



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  
Procurement from the World Bank.

diploma in Public

### **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 provided dedicated 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

# **REIMAGINING LEGAL DETERRENCE: STRENGTHENING INDIA'S APPROACH TO RASH AND NEGLIGENT DRIVING IN THE ERA OF REFORM**

AUTHORED BY - PALAK GUPTA\*

## **ABSTRACT**

In the aftermath of an increase in fatalities from rash and negligent driving, India is at a turning point in rethinking its approach to road safety and legal accountability. Enforcement and the administration of justice are still rife with discrepancies, even with legislative improvements like the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019 and the implementation of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. In order to handle the situation comprehensively, this article promotes a measured legal response that goes beyond punitive frameworks and incorporates technology, judicial uniformity, and a victim-centric mindset.

**Keywords:** Rash and Negligent driving, civil liability in accident, criminal liability in accident,

## **INTRODUCTION**

India, with its rapidly expanding vehicular population and complex road networks, finds itself grappling with a public safety crisis of alarming proportions. Recording over 150,000 road traffic fatalities annually, the country accounts for a significant share of global road deaths despite possessing a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework.<sup>1</sup> While the Indian Penal Code and the Motor Vehicles Act<sup>2</sup> outline criminal and civil liabilities for rash and negligent driving, the persistent rise in accidents reflects a deeper institutional and systemic dysfunction. This includes erratic enforcement of traffic rules, underutilization of modern surveillance technologies, and the lack of uniformity in judicial interpretation of culpability. Despite amendments aimed at deterrence—such as the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019<sup>3</sup> and the punitive provisions introduced in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023<sup>4</sup>, implementation remains fragmented, and justice often elusive, particularly for victims and their families. The gap between law in books and law in action continues to widen, eroding public trust in the system's ability to prevent and redress road tragedies.



What exacerbates the issue further is the almost complete absence of a victim-centric or restorative justice lens in India's traffic jurisprudence. The prevailing legal response is largely punitive, focused on fines and imprisonment, with little emphasis on compensation, rehabilitation, or the reintegration of offenders through behavioral correction. Moreover, judicial delays, inconsistencies in sentencing, and challenges in proving criminal negligence have led to a low conviction rate in motor accident cases. The reliance on outdated evidentiary standards—often lacking forensic or digital corroboration—further weakens the prosecutorial case. These limitations necessitate a reorientation of our approach to road safety law: one that prioritizes swift justice, integrates technology for real-time enforcement, ensures proportional and consistent sentencing, and, most importantly, places the victim at the center of the legal process. In a country where economic loss due to road accidents is estimated to be nearly 3% of the GDP, legal reform is not just a moral imperative—it is an economic and social necessity.

## **I. UNDERSTANDING THE CRISIS: BEYOND STATUTORY LANGUAGE**

The legal architecture addressing reckless and negligent driving in India has seen periodic amendments, yet the core issue lies not solely in the text of the statutes, but in their interpretive application and systemic enforcement. The newly enacted Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), which supplants the Indian Penal Code after more than a century of legal tradition, attempts to modernize and streamline criminal law, including offenses related to road safety. Section 106 of the BNS now consolidates earlier provisions such as Sections 279 and 304A IPC, with a more structured differentiation between negligent driving, death caused thereby, and the aggravated case of fleeing the scene. On paper, these changes appear to strengthen deterrence. However, the real-world impact remains muted due to the continued over-reliance on traditional evidentiary thresholds and interpretative conservatism in the judiciary.

Despite the proliferation of high-speed vehicles, digital distractions, and congested roadways, courts continue to demand overt and incontrovertible signs of dangerous conduct—such as physical evidence of high-speed impact, reliable eyewitnesses, or visible vehicle damage—to establish criminal rashness. In the *State v. Gabbar Singh* case<sup>5</sup>, for instance, the trial court refused to convict the driver despite serious injuries to the victim, citing lack of persuasive proof of recklessness. This reflects a broader pattern in Indian trial courts, where absence of real-time or forensic evidence often results in acquittals, irrespective of circumstantial



indicators of negligent behavior. The prevailing judicial outlook remains tied to a classical model of criminal culpability that prioritizes intent and visible acts over contextual or circumstantial inferences.

What compounds the problem is the judiciary's narrow construction of the terms "rash" and "negligent," which is increasingly ill-suited to contemporary traffic realities. In *State of Karnataka v. Satish* (1998)<sup>6</sup>, the Supreme Court observed that excessive speed alone cannot be equated with rashness. While this reasoning was appropriate in its time, applying it uncritically in today's context risks trivializing serious offenses. Speeding, when coupled with digital distraction, fatigue, or poor road planning, creates a lethal combination that may not always leave visible signs. A fatigued driver behind the wheel for 14 continuous hours or one distracted by a WhatsApp notification poses just as grave a threat as someone overtaking on a blind curve. Yet such conduct, while foreseeably dangerous, often escapes the legal definition of "recklessness" because it lacks visible aggression or intent. This evidentiary and definitional gap must be bridged if legal accountability is to meet the demands of modern public safety.

An evolved jurisprudence is therefore needed—one that reflects behavioral patterns of urban and semi-urban India, incorporates technological changes in vehicular operation, and accounts for systemic deficiencies like poor signage, road maintenance, or inadequate pedestrian protections. Courts must move towards a context-sensitive interpretation of Section 106, one that gives due weight to circumstantial evidence, systemic factors, and expert testimony on risk and foreseeability. In parallel, statutory reforms should include guidelines for assessing rashness and negligence, as well as procedures to accommodate digital evidence (e.g., dashcam footage, GPS data, mobile phone usage logs). Only by expanding both the normative framework and evidentiary standards can we hope to convert our road safety laws from symbolic codes into instruments of real deterrence and justice.

## **II. JUDICIAL INCONSISTENCIES AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES**

The judiciary is often seen as the ultimate guardian of legal accountability, particularly in cases involving rash and negligent driving that result in injury or loss of life. However, a closer examination of judicial behavior in this domain reveals a pattern of inconsistent rulings, interpretative ambiguity, and sentencing variability that undermine both deterrence and justice. The statutory framework under the Indian Penal Code (IPC)—notably Sections 279, 304A, and

338—and now Section 106 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), provides the foundational legal tools to address such offenses. Yet, in practice, courts have struggled to apply these provisions with uniformity. The primary reason is the subjective judicial interpretation of key terms such as "rash" and "negligent," which lack precise legislative definitions. This has led to a jurisprudence that is reactive rather than proactive, often shaped by the specific facts of a case rather than guided by consistent legal standards.

One of the most critical issues that has emerged is the evidentiary burden required to establish rashness or negligence in criminal courts. In *State of Karnataka v. Satish* (1998), the Supreme Court famously ruled that merely driving at high speed is not per se rash or negligent unless it is proven that such speed endangered public safety. While this judgment rightly discourages the blanket criminalization of fast driving, it also introduced a legal standard that has become a double-edged sword. Prosecutors must now prove not only that the driver was exceeding the speed limit but also that their manner of driving reflected a conscious disregard for human life. In reality, this often requires eyewitness accounts, mechanical inspection reports, and increasingly, digital or forensic evidence—all of which are difficult to procure, especially in rural or semi-urban contexts. Consequently, many drivers accused of serious offenses are acquitted for want of technical evidence, leaving victims and their families with a lingering sense of injustice.

This interpretational rigidity has been evident in recent trial court rulings, such as *State v. Gabbar Singh* (2024), where the accused was acquitted of charges under Sections 279 and 338 IPC despite the victim suffering grievous injuries. The court emphasized the absence of skid marks, lack of credible independent witnesses, and insufficient clarity about the vehicle's speed. Furthermore, the fact that the accused stayed at the scene and helped transport the injured to the hospital was treated as indicative of his responsible conduct rather than his potential liability. While such considerations are humane and ethically significant, they should not detract from the legal obligation to evaluate whether the conduct leading to the accident met the threshold of criminal negligence. This reveals a larger issue: courts often conflate post-accident behavior with the culpability of the act itself, thereby diluting the seriousness of the offense committed.

In addition to interpretive inconsistencies, sentencing patterns also show substantial variation. While some courts impose the maximum punishment permissible under law, others opt for

minimal fines, probation, or admonition, even in cases where the outcome has been fatal. This disparity reflects the absence of a centralized or codified sentencing policy for road traffic offenses in India. Unlike in countries such as the United Kingdom or Canada, where sentencing guidelines provide judges with structured discretion, Indian courts rely almost entirely on precedent and subjective evaluation. This leads to significant regional variation: a similar act of negligence may attract two years of imprisonment in one jurisdiction and a nominal fine in another. Such arbitrariness undermines the principle of equality before the law, protected under Article 14 of the Indian Constitution<sup>7</sup>, and severely weakens the law's deterrent value.

The broader judicial approach also appears to inadequately address the socio-economic context in which many of these cases occur. In numerous instances, socio-economically privileged defendants—such as corporate executives or politically connected individuals—receive more lenient treatment, either through delayed prosecution or outright acquittal. On the other hand, commercial drivers or migrant laborers, often with limited legal representation, may face disproportionate consequences for similar offenses. This inequality perpetuates a class bias within the justice system and contributes to growing public cynicism regarding judicial impartiality in traffic-related offenses.

The Motor Accident Claims Tribunals (MACTs), which are tasked with awarding compensation to victims or their dependents, are also not immune to criticism. While they are intended to offer an expedited and less adversarial remedy for victims, MACT proceedings are often plagued by delays, inconsistent computation of damages, and lack of access to legal aid for marginalized claimants. In the absence of a national formula for determining compensation, awards can vary widely for similar injuries or deaths.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, MACTs function in isolation from the criminal justice process, leading to a bifurcated system where a victim may win compensation in one forum while the accused walks free in another. This fragmented structure fails to offer a holistic sense of justice and may further alienate victims from the legal process.

Furthermore, the absence of technological integration in trial and claims processes severely limits the efficiency and accuracy of evidence assessment. In an era where dash-cam footage, GPS data, and traffic surveillance are readily available in urban settings, their absence in courtrooms—either due to lack of infrastructure or procedural non-recognition—represents a missed opportunity. The failure to integrate such tools not only hampers evidence gathering



but also sustains a culture of speculative litigation and judicial subjectivity.

In sum, the Indian judiciary's approach to rash and negligent driving is characterized by an inconsistency that stems from definitional ambiguity, evidentiary challenges, unstructured sentencing, and systemic inequalities. These flaws collectively weaken the deterrent potential of the legal framework, reduce public faith in judicial processes, and prolong the suffering of victims and their families. For a more robust and equitable legal response, India must consider codifying sentencing principles, embracing technology in judicial proceedings, improving forensic and investigative capacity, and aligning civil and criminal remedies in a more integrated manner. Only through such comprehensive reform can the judiciary fulfill its constitutional role of ensuring justice, not merely in form but in substance.

### **III. LEGISLATIVE SHIFTS: ARE THEY ENOUGH?**

India's legislative landscape concerning road safety has witnessed significant reforms in recent years, signaling an apparent shift toward a stricter, deterrent-based framework. With the enactment of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, replacing the Indian Penal Code<sup>9</sup>, and the earlier Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019, lawmakers aimed to rectify longstanding criticisms of lenient punishments and ambiguous legal thresholds in cases of rash and negligent driving. A particularly noteworthy change is the new provision under Section 106(2) of the BNS, which prescribes a prison term of up to 10 years for drivers involved in fatal hit-and-run incidents who fail to report the accident to authorities. This provision introduces a clear bifurcation between mere negligence and aggravated culpability caused by absconding after an accident—a nuance absent in the now-repealed Section 304A of the IPC, which capped imprisonment at two years for all negligent driving deaths.

However, legal scholars and transport policy experts continue to raise concerns about whether these harsher penalties alone will meaningfully reduce the frequency and severity of road traffic incidents. Enforcement asymmetry across Indian states significantly hampers the realization of these legislative ambitions. For example, while states like Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra have initiated more proactive enforcement strategies, integrating road audits and electronic monitoring, many others still lack essential infrastructure such as speed detection systems or centralized violation databases. Data from the India Status Report on Road Safety 2024 reveals glaring disparities in per capita traffic fatalities: Tamil Nadu recorded 21.9 deaths per 100,000

people, while states like West Bengal reported just 5.9. Moreover, helmet usage remains below 50% in the majority of states, despite statutory requirements.<sup>10</sup> The lack of uniform implementation results in a fragmented deterrence structure, where the likelihood of punishment is perceived as arbitrary and region-dependent, rather than universal and certain.

The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019 sought to address these inconsistencies by empowering state governments with more administrative autonomy and increasing fines for a range of violations—from ₹1,000 for speeding to ₹10,000 for drunk driving. It also laid out provisions for compensating victims through Section 164B, which mandates a no-fault compensation scheme for serious injuries and fatalities. Despite these developments, bureaucratic inertia and political pushback have slowed enforcement. Several states have resisted implementing the increased fines, citing public backlash and financial burden on lower-income drivers. As a result, the potential of the law to serve as a credible deterrent remains unrealized in many regions.

In sum, while India's recent legislative interventions mark a commendable departure from the historically lenient stance on reckless driving, their real-world efficacy hinges on consistent, technology-driven enforcement, centralized offender tracking, and harmonized implementation across jurisdictions. Without these systemic changes, even the most progressive statutes risk becoming toothless instruments—well-intentioned in principle but ineffective in practice.

#### **IV. TOWARD A HOLISTIC LEGAL STRATEGY: RECOMMENDATIONS**

To confront the ongoing crisis of road fatalities in India, a transformative approach is essential—one that goes beyond conventional punitive models and considers a more systemic, balanced, and forward-looking legal response. The current reliance on loosely interpreted statutory language and inconsistent judicial pronouncements underscores the urgent need for uniformity and predictability in the adjudication and sentencing of traffic-related offenses. Codified sentencing norms tailored to the gravity of offenses can play a decisive role in this reform. These guidelines should incorporate elements such as the extent of recklessness, prior infractions, the presence of aggravating factors (e.g., driving under the influence), and the tangible impact on victims and their families. By eliminating ambiguity and judicial

arbitrariness, such standards can enhance both deterrence and public faith in the justice system.

Equally critical is the adoption of advanced enforcement mechanisms. The integration of artificial intelligence and automated traffic surveillance has shown tangible benefits in jurisdictions like Singapore and the United Kingdom<sup>11</sup>. For India, the deployment of AI-powered red-light violation detection systems, speed radar cameras, and automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) tools can revolutionize evidence gathering and facilitate timely penal action. These technologies not only ensure objectivity in enforcement but also reduce human discretion—thereby curbing opportunities for corruption. Moreover, digitized traffic records linked to driving license databases would enable authorities to identify habitual offenders and apply graduated penalties, creating a fair and transparent penalty structure.

However, justice must not be confined to retribution. Incorporating restorative justice elements within India's traffic jurisprudence offers an opportunity to bridge the gap between the law and societal expectations of accountability and closure. In non-fatal or first-time offenses, structured mediation models involving the victim and the offender—facilitated by neutral third-party mediators—can promote genuine acknowledgment of harm, emotional redress, and community-based solutions. This approach not only humanizes the justice process but also aligns with constitutional ideals of reform and rehabilitation, particularly for younger or economically vulnerable offenders.

Another vital component in this holistic strategy is a restructured and efficient compensation system for victims. The Motor Vehicles Act (especially Section 164B) aims to provide swift, no-fault compensation, but its procedural complexities and bureaucratic inertia often delay justice. Establishing specialized Victim Compensation Tribunals with quasi-judicial authority can expedite claim settlements while ensuring consistency in awards. These tribunals must be equipped with digital infrastructure, fixed timelines for adjudication, and trained legal professionals who understand the nuances of accident jurisprudence. Additionally, integrating health and insurance databases can simplify verification processes and prevent fraudulent claims.

Lastly, the legal framework must address the behavioral dimension of traffic violations. Mandatory rehabilitation programs—including driver re-education modules, psychological assessments, and community service—should be built into the sentencing of repeat or high-



risk offenders. Such programs should emphasize cognitive-behavioral change and instill a sense of civic duty. Empirical studies from Nordic countries show that rehabilitative interventions can significantly reduce recidivism among traffic offenders, making roads safer over time<sup>12</sup>.

In essence, India's legal response to rash and negligent driving must evolve into a multi-pronged strategy—one that combines judicial uniformity, technological enforcement, victim restitution, and offender reform. Only through such a comprehensive, forward-thinking legal architecture can the country hope to meaningfully curb the human and economic toll of road traffic incidents and build a justice system that resonates with the aspirations of a modern, safety-conscious society.

## **CONCLUSION**

India's road safety framework, while comprehensive in its statutory construction, continues to falter at the level of implementation due to a confluence of factors—ranging from inadequate enforcement and judicial inconsistencies to procedural inertia and a lack of technological integration. Despite commendable legislative strides, such as the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019 and the incorporation of Section 106 in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the lived reality for victims of rash and negligent driving remains disheartening. Legal redress is often delayed, compensation is inconsistent, and conviction rates remain abysmally low. The enhanced punitive provisions, including stricter penalties for hit-and-run incidents, reflect a welcome shift in legislative intent but fall short in practice due to systemic bottlenecks—such as undertrained law enforcement personnel, poor forensic infrastructure, and vast disparities in judicial outcomes across regions.

To bridge this gap, India must transition from a purely punishment-centric paradigm to a more nuanced, victim-oriented model of traffic justice. This demands a multi-pronged approach—anchored in behavioral reform, intelligent traffic surveillance, and institutional safeguards that prioritize victim restitution. The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and data analytics in enforcement mechanisms, combined with real-time tracking of offenses and automated evidence generation, can significantly enhance transparency and accountability. Furthermore, the establishment of dedicated fast-track courts and Motor Accident Claims Tribunals (MACTs) with standardized compensation criteria would ensure uniformity in justice delivery.

The rollout of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita presents a critical moment to reimagine and recalibrate India's traffic laws—not merely as instruments of deterrence but as frameworks for systemic transformation. A justice system that upholds the dignity of victims, ensures timely adjudication, and reinforces public trust is not just a legal ideal but a constitutional necessity. Through such reform, India can move closer to achieving the dual objectives of road safety and equitable justice, thereby affirming its commitment to the rule of law and the sanctity of human life.

