INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions ofthe authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in theJournal.

IJLRA

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

ISSN: 2582-6433

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur.Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board

Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India.India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time &Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020).Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

 ISSN: 2582-6433

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi.Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.

Avinash Kumar

Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship.He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi.Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi.He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANLAYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

DECRIMINALIZATION OF ATTEMPT TO SUICIDE (IPC 309): MENTAL HEALTH PERSPECTIVES

AUTHORED BY - DR. VINAY SHARMA & DR. POOJA SOOD
(Assoc. Prof., UILS, Swami Sarvanand Giri Punjab University Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, Punjab)

Abstract

The decriminalization of attempted suicide under Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code marks a critical shift in India's legal approach to mental health. Historically, this colonial-era provision punished vulnerable individuals instead of addressing underlying mental health crises. This paper analyzes the legislative evolution and judicial reasoning behind this reform, particularly through landmark cases like *P. Rathinam* (1994) and *Gian Kaur* (1996), which debated the constitutionality of criminalizing suicide attempts. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, formally recognized suicide attempts as manifestations of severe stress, mandating rehabilitation over punishment—a progressive step aligning with Article 21's guarantee of dignity. However, decriminalization alone is insufficient without robust mental health infrastructure and awareness among law enforcement. Challenges persist, including inadequate healthcare access, continued police misuse of Section 309, and societal stigma. A comparative analysis with jurisdictions like the UK reveals gaps in India's implementation. The paper argues that effective decriminalization requires policy measures such as training for police and judges, expanded crisis intervention services, and public education to reduce stigma. By transitioning from a punitive to a rehabilitative framework, India can better uphold mental health rights while addressing the socio-economic factors driving suicide.

Keywords: Attempted suicide, IPC 309, Mental Healthcare Act, Decriminalization, Right to dignity, Mental health policy, Judicial reform, Public health, Section 309, Suicide prevention.

1. Introduction

The act of attempting suicide, once a grave criminal offense under Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), has long been a contentious issue in legal and medical discourse. This provision, which penalized individuals who survived a suicide attempt with imprisonment and/or a fine, reflected a societal and legal stance rooted in historical and moralistic perspectives. It viewed suicide not as a cry for help emanating from profound distress, but as a deliberate act against the state or divine will, warranting punitive action.[1] However, the global understanding of mental health has undergone a radical transformation in recent decades, shifting from a stigmatized and often ignored aspect of human well-being to a recognized and critical component of overall health. This paradigm shift has inevitably brought into sharp focus the ethical and practical implications of criminalizing suicide attempts, leading to a burgeoning debate on the necessity and benefits of decriminalization.[2]

From a mental health perspective, the criminalization of attempted suicide under IPC 309 presented a multitude of formidable challenges. Foremost among these was the exacerbation of stigma surrounding mental illness. Individuals grappling with severe depression, anxiety, or other psychological disorders, often driven to the brink by unbearable emotional pain, were faced with the added fear of legal repercussions. This fear acted as a significant deterrent to seeking professional help, pushing vulnerable individuals further into isolation and despair. The very act of attempting suicide is, in the vast majority of cases, a desperate manifestation of an untreated or inadequately managed mental health condition. To penalize such an act was tantamount to punishing an individual for being ill, effectively creating a barrier to the very support systems that could facilitate recovery.[3]

Furthermore, the existence of IPC 309 created an environment where mental health professionals found their efforts hindered. The fear of legal involvement could make it difficult for families and caregivers to openly discuss a suicide attempt or seek emergency medical attention, for fear of their loved one being arrested or facing prosecution. This clandestine approach to a critical medical emergency often delayed life-saving interventions and follow-up care, thereby increasing the risk of subsequent attempts. The police, often the first

[1] Ranjan, R., Kumar, S., Pattanayak, R. D., Dhawan, A., & Sagar, R. (2014). (De-) criminalization of attempted suicide in India: A review. *Industrial psychiatry journal*, *23*(1), 4-9.
[2] Behere, P. B., Rao, T. S., & Mulmule, A. N. (2015). Decriminalization of attempted suicide law: journey of fifteen decades. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, *57*(2), 122-124.
[3] Kaushika, M. N. (2018). Decriminalisation of attempt to commit suicide. *Supremo Amicus*, *6*, 193.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

responders to such incidents, were placed in an unenviable position of having to balance their law enforcement duties with the immediate medical and psychological needs of a distressed individual. This often led to a lack of empathy and understanding, further traumatizing an already vulnerable person.[4]

The global trend towards decriminalization of suicide attempts reflects a growing recognition that punitive measures are not only ineffective in preventing suicide but are actively counterproductive to mental health promotion. Instead, the focus has shifted towards a public health approach, emphasizing prevention, early intervention, and comprehensive mental healthcare. The argument for decriminalization is firmly rooted in the understanding that suicide attempts are primarily a health issue, not a criminal one. It advocates for a compassionate and supportive response that prioritizes treatment, rehabilitation, and the creation of a safe space for individuals to seek help without fear of legal reprisal. This approach aligns with international human rights standards and best practices in mental healthcare, which underscore the importance of dignity, autonomy, and access to care for all individuals, especially those in mental distress. The push for decriminalization, therefore, is not merely a legal reform; it is a fundamental shift in societal attitudes towards mental health, embracing empathy and support over punishment and condemnation.[5]

2. Legal Evolution of IPC Section 309

The legal journey of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which criminalized the attempt to commit suicide, is a fascinating and often contentious saga, reflecting the evolving societal understanding of mental health and individual rights. This section's roots are deeply embedded in India's colonial past, profoundly influenced by Victorian morality and subsequent judicial interpretations.[6]

The Indian Penal Code, enacted in 1860, was a direct product of British colonial rule in India. Its provisions, including Section 309, were largely shaped by the prevailing legal and moral philosophies of Victorian England. In 19th-century Britain, suicide was not only a grave sin in

[4] Khan, D. (2021). Rising Suicide Rates in Covid-19: A Call for Decriminalization of Section 309 IPC. *Indian JL & Legal Rsch.*, *2*, 1.
[5] Sneha, V., Madhusudhan, S., Prashanth, N. R., & Chandrashekar, H. (2018). Decriminalization of suicide as per section 115 of mental health care act 2017. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, *60*(1), 147-148.
[6] Sharma, B. R., Sharma, A. K., & Harish, D. (2006). Abolition & restoration of Section 309 IPC—An overview. *Anil Aggrawal's Internet Journal Forensic Medicine & Toxicology*, *7*(1).

the eyes of the Church but also considered a felony against the Crown. The underlying rationale was that an individual, by taking their own life, was denying the sovereign a subject and the state a productive member. This deeply ingrained moral and religious disapproval, coupled with a lack of understanding of mental illness, led to a punitive approach.[7]

This Victorian moral framework was directly transplanted into the Indian legal system. Section 309, therefore, did not emerge from indigenous legal traditions or social norms, but rather from a colonial imposition reflecting a paternalistic state's view that it had a right to dictate even the most personal decisions of its subjects. There was little to no consideration for the underlying psychological distress that might drive an individual to attempt suicide. Instead, the act was perceived as a wilful defiance of legal and moral order, thus warranting punishment. This colonial legacy meant that for over a century, India continued to criminalize a deeply personal act, long after many Western nations began to re-evaluate their own laws on suicide.

2.1. Judicial Milestones

The rigidity of IPC Section 309 eventually came under scrutiny in independent India's courts, leading to a series of landmark judgments that reflected a gradual shift in legal and philosophical perspectives.

P. Rathinam v. Union of India (1994): Struck down IPC 309 as Unconstitutional

A pivotal moment arrived with the Supreme Court's verdict in *P. Rathinam v. Union of India* in 1994. In a progressive ruling, the Court struck down Section 309 of the IPC, declaring it unconstitutional. The bench, comprising Justices R.M. Sahai and B.L. Hansaria, held that the right to life enshrined in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution implicitly included the "right to die." The Court reasoned that if an individual had the right to live with dignity, they also possessed the right to end their life with dignity. This judgment was celebrated by human rights activists and mental health advocates, who saw it as a significant step towards decriminalization and a more compassionate approach to suicide. It acknowledged the immense suffering that often precedes a suicide attempt and suggested that the state should not penalize those who fail in their attempt to end their lives.[8]

[7] Sunil, A. (2020). Contrast in section 309 of the Indian penal code and section 115 of the mental health care act 2017: An analysis. *Jus Corpus LJ*, *1*, 579.
[8] P. Rathinam v. Union of India, (1994) 3 SCC 394

 ISSN: 2582-6433

Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab (1996): Reversed Rathinam but Affirmed "Right to Die with Dignity"

The triumph of *Rathinam* was short-lived. Just two years later, in 1996, a larger five-judge bench of the Supreme Court, in *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab*, reconsidered and ultimately reversed the *Rathinam* judgment. The Court held that the "right to life" under Article 21 did not include the "right to die." While it affirmed that the "right to live with dignity" was indeed part of Article 21, it distinguished this from a "right to die," arguing that the latter would be inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of the right to life.[9]

However, despite reversing *Rathinam* on the issue of the right to die, *Gian Kaur* did not entirely shut the door on the idea of a dignified end. Crucially, the Court distinguished between "suicide" and "euthanasia." It held that while active euthanasia was not permissible, passive euthanasia (withdrawal of life support in certain terminal cases) could be considered under specific circumstances, effectively affirming a "right to die with dignity" in the context of a prolonged, undignified existence. This nuanced interpretation, while reinstating Section 309, implicitly opened a dialogue on the suffering that leads to a desire for death, foreshadowing future legislative reforms.

2.2. Mental Healthcare Act (MHCA), 2017: Implicit Decriminalization (Section 115)

The true turning point for IPC Section 309 came with the enactment of the Mental Healthcare Act (MHCA) in 2017. While not explicitly repealing Section 309, the MHCA 2017 effectively rendered it inoperative by introducing a crucial provision, Section 115. This section states:[10]

"Notwithstanding anything contained in section 309 of the Indian Penal Code, whoever attempts to commit suicide shall be presumed, unless proved otherwise, to have severe stress and shall not be liable to be punished under the said section."

This provision represents a monumental paradigm shift. By creating a presumption of "severe stress" for anyone attempting suicide, the MHCA effectively decriminalized the act. The burden of proof was shifted: instead of the state proving criminal intent, the law now presumed mental distress. Furthermore, Section 115 explicitly states that such individuals "shall not be liable to be punished." This legislative intent clearly moved away from a punitive approach towards one of compassion and care. The MHCA 2017, therefore, implicitly but unequivocally,

---

[9] Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab, (1996) 2 SCC 648

[10] Harbishettar, V., Enara, A., & Gowda, M. (2019). Making the most of mental healthcare act 2017: Practitioners' perspective. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, *61*(Suppl 4), S645-S649.

decriminalized attempt to suicide in India, aligning the country's legal framework with modern mental health principles.[11]

2.3. Comparative Law: UK's Suicide Act 1961 vs. India's MHCA 2017

Examining comparative legal frameworks further highlights the evolution of India's approach. The United Kingdom, from which India inherited its colonial legal system, underwent its own transformation with the **Suicide Act 1961**. This landmark legislation fully decriminalized suicide and attempted suicide in England and Wales. The Act recognized that the act of suicide was often a manifestation of mental distress and that criminalizing it served no constructive purpose. Instead, it shifted the focus towards providing support and intervention for individuals in crisis.[12]

While the UK's Suicide Act 1961 explicitly repealed the offense, India's MHCA 2017 achieved a similar outcome through implicit decriminalization via Section 115. Both legislative measures reflect a global consensus that penalizing individuals who attempt suicide is counterproductive and inhumane. The difference lies in the legislative mechanism: a direct repeal in the UK versus a presumption-based nullification in India. Nonetheless, both represent a significant move towards treating suicide as a public health issue requiring medical and psychological intervention rather than legal retribution.[13]

3. Mental Health Perspectives

The legal evolution of Section 309 is intrinsically linked to a growing understanding of mental health, marking a significant shift from a punitive to a public health-oriented approach.

3.1. Suicide as a Public Health Issue

The World Health Organization (WHO) has long emphasized that suicide is a major public health concern. Globally, it is a leading cause of death, particularly among young people.[14] In India, the statistics paint a grim picture. **WHO data on suicide rates in India**, while varying,

---

[11] Mukhopadhyay, S., & Banerjee, D. (2021). Physician assisted suicide in dementia: a critical review of global evidence and considerations from India. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *64*, 102802.
[12] Mann, J. J., Waternaux, C., Haas, G. L., & Malone, K. M. (1999). Toward a clinical model of suicidal behavior in psychiatric patients. *American journal of Psychiatry*, *156*(2), 181-189.
[13] Caldwell, C. B., & Gottesman, I. I. (1990). Schizophrenics kill themselves too: a review of risk factors for suicide. *Schizophrenia bulletin*, *16*(4), 571-589.
[14] Knox, K. L., Conwell, Y., & Caine, E. D. (2004). If suicide is a public health problem, what are we doing to prevent it?. *American journal of public health*, *94*(1), 37-45.

consistently place the country among those with a high burden of suicides. Similarly, the **National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) statistics** in India regularly highlight the alarming number of suicides reported annually, underscoring the severity of the crisis. These figures are not just numbers; they represent immense human suffering, shattered families, and a significant loss of human potential.[15]

Recognizing suicide as a public health issue necessitates a paradigm shift from a criminal justice response to a comprehensive, multi-sectoral public health strategy. This involves not only prevention and intervention but also post-vention support for those affected by suicide. It calls for addressing the root causes of mental distress, improving access to mental healthcare, reducing stigma, and fostering a supportive environment where individuals feel comfortable seeking help.

3.2. Stigma and Criminalization: How IPC 309 Deterred Help-Seeking Behavior

For decades, the existence of IPC Section 309 significantly contributed to the pervasive stigma surrounding mental illness and suicide in India. The threat of legal consequences acted as a formidable barrier to help-seeking behavior. Individuals who were contemplating suicide or who had survived an attempt often feared arrest, interrogation, and potential imprisonment. This fear drove the problem underground, making it incredibly difficult for families, friends, and even mental health professionals to intervene effectively.[16]

The criminalization fostered a culture of shame and secrecy. Families often concealed suicide attempts to protect their loved ones from legal repercussions, denying them crucial medical and psychological support. This created a vicious cycle: mental health issues remained hidden, untreated, and continued to escalate, increasing the risk of further attempts. The very legal provision designed to deter suicide arguably had the opposite effect by isolating those most in need of compassion and care. Mental health experts consistently argued that criminalizing suicide was illogical and counterproductive, as it punished individuals precisely when they were at their most vulnerable.[17]

---

[15] Abraham, Z. K., & Sher, L. (2019). Adolescent suicide as a global public health issue. *International journal of adolescent medicine and health*, *31*(4).
[16] Bangkim, C., & Utyasheva, L. (2019). Criminalisation of Attempted Suicide in India Hinders Effective Suicide Prevention Response. *Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, *2*, 17.
[17] Amosu, O. (2017). *Causal Attributions, Help-Seeking Attitudes, and Cultural Mistrust on Intentions to Seek Counseling in Black American College Students*. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

3.3. MHCA 2017's Paradigm Shift: "Presumption of Severe Stress" for Suicide Attempters (Section 115)

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, marks a monumental paradigm shift in India's approach to suicide attempts. The cornerstone of this change is **Section 115**, which, as discussed, establishes a "presumption of severe stress" for anyone attempting suicide. This is not merely a legal technicality; it reflects a profound change in how society, through its laws, views individuals who attempt suicide.[18]

This presumption fundamentally redefines the act: it is no longer seen as a criminal offense driven by malicious intent, but as a symptom of underlying mental distress. This legislative acknowledgement aligns India with global best practices in mental health and human rights. By presuming severe stress, the law mandates a compassionate and therapeutic response rather than a punitive one.[19]

Furthermore, the MHCA 2017 goes beyond mere decriminalization. It includes a **mandate for mental health rehabilitation** for individuals who have attempted suicide. This is a crucial step towards a holistic approach. It emphasizes that surviving a suicide attempt is not the end of the journey, but the beginning of a process of recovery and support. The Act directs the appropriate government to provide care, treatment, and rehabilitation services to such individuals, recognizing their vulnerability and the need for ongoing support to prevent future attempts. This comprehensive approach, rooted in empathy and understanding, stands in stark contrast to the earlier punitive framework of IPC 309, embodying a true paradigm shift in India's legal and mental health landscape.[20]

4. Discussion

The decriminalization of attempt to suicide under IPC 309 through the Mental Healthcare Act (MHCA) 2017 represents a monumental shift in India's legal and mental health landscape, moving from a punitive, colonial-era approach to one rooted in compassion and public health principles. The primary result of this legal evolution is the **effective nullification of Section 309, replacing criminalization with a presumption of "severe stress" (Section 115**

[18] Satapathy, S., & Mohanty, M. (2021). Punishing the Suicide Survivors-The Justifiability. *Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology*, *15*(2), 3499-3503.
[19] Satapathy, S., & Mohanty, M. (2021). Role of Mental Health in Understanding and Preventing Suicide. *Prof.(Dr) RK Sharma*, *21*(1), 979.
[20] Satapathy, S., & Mohanty, M. (2020). AN ANALYSIS ON ATTEMPT TO COMMIT SUICIDE IN INDIA. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-9.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

MHCA). This crucial amendment acknowledges that an individual attempting suicide is primarily in a state of profound psychological distress, rather than acting with criminal intent. This legislative change is a direct response to decades of advocacy from mental health professionals and human rights organizations, who argued that criminalizing suicide attempts exacerbated stigma, deterred help-seeking behavior, and was counterproductive to suicide prevention efforts. For instance, studies indicate that criminalization was associated with higher suicide rates in some countries, suggesting that the fear of legal repercussions pushed individuals further into the shadows, making accurate data collection difficult and hindering timely intervention.[21]

However, the discussion surrounding this decriminalization reveals several ongoing challenges and areas requiring further attention. While the legal barrier has been removed, the **implementation gap** remains a significant concern. The MHCA 2017 did not explicitly repeal Section 309, leading to potential confusion among police and frontline responders who may still default to older, punitive mindsets or continue to register suicide attempts as medico-legal cases, hindering open reporting and immediate access to care. This highlights the urgent need for comprehensive **training and sensitization programs** for law enforcement, healthcare providers, and other community gatekeepers to ensure a uniform and empathetic response consistent with the MHCA's spirit. Furthermore, the decriminalization places an immense responsibility on the **strained mental healthcare infrastructure** in India. The law now mandates support and rehabilitation for suicide attempters, but the severe shortage of mental health professionals, lack of accessible facilities, and inadequate funding for community-based services pose significant barriers to providing the necessary follow-up care. Without substantial investment in strengthening this infrastructure, the decriminalization risks becoming a legal victory without tangible impact on the ground. Finally, despite the legal reform, the deeply entrenched **societal stigma** surrounding mental illness and suicide persists. This cultural barrier often prevents individuals and families from openly discussing mental health struggles and seeking help, even without the threat of legal action. Therefore, sustained and widespread public awareness campaigns are crucial to foster a compassionate environment, ensuring that the legal decriminalization translates into true social acceptance and encourages help-seeking behavior, ultimately contributing to a meaningful reduction in suicide rates.[22]

[21] Namboodiri, V., George, S., & Singh, S. P. (2019). The Mental Healthcare Act 2017 of India: A challenge and an opportunity. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, *44*, 25-28.
[22] Sethi, D. (2021). Indian Mental Healthcare Act, 2017: CBR Matrix for Inclusive Implementation. *Statute Law Review*, *42*(1), 88-100.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

5. Challenges Post-Decriminalization

While the decriminalization of attempted suicide through the Mental Healthcare Act (MHCA) 2017 represents a monumental leap forward for mental health in India, the journey towards a truly supportive and effective system is far from over. The abrogation of Section 309 of the IPC has undeniably removed a significant legal barrier, but it has simultaneously brought to the fore a new set of challenges that require concerted effort from various stakeholders. These challenges span legal interpretation, public awareness, infrastructure development, and the sensitive issue of resource allocation.[23]

5.1. Implementation Gaps and Legal Ambiguities

Despite the clear intent of Section 115 of the MHCA 2017, its implementation has not been without its complexities and ambiguities. One of the primary concerns revolves around the **interpretation of "presumption of severe stress."** While the law dictates this presumption, the practical application by law enforcement agencies, particularly at the initial point of contact, remains a gray area. Police personnel, traditionally trained to enforce the IPC, may still view a suicide attempt through a quasi-criminal lens due to ingrained habits and a lack of specific training regarding the nuances of the MHCA. This can lead to inappropriate responses, such as delayed medical attention or even lingering threats of legal action, albeit without formal charges under Section 309. The distinction between "severe stress" requiring medical intervention and other potential motivations for self-harm needs to be clearly understood and uniformly applied across the justice system.[24]

Furthermore, the MHCA does not explicitly repeal Section 309, but rather renders it inoperative through Section 115. This **implicit decriminalization** can lead to confusion. While legally, the protection is absolute, the continued presence of Section 309 in the IPC, even if nullified by the MHCA, might still create a perception of criminality in the minds of some, hindering full and open disclosure of suicide attempts. There is a need for clearer communication and perhaps an eventual legislative amendment to fully remove Section 309 from the IPC, thereby eliminating any lingering ambiguity and ensuring a consistent legal message.

[23] Namboodiri, V., George, S., & Singh, S. P. (2019). The Mental Healthcare Act 2017 of India: A challenge and an opportunity. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, *44*, 25-28.
[24] Satapathy, S., & Mohanty, M. (2021). Role of Mental Health in Understanding and Preventing Suicide. *Prof.(Dr) RK Sharma*, *21*(1), 979.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

5.2. Gaps in Mental Healthcare Infrastructure

Perhaps the most significant challenge post-decriminalization lies in the glaring **deficiencies in India's mental healthcare infrastructure.** Decriminalization shifts the responsibility from the penal system to the healthcare system, demanding a robust and accessible network of mental health services. Unfortunately, India faces a severe shortage of trained mental health professionals, including psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, and psychiatric social workers. The doctor-to-patient ratio for mental health professionals is alarmingly low, especially in rural and semi-urban areas. This scarcity means that even when individuals are identified as needing support after a suicide attempt, access to timely and appropriate care remains a significant hurdle.[25]

Beyond personnel, the **lack of adequate facilities** is another critical issue. Many districts lack dedicated mental health hospitals or even sufficient beds in general hospitals for psychiatric care. Community-based mental health services, which are crucial for long-term rehabilitation and support, are nascent or non-existent in many regions. The absence of easily accessible and affordable mental health services means that the decriminalization, while well-intentioned, may not translate into tangible support for those in distress. Without a strong healthcare safety net, individuals presumed to be under "severe stress" may still fall through the cracks, increasing their vulnerability to future attempts.[26]

5.3. Continuing Stigma and Lack of Public Awareness

Despite the legal reforms, the deeply entrenched **stigma surrounding mental illness and suicide** persists within Indian society. Decriminalization addresses the legal punitive aspect, but it does not automatically erase centuries of societal prejudice and misunderstanding. Many families still view mental health issues as a source of shame, leading to reluctance in acknowledging problems or seeking professional help. This stigma is often compounded by cultural beliefs, superstitions, and a general lack of education about mental health conditions.[27] The public awareness campaigns necessary to destigmatize mental illness and promote help-seeking behavior have been insufficient. There is a critical need for large-scale, culturally sensitive public health campaigns that educate the masses about mental health, available

[25] Kaur, R., & Pathak, R. K. (2017). Treatment gap in mental healthcare: Reflections from policy and research. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34-40.

[26] Cummings, J. R., Wen, H., Ko, M., & Druss, B. G. (2013). Geography and the Medicaid mental health care infrastructure: implications for health care reform. *JAMA psychiatry*, *70*(10), 1084-1090.

[27] Hinshaw, S. P. (2006). *The mark of shame: Stigma of mental illness and an agenda for change*. Oxford University Press.

ISSN: 2582-6433

services, and the fact that attempting suicide is a sign of distress, not a crime. Without a significant shift in public perception, individuals may continue to suffer in silence, even with the legal protections in place. The success of decriminalization hinges not just on legal changes but on a profound cultural transformation that embraces empathy and understanding for those struggling with their mental health.

5.4. Resource Allocation and Training

Finally, the effective implementation of the MHCA 2017 and the broader goal of preventing suicide require substantial **resource allocation** and targeted **training initiatives**. State governments, which bear the primary responsibility for healthcare, need to significantly increase their budgets for mental health. This includes funding for recruiting and training mental health professionals, establishing new facilities, expanding community-based services, and investing in research and surveillance.[28]

Crucially, **training for various frontline workers** is paramount. This includes police personnel, who are often the first point of contact in a suicide attempt scenario, to sensitize them to the MHCA 2017's provisions and equip them with basic psychological first aid skills. Healthcare professionals, including general practitioners and nurses, also need enhanced training to identify signs of mental distress and refer individuals to appropriate services. Teachers, social workers, and community leaders can play a vital role if adequately trained to recognize signs of distress and provide initial support. Without dedicated resources and a comprehensive training strategy for all relevant stakeholders, the full benefits of decriminalization will remain largely unrealized, and India's fight against suicide will continue to face significant headwinds.[29]

6. Suggestions for a Comprehensive Approach

The decriminalization of attempted suicide in India, spearheaded by the Mental Healthcare Act (MHCA) 2017, marks a pivotal moment in the nation's public health trajectory. However, realizing the full potential of this progressive legal reform necessitates a multi-pronged strategy that addresses the lingering challenges. A truly comprehensive approach must move beyond

[28] Ameen, S., Gowda, M., & Ramkumar, G. S. (2019). Mental Healthcare Act 2017: Preface to the supplement. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, *61*(Suppl 4), S637-S639.
[29] Cratsley, K. R., Wickremsinhe, M. N., & Mackey, T. K. (2021). Human rights and global mental health: Reducing the use of coercive measures. In *Global mental health ethics* (pp. 247-268). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

legal provisions to encompass robust infrastructure, widespread awareness, and a compassionate societal response.

6.1. Strengthening Mental Healthcare Infrastructure

The bedrock of effective suicide prevention lies in accessible and quality mental healthcare. India must embark on a mission to significantly **increase its mental health workforce**. This requires greater investment in training programs for psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, and psychiatric nurses. Incentives, such as scholarships and rural postings, could encourage professionals to serve in underserved areas. Furthermore, the focus should shift towards developing a strong network of **community-based mental health services**. This includes establishing well-equipped mental health units at primary healthcare centers, offering outpatient services, and setting up crisis intervention centers that are easily reachable at the local level. Mobile mental health units, tele-psychiatry services, and digital mental health platforms can bridge geographical gaps, particularly in remote regions. Integrating mental healthcare into general healthcare settings is also crucial, ensuring that physical health check-ups routinely screen for mental distress, thereby facilitating early detection and intervention.

6.2. Enhanced Public Awareness and Destigmatization Campaigns

Decriminalization, while a legal triumph, cannot by itself dismantle centuries of stigma. Sustained and impactful **public awareness campaigns** are indispensable. These campaigns should leverage diverse media platforms – television, radio, social media, and community outreach programs – to disseminate accurate information about mental health, challenge misconceptions, and normalize seeking help. Collaborating with celebrities, mental health advocates, and survivors can lend credibility and reach. The narrative needs to shift from viewing mental illness as a personal failing to recognizing it as a treatable health condition. Schools and colleges must incorporate mental health education into their curricula, fostering open discussions from a young age. Community leaders, religious figures, and local self-governing bodies (Panchayats and Municipalities) should be engaged to promote mental well-being and provide a supportive environment. The focus should be on building empathy and understanding, encouraging open conversations, and creating safe spaces for individuals to share their struggles without fear of judgment.

6.3. Training and Sensitization for Frontline Responders

The effective implementation of the MHCA 2017 heavily relies on the appropriate response of

frontline personnel. **Extensive training programs for police officers** are crucial to sensitize them to the provisions of Section 115 of the MHCA. This training should emphasize that suicide attempts are medical emergencies requiring compassionate handling, not criminal prosecution. It should equip them with basic psychological first aid skills, de-escalation techniques, and knowledge of referral pathways to mental health services. Similarly, **training for healthcare professionals**, including doctors, nurses, and paramedics, is essential to improve their ability to identify signs of mental distress, provide empathetic care to suicide attempt survivors, and ensure appropriate follow-up. This includes training in suicide risk assessment and management protocols. Other community gatekeepers, such as teachers, social workers, and even shopkeepers, can be trained to recognize warning signs and guide individuals towards help.

6.4. Dedicated Funding and Policy Implementation

The successful implementation of the MHCA 2017's mandate for mental health rehabilitation requires **dedicated and adequate funding**. Both central and state governments must significantly increase their budgetary allocations for mental health. This funding should be earmarked for infrastructure development, human resource training, research, and the establishment of robust mental health programs. Clear **policy frameworks and guidelines** are needed for the uniform implementation of the MHCA across all states and union territories. Regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should be put in place to assess the effectiveness of programs and identify areas for improvement. Furthermore, **inter-sectoral collaboration** is vital. Health, education, social welfare, and law enforcement departments must work in synergy to create a cohesive support system for individuals struggling with mental health issues.

7. Conclusion

The journey of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code, from a punitive colonial relic to its effective nullification by the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, encapsulates India's evolving understanding of mental health. The decriminalization of attempted suicide is not merely a legal victory; it is a profound ethical shift, recognizing that despair and distress, not criminality, drive individuals to such desperate acts. The implicit repeal of Section 309 is a testament to India's commitment to treating mental health as a public health priority, moving away from punishment towards compassion, care, and rehabilitation. However, the legal reform is but one step in a much longer and more complex process. The true success of decriminalization will be

 ISSN: 2582-6433

measured not by the absence of legal cases under Section 309, but by the tangible improvement in mental health outcomes across the nation. This requires a sustained and collective effort to build a robust mental healthcare infrastructure, dismantle deeply ingrained stigma through widespread awareness, and equip all stakeholders with the knowledge and tools to respond empathetically and effectively to mental distress. As India moves forward, the focus must remain steadfastly on transforming the legislative intent into lived reality. By investing in mental health services, fostering a culture of empathy, and ensuring that no individual is left behind due to lack of support or understanding, India can truly uphold the spirit of the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, offering hope and healing to those grappling with the profound challenges of mental illness. The decriminalization of attempted suicide is a beacon of progress, illuminating the path towards a more humane and mentally healthy society.