necrophilia violates the dignity of the dead** and should be **criminalized explicitly**.

Legal Gaps Identified

- While the court recognized the **dignity of the deceased**, there is **no penal provision criminalizing sexual offenses against corpses**.
- The judgment can be used to argue that **necrophilia violates the constitutional right to dignity** and should be **punishable under law**.

10. SUPREME COURT OF INDIA:

RAMJI SINGH @ MUJEEB BHAI V. STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH (2009)

Facts of the Case

- The **Allahabad High Court ruled that the right to dignity extends to the deceased**, interpreting **Article 21 of the Constitution to include protection of corpses**.

Judicial Observations

- The court noted that **dead bodies must be treated with respect** and that **violations of their dignity should be punishable**.
- It called for **stronger legal provisions to prevent desecration and sexual assault on corpses**.

Legal Gaps Identified

- **Necrophilia remains unrecognized under Indian criminal law**, leading to **inadequate penalties for such offenses**.
- **Judgments like this can be used to push for legislative reforms to criminalize necrophilia explicitly**.

Comparative Analysis of Judicial Trends and Observations –

Case Name	Necrophilia Recognized?	Legal Provisions Applied	Judicial Observations	Identified Legal Gaps
Nithari Case, 2006)	No, only murder and sexual offenses against living victims considered	IPC Sections 302, 364, 201	Courts focused on murder and sexual offenses, necrophilia was not separately charged	No specific provision for necrophilia in Indian law
Tumakuru Case, 2015)	Yes, but not punishable	IPC Sections 302, 376 (rape charge overturned)	Court ruled rape applies only to the living, urged legal reforms to criminalize necrophilia	No explicit recognition of necrophilia as a separate crime
Palghar Mortuary Case, 2020	Yes, but only minor punishment	IPC Section 297	Accused booked under Section 297 IPC with only a 1-year sentence, sparking public outrage	Section 297 does not cover necrophilic acts in hospitals/mo rtuaries
Jalandhar Case, 2015	Yes, but minor punishment	IPC Section 297	Court recognized moral depravity but lacked legal basis for stronger punishment	No clear penal provision for necrophilia in IPC
Karim Ganj Hospital Case, 2016	Yes	IPC Section 297	Court urged legal reforms, emphasized need for stronger deterrents	No provision criminalizin g necrophilia explicitly

Udalguri Case, 2022)	Yes, but not punished separately	IPC Sections 302, 201	Convicted for murder but necrophilia was ignored	No provision for post-mortem sexual assault
Ghaziabad Graveyard Case, 2015	Yes	IPC Section 297	Court recommended legal amendments to criminalize post-mortem sexual assault	No strong deterrent laws exist against necrophilia
Neelu Nagesh v. State of Chhattisgarh (2023)	Yes, but not punishable	IPC Sections 363, 376(3), POCSO Act	Court ruled rape laws apply only to the living, urged lawmakers to introduce new laws	No legal recognition of necrophilia
Paramanand Katara v. Union of India (1995)	Indirectly recognized dignity of the dead	Article 21 (Right to Dignity)	Supreme Court affirmed that dignity extends after death	No penal provision for post-mortem sexual abuse
Ramji Singh @ Mujeeb Bhai v. State of U.P. (2009)	Recognized indirectly	Article 21 of Constitution	Courts urged legal reforms to protect dead bodies	No punishment for necrophilia

strict for

Key Judicial Trends and Observations

- 1. Recognition of Necrophilia as a Serious Crime:** Courts acknowledged the severity and moral depravity of necrophilia, but could not legally convict offenders due to statutory limitations.

2. **Rape Laws Apply Only to the Living:** Courts consistently ruled that Section 375 IPC (Rape) does not apply to dead bodies, leading to acquittals in necrophilia cases.
3. **Misuse of Section 297 IPC:** The only section used for necrophilia cases is Section 297 IPC (Trespassing on burial places and indignity to a corpse), which carries a maximum punishment of one year—far too lenient.
4. **Judicial Urging for Legal Reforms:** High Courts and the Supreme Court have repeatedly urged lawmakers to introduce a separate provision criminalizing necrophilia, but no legislative action has been taken yet.
5. **Constitutional Recognition of Dignity After Death:** Paramanand Katara (1995) and Ramji Singh (2009) established that Article 21 (Right to Dignity) extends even after death, supporting the criminalization of necrophilia.

GLOBAL COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS

While India lacks a specific statute criminalizing necrophilia, several other countries have recognized and addressed this crime through explicit legal provisions. In the United Kingdom, the Sexual Offences Act of 2003 explicitly criminalizes sexual intercourse with a corpse, prescribing strict penalties for offenders. In Canada, Section 182 of the Criminal Code makes necrophilia a punishable offense, carrying imprisonment of up to five years. Similarly, New Zealand's Crimes Act, 1961, and South Africa's Sexual Offenses and Related Matters Act, 2007, criminalize necrophilia, emphasizing the violation of human dignity and bodily integrity.

In contrast, the legal landscape in the United States varies across states, with some states explicitly penalizing necrophilia under sexual offense statutes, while others prosecute it under laws concerning the desecration of corpses. This study draws comparisons between these jurisdictions and India, identifying best practices that could be incorporated into Indian law. By analyzing the effectiveness of these international statutes, this paper makes a case for enacting a dedicated law criminalizing necrophilia in India.

1. India

- **Legal Status:** No specific law criminalizing necrophilia.
- **Relevant Laws:**
 - **Section 297, Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860** – Trespassing on burial grounds with the intent to insult religion or wound feelings (may apply in some cases).

- **Section 377 IPC (before 2018)** – Unnatural offences (occasionally applied in past cases, but now decriminalized).
- **Penalty:**
 - **Section 297 IPC:** Up to **one-year imprisonment**, fine, or both.
- 2. United States (Varies by State)
- **Legal Status:** Necrophilia is explicitly illegal in most states, classified as either a felony or misdemeanor.
- **Relevant Laws:**
 - **California Penal Code § 7052** – Felony, up to **8 years imprisonment**.
 - **Texas Penal Code § 42.08** – Abuse of a corpse, up to **2 years in jail**.
 - **Michigan Penal Code § 750.349** – Felony, up to **10 years imprisonment** and fines.
- **Penalty:** Ranges from **misdemeanors to felonies** with varying prison sentences.
- 3. United Kingdom
- **Legal Status:** Explicitly illegal under the **Sexual Offences Act 2003**.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Section 70, Sexual Offences Act 2003** – Prohibits **sexual penetration of a corpse**.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 2 years imprisonment.**
- 4. Germany
- **Legal Status:** Illegal under the **German Criminal Code**.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Section 168, German Penal Code (Strafgesetzbuch, StGB)** – Disturbing the peace of the dead.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 3 years imprisonment or fine.**
- 5. France
- **Legal Status:** No direct law on necrophilia, but criminalized under desecration laws.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 225-17, French Penal Code** – Protects corpses from desecration.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 1-year imprisonment and €15,000 fine.**
- 6. Canada

- **Legal Status:** Explicitly criminalized under **Criminal Code of Canada**.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Section 182, Criminal Code** – Indignity to a human body.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 5 years imprisonment.**

7. Australia (Varies by State)

- **Legal Status:** Illegal in all states under different laws.
- **Examples of State Laws:**
 - **New South Wales: Crimes Act 1900 (NSW) Section 81C.**
 - **Victoria: Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) Section 55.**
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 5 years imprisonment.**

8. Russia

- **Legal Status:** No direct law, but prosecuted under corpse desecration statutes.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 244, Russian Criminal Code** – Abuse of a corpse or burial places.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Fine-based punishment or short-term imprisonment.**

9. China

- **Legal Status:** No explicit law, but covered under **corpse desecration** laws.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 302, Criminal Law of China** – Protects corpses from damage.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Fines and short-term imprisonment** (varies by case).

10. Japan

- **Legal Status:** No specific law criminalizing necrophilia.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 190, Japanese Penal Code** – Criminalizes desecration of corpses.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Fine or short-term imprisonment.**

11. South Africa

- **Legal Status:** Explicitly illegal under sexual offence laws.
- **Relevant Law:**

- **Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act, 2007.**
- **Penalty:**
 - **Imprisonment** (duration varies based on circumstances).
- 12. Brazil
- **Legal Status:** Explicitly criminalized.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 212, Brazilian Penal Code** – Violation of a grave or corpse.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Up to 3 years imprisonment.**
- 13. Saudi Arabia
- **Legal Status:** No explicit law, but heavily penalized under **Sharia law**.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Severe punishments, potentially execution or life imprisonment.**
- 14. South Korea
- **Legal Status:** No direct law against necrophilia.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 160, South Korean Penal Code** – Covers corpse desecration.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Fine or short-term imprisonment.**
- 15. Italy
- **Legal Status:** Prohibited under corpse desecration laws.
- **Relevant Law:**
 - **Article 410, Italian Penal Code** – Desecration of a corpse.
- **Penalty:**
 - **Fine or short imprisonment.**

Comparative Summary:

Country	Legal Status	Relevant Law/Section	Penalty
India	No explicit law	IPC Sec 297 (indirect)	1-year imprisonment,

USA	Illegal (varies by state)	California Penal Code §7052, others	Up to 10 years imprisonment
UK	Explicitly illegal	Sexual Offences Act 2003, Sec 70	2 years imprisonment
Germany	Illegal	Sec 168 German Penal Code	3 years imprisonment
France	No direct law, desecration	Article 225-17 Penal Code	1 year imprisonment, fine
Canada	Explicitly illegal	Criminal Code Sec 182	5 years imprisonment
Australia	Illegal (state laws vary)	Crimes Act (NSW Sec 81C, Vic Sec 55)	5 years imprisonment
Russia	No direct law, desecration	Article 244 Russian Criminal Code	Fine or short-term imprisonment
China	No explicit law	Article 302 Chinese Criminal Law	Varies
Japan	No explicit law	Article 190 Japanese Penal Code	Fine or imprisonment
South Africa	Explicitly illegal	Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2007	Varies
Brazil	Explicitly illegal	Article 212 Brazilian Penal Code	3 years imprisonment
Saudi Arabia	No explicit law, severe	Sharia Law	Life imprisonment, possible

South Korea	No direct law	Article 160 Penal Code	Fine or imprisonment
Italy	Illegal under desecration	Article 410 Italian Penal Code	Fine or short imprisonment

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Necrophilia stands as one of the most disturbing and morally grotesque acts imaginable an egregious violation of the sanctity, bodily integrity, and dignity of the deceased. Although rare, the horror it entails is deeply unsettling and its occurrence exposes glaring voids in the Indian criminal justice system. This paper has traversed the historical, psychological, legal, and comparative dimensions of necrophilia, revealing a disquieting truth: Indian law remains woefully inadequate in addressing such a heinous offense. Despite repeated judicial outcries and mounting public indignation, there exists no standalone penal provision in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) or earlier Indian Penal Code (IPC) that criminalizes necrophilia in clear and unequivocal terms.

From landmark judicial pronouncements to appalling real-life case studies such as the Nithari killings or the Palghar mortuary incident, the judiciary has consistently been forced to rely on weak proxies like Section 297 IPC originally meant for burial trespass to deal with crimes as severe as post-mortem sexual violation. This reliance results in unjustly lenient sentences that do not reflect the magnitude of the offense, nor do they serve as effective deterrents.

Moreover, this research reveals that India lags behind a significant number of countries that have taken proactive steps to criminalize necrophilia explicitly, such as the United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa, and various U.S. states. These legal frameworks not only recognize the inherent human dignity of the dead but also impose appropriate punitive measures to reflect the seriousness of the offense.

In the Indian context, the absence of clear statutory recognition denies both justice to the deceased and closure to their families. It is a failure not only of law but also of the larger moral and ethical compact between the individual and society. This paper thus calls for a multi-pronged approach combining robust legislation, procedural safeguards, institutional reforms,

and public awareness to ensure that the right to dignity does not cease at death.

Recommendations and Suggestions

1. Statutory Reforms:

- **Introduce a Specific Provision on Necrophilia in BNS:** A separate section must be added to the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita clearly defining necrophilia as a sexual offense against a dead body, with a minimum punishment of 5 to 10 years of rigorous imprisonment, and extending up to life imprisonment in aggravated cases.
- **Expand the Definition of Rape under Section 63 of BNS:** Redefine rape to include sexual acts committed on corpses, thereby closing the definitional loophole that currently enables acquittals in necrophilia cases.
- **Amend Section 297 BNS (Previously IPC):** Enlarge the scope of this provision to include all locations—hospitals, morgues, funeral homes, crematoriums, and private residences where a corpse may be found. Raise the penalty to a minimum of 5 years and impose harsher sentences in cases of repeat or aggravated offenses.

2. Forensic and Institutional Safeguards:

- **Mandatory Installation of CCTV Cameras** in mortuaries, hospital storage units, and burial grounds to monitor any suspicious activities.
- **Stringent Background Checks** and periodic psychological evaluations for mortuary staff, embalmers, and individuals handling the deceased.
- **Chain of Custody Protocols** should be implemented rigorously to track the movement and handling of deceased bodies.

3. Judicial and Law Enforcement Training:

- **Sensitization Workshops** for judges, police personnel, and forensic officers on recognizing and appropriately charging necrophilic acts.
- **Development of Investigation Protocols** tailored to identify post-mortem sexual assaults through forensic pathology.

4. Public Awareness and Legal Literacy:

- **Launch Public Campaigns** to destigmatize discussion around necrophilia, encouraging citizens to report such crimes and demand stronger legal protection for the deceased.
- **Educational Outreach Programs** in medical colleges, legal institutions, and police academies to foster sensitivity toward the posthumous dignity of individuals.

5. Creation of a Centralized Registry:

- Maintain a national database of necrophilic offenses, including information about offenders, modus operandi, and locations, to aid in pattern recognition and preventive policymaking.

6. Comparative Law Adoption:

- **Incorporate international best practices** from countries like the UK, Canada, and South Africa by adopting clear language criminalizing sexual offenses against corpses in Indian legislation.

This paper thus concludes not with despair over legislative inaction, but with a call to conscience. It is time for Indian law to unequivocally declare that **death does not render a person's body unworthy of respect**. The sanctity of human dignity must transcend mortality, and our legal system must evolve to ensure that even in death, justice is neither blind nor silent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books and Journals

1. Aggrawal, Anil. *Forensic and Medico-legal Aspects of Sexual Crimes and Unusual Sexual Practices*. CRC Press, 2009.
2. Bhattacharyya, Harihar. *Criminal Law in India: Historical and Social Perspectives*. Routledge India, 2017.
3. Tewari, R.K. and Bhushan, Sudhir. *Indian Criminal Law: Principles and Critique*. Universal Law Publishing, 2021.
4. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*. 5th ed., American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013.
5. Kaplan, Harold I., and Benjamin J. Sadock. *Synopsis of Psychiatry: Behavioral Sciences/Clinical Psychiatry*. 10th ed., Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2007.
6. Bharati, Kavita. "Dead but Not Safe: The Legal Dilemma of Necrophilia in India." *Journal of Indian Law and Society*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2022, pp. 113–130.
7. Singh, Avtar. *Principles of Criminal Law*. Eastern Book Company, 2022.
8. Sarkar, S. *Sarkar's Criminal Major Acts*. LexisNexis, 2023.

II. Indian Statutes and Codes

1. **Indian Penal Code, 1860** (Prior to repeal)
2. **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023** (Replacement of IPC, effective 2024)

3. Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012

4. Constitution of India, Article 21 – Right to Life and Dignity

III. Foreign Laws and Comparative Statutes

1. **United Kingdom** – Sexual Offences Act, 2003, Section 70
2. **Canada** – Criminal Code, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, Section 182
3. **United States** – Varies by State:
 - California Penal Code § 7052
 - Michigan Penal Code § 750.349
 - Texas Penal Code § 42.08
4. **Germany** – German Penal Code (StGB), Section 168
5. **France** – Penal Code, Article 225-17
6. **Australia** –
 - Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), Section 81C
 - Crimes Act 1958 (Victoria), Section 55
7. **South Africa** – Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act, 2007
8. **Russia** – Russian Criminal Code, Article 244
9. **China** – Criminal Law of China, Article 302
10. **Japan** – Japanese Penal Code, Article 190
11. **Brazil** – Brazilian Penal Code, Article 212
12. **Italy** – Italian Penal Code, Article 410
13. **South Korea** – South Korean Penal Code, Article 160
14. **Saudi Arabia** – Sharia Law (Customary practice, no codified law)

IV. Online and Government Resources

1. Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice. *The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*.
<https://legislative.gov.in>
2. National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Ministry of Home Affairs. *Crime in India Reports*.
<https://ncrb.gov.in>
3. Legal Service India. *Articles and legal commentary on criminal law*.
<https://www.legalserviceindia.com>

4. “Landmark Judgments on Necrophilia and IPC Gaps.” *LiveLaw.in*, 2022.
<https://www.livelaw.in>

V. NEWS ARTICLES

1. Express News Service, *Surat: Serial Killer Suspect Nabbed, Probe into Necrophilia Angle*, The Indian Express (Feb. 16, 2024), <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/surat/gujarat-serial-killer-suspect-rahul-jat-9137997/>.
2. Press Trust of India, *Sex with Dead Body Not Rape, Chhattisgarh High Court Rules in Horrific Case*, Deccan Herald (Jan. 9, 2024), <https://www.deccanherald.com/india/chhattisgarh/sexual-intercourse-with-dead-body-not-rape-says-chhattisgarh-high-court-3328805>.
3. PTI, *UP: Youth Arrested under NSA for Killing Two Women, Necrophilia Acts*, India Today (May 5, 2023), <https://www.indiatoday.in/crime/story/up-man-arrested-for-killing-women-sex-with-dead-bodies-2368056-2023-05-05>.
4. Tribune News Service, *Jalandhar: E-Rickshaw Driver Held for Killing Nurse, Necrophilia Suspected*, The Tribune (Dec. 27, 2023), <https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/punjab/e-rickshaw-driver-held-for-killing-nurse-in-jalandhar-570295>.
5. IANS, *West Bengal: Death for Man Who Raped, Killed Minor, Life Term for Accomplice*, Hindustan Times (Feb. 6, 2024), <https://www.hindustantimes.com/cities/kolkata-news/death-penalty-for-west-bengal-man-who-raped-killed-minor-101706220225347.html>.
6. Legal Correspondent, *Necrophilia Not Recognized as Offense Under IPC: Supreme Court*, LiveLaw.in (Mar. 19, 2024), <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/necrophilia-not-recognized-under-ipc-sc-observes-legal-gap-250297>.
7. Express News Service, *The Nithari Horror: Necrophilic Tendencies, Legal Loopholes Highlighted in Koli Case*, The Indian Express (Dec. 30, 2014), <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/death-row-nithari-rape-murder-case-surinder-koli/>.
8. Times News Network, *Tumakuru Case: Karnataka HC Acquits Accused of Rape, Urges Legal Reforms on Necrophilia*, Times of India (Jul. 2, 2015), <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/bengaluru/karnataka-hc-acquits-rape-accused-of-sexual-act-on-dead-body/articleshow/47907091.cms>.

9. NDTV, *Palghar: Mortuary Worker Caught Having Sex With Corpse in Government Hospital*, NDTV (Nov. 5, 2020), <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/palghar-hospital-staffer-caught-having-sex-with-dead-body-arrested-2323866>.
10. Hindustan Times, *Jalandhar Morgue Horror: Hospital Staffer Caught in Act with Female Corpse*, Hindustan Times (Mar. 18, 2015), <https://www.hindustantimes.com/punjab/jalandhar-hospital-staffer-caught-having-sex-with-corpse/story-WjSdqUg0zNDG7a6ijY3r0H.html>.
11. ANI, *Assam: Karimganj Hospital Worker Caught Having Sex With Corpse, Arrested*, India.com (Jul. 22, 2016), <https://www.india.com/news/india/assam-hospital-staffer-caught-having-sex-with-corpse-in-karimganj-1347642/>.
12. Assam Tribune, *Udalguri: Youth Murders Woman, Commits Necrophilic Act, Arrested After Villagers' Tip-off*, Assam Tribune (Apr. 12, 2022), <https://assamtribune.com/assam/udalguri-man-held-for-killing-woman-and-sexually-violating-her-corpse-1342256>.
13. The Hindu Staff Reporter, *Ghaziabad: Three Men Dig Up Grave and Rape Woman's Corpse, Arrested*, The Hindu (Apr. 13, 2015), <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/three-held-for-digging-up-grave-rape-corpse-in-ghaziabad/article7099613.ece>.
14. Legal Correspondent, *Chhattisgarh High Court Acquits Rape Conviction Due to Victim Being Deceased*, LiveLaw.in (Jan. 9, 2024), <https://www.livelaw.in/news-updates/chhattisgarh-high-court-sexual-intercourse-with-dead-body-not-rape-250120>.
15. LiveLaw Bureau, *Supreme Court on Dignity of the Dead: Right Under Article 21 Extends Post Death*, LiveLaw.in (Ref. Parmanand Katara v. Union of India) (Jul. 20, 2020), <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/right-to-dignity-of-dead-paramanand-katara-v-union-of-india-159690>.
16. Bar & Bench Staff, *Right to Dignity Includes Dead Bodies: Allahabad HC in Ramji Singh Case*, Bar & Bench (Oct. 9, 2009), <https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/right-to-dignity-includes-dead-bodies-allahabad-hc-ramji-singh>.
17. Express News Service, *Surat: Serial Killer Suspect Nabbed, Probe into Necrophilia Angle*, The Indian Express (Feb. 16, 2024), <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/surat/gujarat-serial-killer-suspect-rahul-jat-9137997/>.

18. Press Trust of India, *Sex with Dead Body Not Rape, Chhattisgarh High Court Rules in Horrific Case*, Deccan Herald (Jan. 9, 2024), <https://www.deccanherald.com/india/chhattisgarh/sexual-intercourse-with-dead-body-not-rape-says-chhattisgarh-high-court-3328805>.
19. PTI, *UP: Youth Arrested under NSA for Killing Two Women, Necrophilia Acts*, India Today (May 5, 2023), <https://www.indiatoday.in/crime/story/up-man-arrested-for-killing-women-sex-with-dead-bodies-2368056-2023-05-05>.
20. Tribune News Service, *Jalandhar: E-Rickshaw Driver Held for Killing Nurse, Necrophilia Suspected*, The Tribune (Dec. 27, 2023), <https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/punjab/e-rickshaw-driver-held-for-killing-nurse-in-jalandhar-570295>.
21. IANS, *West Bengal: Death for Man Who Raped, Killed Minor, Life Term for Accomplice*, Hindustan Times (Feb. 6, 2024), <https://www.hindustantimes.com/cities/kolkata-news/death-penalty-for-west-bengal-man-who-raped-killed-minor-101706220225347.html>.
22. Legal Correspondent, *Necrophilia Not Recognized as Offense Under IPC: Supreme Court*, LiveLaw.in (Mar. 19, 2024), <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/necrophilia-not-recognized-under-ipc-sc-observes-legal-gap-250297>.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL