

30 JAN 2026

NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY, JODHPUR
END TERM EXAMINATION – (Aug-Dec) 2025

Semester: UG III Semester

Subject: Criminal Law-I

Time: Three Hours

Marks: 100

Instructions:

1. Do not write anything on the question paper.
2. Seeking clarity on the question paper is prohibited.
3. Attempt any five.

Q.1) “Grave and sudden provocation as an exception under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, continues to be applied largely through a ‘reasonable man’ standard developed under the IPC.” Critically examine how this standard may be gendered. Illustrate your answer with examples.

(Marks 20)

Q.2) A writ petition is filed challenging Section 84 of the B.N.S., 2023 on the following grounds: (a) it is based on the patriarchal assumption that a wife is the ‘property’ of her husband; (b) it discriminates on the basis of sex and marital status; and (c) it violates a woman’s right to privacy and decisional autonomy in matters of intimate relationships. As an LLB student, critically analyse these arguments and also construct the possible justifications the State may offer to defend the provision. Conclude with your reasoned opinion on whether Section 84 should survive constitutional scrutiny.

(Marks 20)

Q.3) ‘Every person suffering from mental illness cannot claim the defence of unsoundness of mind.’ Critically examine this statement with reference to the defence of unsoundness of mind under S 22 of the B.N.S., 2023. In your answer, you should:

1. Distinguish between medical insanity and legal insanity;
2. Analyse how the Supreme Court and High Courts have applied this distinction in cases and evaluate whether the present legal position adequately protects both accused persons with mental disorders and the interests of victims and society.

(Marks 10X2=20)

Q.4) The defence of consent in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 is limited in several ways- for example in relation to causing serious bodily harm, ‘immoral’ sexual conduct, and other so-called ‘victimless’ offences. Using relevant provisions of the B.N.S., critically examine whether these limits reflect (a) legitimate state paternalism or (b) legal moralism. In your



answer, assess whether the B.N.S. is too paternalistic and moralistic in regulating adult, informed consent.

(Marks 20)

Q.5) What is the rationale for restricting the right of private defence under the IPC only in order to repel the threat of commission of certain kinds of offences, rather than allowing its use to defend against any form of unjustified attack/danger? Should the scope of the right of private defence under the IPC be broadened? If yes, to what extent? Why? Critically analyse.

(Marks 20)

Q.6) Can a court convict an accused person using Section 149 I.P.C (S 190 of B.N.S) when he/she was not originally charged for having committed an offence thereunder, but, was charged for a substantive offence read with Section 34 of the I.P.C (S 3(5) of B.N.S)? If yes, under what circumstances? Discuss with the help of decided cases.

(Marks 20)

