Interpretation of Penal Statutes: Strict or Liberal

Meghanjali Tiwari
Assistant Professor
Shri Krishna University, Chhatarpur (M.P.)

INTRODUCTION

When we talk about interpreting laws, especially penal statutes, one big question that arises is: Should the court interpret such laws strictly or take a more liberal view? Penal statutes refer to laws that deal with offences and prescribe punishments. This is where the liberty and rights of a person may be at stake, and therefore, it's really important to interpret them carefully.

Traditionally, courts have leaned towards a strict interpretation because people should not be punished unless it is absolutely clear from the law. But with changing times and more complex societal issues, courts sometimes adopt a liberal interpretation to serve justice more effectively. This paper discusses both these approaches, explores Indian case laws, and tries to find a balance that suits justice and fairness.

UNDERSTANDING PENAL STATUTES

Penal statutes are basically the rules which say what kind of behaviour is criminal and what punishment should follow. These laws are essential in maintaining law and order. However, the way these laws are interpreted becomes crucial because the wording of a statute might not cover every possible situation.

For example, if a law says that a person shall be punished for "stealing," what exactly qualifies as stealing? Does borrowing without asking count? Or using someone's password? That's where courts step in to interpret the meaning, and the method they use (strict or liberal) can change the outcome.

STRICT INTERPRETATION OF PENAL STATUTES

A strict interpretation means sticking to the letter of the law. In other words, if the words of the statute are clear and specific, then courts should not read more into it than what's written.

This idea is rooted in the principle of legality — "nullum crimen sine lege" — which means no one should be punished for an act which is not clearly defined as a crime in law.

In the classic case Tuck & Sons v. Priester (1887), the court observed that penal laws must be interpreted strictly. If a person's liberty is at stake, the law must be clear and unambiguous. If there are two possible interpretations, the one favouring the accused should be preferred.

SKU JOURNAL OF LEX VIBRENT
(NATIONAL PEER REVIEWED E-RESEARCH JOURNAL)
April – June 2025
E-ISSN 3048-7323

Vol-2
Issue-2

Advantages of this approach
- Ensures no one is punished unfairly.
- Respects the role of the legislature.
- Maintains legal certainty.

LIBERAL INTERPRETATION OF PENAL STATUTES

Now, liberal interpretation is the opposite. Here, the court focuses more on the intention of the legislature. Instead of just the words, the judges consider what the lawmakers actually wanted to achieve.

This approach is helpful when the language of the law is vague or when applying the strict rule would defeat justice. It's used when the court believes that sticking too tightly to the words would allow wrongdoers to escape punishment due to technicalities.

For instance, in State of Maharashtra v. Tapas D. Neogy (1999), the court took a liberal view to include bank accounts in the meaning of "property" for the purpose of seizure under the Criminal Procedure Code. This helped prevent a financial fraudster from walking free.

Strict vs. Liberal Interpretation: A Comparative Look

Feature	Strict Interpretation	Liberal Interpretation
Focus	Literal meaning of words	Purpose and spirit of the law
Protection	Favors the accused	Favors societal interests
Flexibility	Less flexible	More adaptable
Risk	Guilty might escape	Innocent might suffer

The dilemma is real. Strict interpretation protects personal liberty but may sometimes let the guilty go. Liberal interpretation helps catch wrongdoers but can lead to overreach if not done carefully.

POSITION UNDER INDIAN LAW

In India, courts have mostly followed the strict interpretation when it comes to penal statutes. Article 20 of the Indian Constitution also supports this by prohibiting retrospective punishment and double jeopardy.

In Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay (1954), the Supreme Court held that if there are two reasonable interpretations of a penal statute, the one that is more favorable to the accused should be adopted.

But this doesn't mean liberal interpretation is never used. In modern times, especially in cases involving economic offences or crimes against women and children, courts are willing to adopt a more purposive and broader approach.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS: WHAT COURTS HAVE SAID

Let's take a quick look at how courts have handled this issue:

- Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay (1954) – Penal laws must be strictly interpreted.
- Sanjay Dutt v. State (1994) – Reaffirmed that procedural rights under penal laws must be respected.
- Nathulal v. State of Madhya Pradesh (1966) – The court considered the absence of guilty intention and showed some flexibility.
- State of Maharashtra v. Tapas D. Neogy (1999) – Liberal approach used to secure justice in economic offence.
- M. Narayan Nambiar v. State of Kerala (2008) – Held that interpretation must match social objectives, even if language is vague.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF STRICT INTERPRETATION

1. Clarity: It prevents arbitrary punishment.
2. Legislative Respect: Judges don't create laws; they interpret them.
3. Liberty Protection: Penal statutes must be clear because they affect personal freedom.
4. Rule of Law: Everyone knows what to expect from the law.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF LIBERAL INTERPRETATION

1. Justice Orientation: Helps courts deliver justice in complex, modern issues.
2. Filling the Gaps: Law can't cover every new form of crime, especially cybercrimes.
3. Public Interest: Sometimes, sticking too tightly to text can harm the larger society.
4. Purpose Matters: What is written is important, but so is why it is written.

RECENT TRENDS: A BALANCED APPROACH

In recent years, Indian courts have slowly started blending both views. The contextual or purposive method is becoming more popular.

For example, in environmental crimes or cases involving corporate fraud, a broader understanding is needed. Yet, in offences like sedition or preventive detention, courts have preferred strict rules.

So, it is becoming more case-to-case now. Courts examine:

- Nature of the offence
- Rights involved
- Social impact
- Clarity of the text

CONCLUSION

To conclude, there's no one-size-fits-all method. While strict interpretation ensures fairness and limits judicial overreach, liberal interpretation helps the courts deliver justice in a changing society.

The Indian judiciary is right in choosing a middle path. When the law is clear and liberty is at stake, strict reading must be used. When the objective of the law is broader, and public interest is involved, some flexibility is acceptable. Ultimately, interpretation must be guided by justice, fairness, and reasonability.

Bibliography

1. Singh, G.P. Principles of Statutory Interpretation, LexisNexis.
2. Constitution of India.
3. Indian Penal Code, 1860.
4. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
5. R.A. Duff, Criminal Law and Philosophy.
6. Tuck & Sons v. Priester (1887).
7. Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay, AIR 1954 SC 496.
8. Nathulal v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1966 SC 43.
9. State of Maharashtra v. Tapas D. Neogy, AIR 1999 SC 2516.
10. Sanjay Dutt v. State, (1994) 5 SCC 410.
11. M. Narayan Nambiar v. State of Kerala, (2008) 11 SCC 755.