

News

The Supreme Court overturns an MP High Court ruling that required "tree planting" before granting bail to murder defendants.



When the High Court suspended the life sentence of life inmates under Section 302 IPC without considering the merits, Justice Aravind Kumar claimed that the concept of social duty had "**swayed**" the court.

A Madhya Pradesh High Court ruling that had suspended two men's life sentences for murder convictions on the stipulation that they plant trees and support social causes was overturned by the Supreme Court on Monday.

A bench consisting of Justices Aravind Kumar and NV Anjaria declared that the High Court's justification for sentence suspension was legally untenable.

When setting bail requirements and ordering the convicted murderer to plant saplings on the grounds that it is for a social good, the High Court has been influenced. Bail was given without any justification. When announcing the order, Justice Kumar stated, "This cannot withstand the test of law."

Nonetheless, the Court ordered that the prisoners not be placed under arrest until the Supreme Court made a decision on two interlocutory applications that were still pending.

Justice Kumar made the following observation after petitioner's attorney said that the order would be ineffective if the accused kept evading arrest:

"The patient is dead; the operation was successful." Imagine, however, that they had been absent for six months. Let's decide the pleas first.

The Madhya Pradesh High Court's decision to halt the life sentences of two individuals found guilty under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code was met with fierce opposition from the Supreme Court on August 28.

After noting that the prisoners had promised to "purge their misdeeds" by serving the community and planting saplings for environmental or national causes, the High Court had granted bail.

The High Court had stipulated that each accused person had to dig pits that were 3–4 feet deep, plant 6–8 foot saplings, and provide photos of the plantation within 30 days after being released.

Additionally, they had to submit progress updates to the trial court every three months until the trial was over, warning that their bail may be revoked if they failed to maintain the saplings.

The Supreme Court had declared in its August ruling that this method was "appalling" and that sentence suspension could not be granted based on factors unrelated to the assessment of the evidence.

After that, the State and the respondents received notice from the Court.

The High Court's order was overturned by the Court today.

Lawread