



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, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

MENS REA, PROXIMATE ACTS, AND SUICIDE: A JUDICIAL ANALYSIS OF SECTION 306 IPC

AUTHORED BY - KAUSTUBH SINGH
BA.LLB, Xavier's law school, St Xavier's University

Abstract

Abetment of suicide under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) is a complex offence requiring a direct, intentional, and proximate act by the accused. This paper examines the doctrinal contours of Section 306 IPC and its intersection with Section 107 IPC, which defines abetment through instigation, conspiracy, or intentional aid. Through a doctrinal case law analysis, the study explores judicial reasoning on mens rea, proximate causation, and evidentiary requirements, highlighting how courts differentiate legally significant instigation from ordinary disputes, harassment, or emotional exchanges. Key case studies, including *Prakash v. State of Maharashtra*, *R Shashirekha v. State of Karnataka*, and *Ansh Jindal v. State of NCT of Delhi*, illustrate the application of legal principles, the importance of causal nexus, and the role of the deceased's vulnerability in determining liability. Critical analysis reveals consistent judicial emphasis on proximate acts, mens rea, and evidence quality, while cautioning against frivolous or vexatious prosecution. The paper concludes with recommendations for investigative rigor, holistic evidence assessment, and legal advocacy focused on intent and causation. By synthesizing legal doctrine and judicial trends, this study provides clarity on Section 306 IPC, offering insights for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers engaged in the prevention of suicide and the just application of criminal law.

Keywords: Abetment of Suicide; Section 306 IPC; Mens Rea; Proximate Causation; Judicial Analysis

1. Introduction

Abetment of suicide constitutes a serious offence under the Indian Penal Code, 1860. Section 306 criminalizes the act of abetting another to commit suicide, making it punishable with imprisonment of up to ten years, along with a fine. The provision is anchored in the broader definition of abetment under Section 107 IPC, which includes instigation, conspiracy, or

intentional aid in facilitating an act.¹ Judicial pronouncements have consistently emphasized that, for liability under Section 306 IPC, there must be a proximate and deliberate act of instigation, accompanied by a direct causal connection between the accused's conduct and the suicide. Ordinary family quarrels, emotional disputes, or financial disagreements do not suffice to establish abetment unless it can be shown that the accused intentionally and directly contributed to the deceased's decision to commit suicide.

Recent judicial interpretations further clarify that courts must safeguard the rights of the accused from frivolous prosecution, while also upholding the societal interest in preventing suicides and protecting the dignity of the deceased. This paper explores the doctrinal contours of Section 306 IPC, judicial reasoning from relevant case law, and the principles governing abetment of suicide in India.

2. Issue

The central issue in Section 306 IPC cases revolves around determining whether the conduct of the accused constitutes instigation, aiding, or intentional assistance that directly or indirectly led to the deceased's suicide. Courts focus on the temporal proximity of the accused's actions and the suicidal act, and whether sufficient evidence demonstrates a clear causal link. Another dimension involves assessing the deceased's mental and emotional condition, as vulnerability or psychiatric conditions may influence the standard of proof required to establish abetment.²

3. Methodology and Objective

This study employs a doctrinal case law approach, analysing reported judgments to extract fundamental legal principles and patterns in Section 306 IPC adjudication. The methodology involves reviewing judicial reasoning on instigation, mens rea, and proximate causation; examining how courts differentiate legally significant instigation from ordinary disputes; assessing evidentiary sufficiency; and synthesizing judicial trends to provide clarity for both legal practice and scholarship. The primary objective is to elucidate the legal framework of abetment of suicide, demonstrate its application through case studies, and critically evaluate consistency and reasoning in judicial outcomes.

4. Conceptual and Legal Framework

4.1 Section 306 IPC and Abetment

Section 306 IPC stipulates that “if any person commits suicide, whoever abets the commission of such suicide shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.” Abetment under Section 107 IPC includes instigation, defined as encouraging or provoking a person to commit the act; conspiracy, meaning an agreement to commit the act; and intentional aid, referring to direct or indirect assistance.³ Therefore, offences under Section 306 IPC require proof of at least one of these elements, along with a temporal and causal nexus linking the accused’s conduct to the suicide.

4.2 Proximate Act and Nexus

The Supreme Court has consistently held that liability necessitates a proximate act of instigation closely linked in time and effect to the suicide. In *Prakash v. State of Maharashtra*, the Court clarified that the accused’s conduct must be sufficiently proximate to create a reasonable inference that the act led the deceased to commit suicide.⁴

4.3 Mens Rea and Instigation

Instigation requires not merely words or emotional exchanges but a demonstrable intent or knowledge that the accused’s actions could precipitate suicide. Expressions of anger or frustration, without intent to cause suicide, do not satisfy the threshold of instigation.⁵

4.4 Vulnerability of the Deceased

Courts have held that when the deceased has psychiatric or emotional vulnerabilities, a heightened evidentiary standard is required to establish that the accused’s actions were sufficiently instigative.⁶

5. Case Studies and Judicial Analysis

5.1 *R Shashirekha v. State of Karnataka & Ors. (2025 INSC 402)*

The Supreme Court upheld the Karnataka High Court’s quashing of the FIR. The deceased, a business partner, alleged fraud by the respondents but no proximate act linked the accused to the suicide. The Court reiterated that belated or afterthought allegations cannot constitute instigation.⁷

5.2 *Sivadasan Nair K.G. v. State of Kerala (2025: KER: 76800)*

The Kerala High Court noted that instigation need not compel suicide but must be suggestive of the consequence. Evidence included a suicide note attributing blame to the accused, and the Court applied a holistic appraisal of circumstances.⁸

5.3 *Geeta v. State of Karnataka (2025 INSC 1089)*

The Supreme Court held that routine quarrels or heated family exchanges are insufficient to establish abetment. Intentional instigation as per Section 107 IPC is necessary, and no such evidence was found in this case.⁹

5.4 *Ansh Jindal v. State of NCT of Delhi (2025 DHC 3036)*

The Delhi High Court emphasised that a higher standard of proof is required when the deceased has psychiatric issues. Mere harassment does not meet the threshold for abetment.¹⁰

5.5 *Meenki Devi v. State of Himachal Pradesh (2026: HHC:6)*

The High Court acquitted the accused, citing insufficient evidence and lack of clear instigation, reiterating principles from *Patel Babubhai Manohardas v. State of Gujarat (2025 INSC 322)*.¹¹

5.6–5.9 Additional Cases

Other cases including *Kumar @ Shiva Kumar v. State of Karnataka (2024 INSC 156)*, *Rohini Sudarshan Gangurde v. The State of Maharashtra (2024 INSC 519)*, *Safwan Adhur v. State of Kerala (2026:KER: 6717)*, and *Mahesghai Dhirubhai v. The State of Gujarat & Anr.* reinforce that positive proximate acts with mens rea are crucial for establishing abetment.¹²

6. Critical Analysis

A close examination of the judicial precedents discussed in this study reveals several recurring and crucial principles in cases concerning Section 306 IPC. Foremost among these is the emphasis on proximate acts: courts consistently require that the accused's conduct be closely linked in both time and effect to the suicide, and not merely remote, incidental, or indirectly contributory. Equally important is the element of mens rea; the actions or statements of the accused must exhibit intent or knowledge that their behaviour could reasonably prompt the deceased to take their own life. Where the deceased exhibits psychiatric or emotional vulnerabilities, courts demand heightened evidentiary precision, carefully scrutinizing whether

the alleged acts could plausibly lead to suicide. Ordinary disputes, family disagreements, harassment, or financial conflicts, even if morally reprehensible, do not suffice to establish abetment unless they clearly demonstrate deliberate instigation or intentional facilitation. Lastly, the quality, credibility, and comprehensiveness of evidence—ranging from suicide notes and forensic findings to corroborative witness testimony—play a decisive role in judicial outcomes, underscoring the importance of meticulous investigation and presentation in proving liability.

7. Conclusion

Abetment of suicide under Section 306 IPC is a narrowly defined offence, requiring proof of a direct, intentional, and proximate act by the accused. Jurisprudence has consistently held that ordinary quarrels, emotional exchanges, or harassment alone are insufficient to attract criminal liability; there must be demonstrable instigation or intentional aid with a clear causal connection to the act of suicide. Courts endeavor to balance two competing imperatives: safeguarding the rights of the accused against frivolous or vexatious claims and protecting societal interests in preventing suicide and preserving the dignity of the deceased. The mental and emotional condition of the deceased, alongside the strength, clarity, and coherence of the evidentiary record, remains pivotal in judicial determinations, reinforcing the necessity of careful legal and factual scrutiny.

8. Recommendations

To ensure fair and accurate adjudication under Section 306 IPC, several steps are recommended. Investigating authorities should undertake rigorous fact-finding and verify prima facie evidence of proximate instigation before filing FIRs, ensuring that allegations are substantiated by observable conduct with a clear causal link. Courts should adopt a holistic approach to evidence appraisal, particularly in cases involving deceased individuals with psychiatric vulnerabilities, weighing the full context rather than isolated incidents. Legal practitioners, whether representing the prosecution or defence, must highlight the elements of mens rea and causal nexus, structuring arguments to establish or contest the presence of intent and proximate connection. Finally, public policy measures promoting mental health awareness, access to psychological support, and proactive suicide prevention can reduce suicide rates and, consequently, the reliance on adversarial criminal proceedings, aligning the objectives of criminal law with broader societal welfare.

Footnotes / References

1. Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 107 & 306.
2. *Ansh Jindal v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2025 DHC 3036.
3. Section 107 IPC; illustrative cases.
4. *Prakash v. State of Maharashtra* (2024).
5. *Kumar @ Shiva Kumar v. State of Karnataka* (2024 INSC 156).
6. *Ansh Jindal v. State of NCT of Delhi* (2025 DHC 3036).
7. *R Shashirekha v. State of Karnataka & Ors.* (2025 INSC 402).
8. *Sivadasan Nair K.G. v. State of Kerala* (2025: KER: 76800).
9. *Geeta v. State of Karnataka* (2025 INSC 1089).
10. *Ansh Jindal v. State of NCT of Delhi* (2025 DHC 3036).
11. *Meenki Devi v. State of Himachal Pradesh* (2026: HHC: 6).
12. *Kumar @ Shiva Kumar v. State of Karnataka* (2024 INSC 156).
13. *Rohini Sudarshan Gangurde v. The State of Maharashtra* (2024 INSC 519).
14. *Safwan Adhur v. State of Kerala* (2026: KER: 6717).
15. *Mahesghai Dhirubhai v. The State of Gujarat & Anr.*



WHITE BLACK
LEGAL