

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

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 of the 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 what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

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

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.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS 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.

COMPENSATION FOR WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS: ANALYSING THE ADEQUACY AND FAIRNESS OF LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

AUTHORED BY - DR. SURENDER KUMAR
(Assistant Professor, MDU-CPAS, Gurugram)

ABSTRACT

Wrongful convictions represent one of the most profound failures of the criminal justice system, resulting in devastating personal, social, and economic consequences for innocent individuals. This article critically examines the adequacy and fairness of global compensation frameworks for wrongful convictions. By utilizing a comparative approach, it explores different jurisdictions, including the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, France, and India, analyzing the challenges faced by exonerees in accessing compensation. Key barriers such as stringent eligibility requirements, procedural hurdles, and inconsistent compensation schemes are highlighted. The article also critiques the issue of under-compensation, where financial remedies often fail to address the full spectrum of harm, including psychological trauma and reputational damage. Furthermore, disparities between jurisdictions in both the availability and adequacy of compensation expose significant inequities. To address these gaps, the article proposes comprehensive reforms that focus on enhancing the adequacy of compensation, ensuring fairness and equity, and introducing legislative reforms for consistency. These proposals aim to create a more just and equitable compensation system that accounts for both monetary and non-monetary harms, ensuring that exonerees receive the support they need to rebuild their lives.

INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system, designed to maintain social order by punishing offenders, is prone to errors that can lead to wrongful convictions. Wrongful convictions represent one of the most egregious failures of this system, where innocent individuals are convicted and often spend years behind bars for crimes they did not commit. The impact of wrongful convictions goes beyond the personal suffering of the wrongfully convicted; they erode public trust in the integrity of the legal system. At the core of addressing this injustice is the issue of compensation

for those who have been wrongfully convicted. Compensation is not just a matter of financial redress; it touches upon fundamental principles of human rights, justice, and the state's responsibility toward its citizens.

This research article aims to analyse the adequacy and fairness of compensation frameworks for wrongful convictions globally. It seeks to answer two central questions: Are the current compensation schemes sufficient to address the harm caused by wrongful convictions? Are these schemes fair when examined through the lens of equity and justice? To explore these questions, the article adopts a comparative approach, analysing compensation frameworks across various jurisdictions and identifying the challenges that individuals face when seeking redress. By examining the strengths and weaknesses of these frameworks, this study proposes reforms to ensure more just and equitable compensation systems for wrongfully convicted individuals.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS

Early Cases and Legislative Milestones

The concept of compensating individuals for wrongful convictions has evolved over time, with roots in the broader development of legal accountability and human rights. In the early stages of criminal justice, there was little to no recognition of the state's obligation to compensate those who were wrongfully convicted. Legal systems were primarily focused on punishment, and wrongful convictions were seen as unfortunate but inevitable consequences of a fallible system. The development of compensation mechanisms only gained momentum in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

France was among the first countries to enact formal compensation laws with the *Loi du 8 juin 1895*, which allowed for compensation for wrongful convictions and imprisonment. This landmark law signalled a shift in the state's role, recognising its responsibility to compensate those who had suffered from miscarriages of justice. Other countries, such as Germany and Switzerland, soon followed suit with similar legislation. However, these early compensation systems were limited in scope and often fraught with procedural challenges that made it difficult for wrongfully convicted individuals to receive redress.

International Standards and Human Rights Frameworks

The aftermath of World War II and the rise of international human rights frameworks marked a turning point in the global discourse on wrongful convictions. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR, 1966) laid the groundwork for modern compensation frameworks. Article 14(6) of the ICCPR explicitly recognised the right of individuals who had been wrongfully convicted to seek compensation, provided that their conviction had been overturned or pardoned.

These international instruments influenced the development of domestic laws, prompting many countries to establish compensation mechanisms for wrongful convictions. However, despite this progress, the interpretation and implementation of the right to compensation have varied widely across jurisdictions. While some countries have embraced these human rights principles, others have been slow to develop comprehensive frameworks, resulting in significant disparities in access to compensation.

CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORKS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

United States

The compensation framework in the United States is highly fragmented, with significant variation between federal and state laws. At the federal level, the Innocence Protection Act of 2004 allows for compensation of up to \$50,000 per year of wrongful imprisonment, with \$100,000 for each year spent on death row. However, at the state level, compensation statutes differ drastically in terms of eligibility, the amount of compensation, and procedural requirements. As of 2024, only 38 U.S. states have enacted compensation statutes, leaving a significant number of states without formal legal mechanisms.

This patchwork system has led to gross inequities. Texas, for instance, has one of the most generous compensation schemes, offering \$80,000 per year of wrongful imprisonment, along with lifetime annuities, education benefits, and health insurance. On the other hand, Wisconsin caps compensation at \$25,000, regardless of the length of imprisonment. In many states, exonerees are required to prove their "actual innocence," which can be a difficult and burdensome requirement, especially when evidence may have deteriorated over time.

United Kingdom

The legal framework for compensating wrongful convictions in the United Kingdom is

governed by the Criminal Justice Act of 1988, later amended by the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act of 2008. Compensation is provided through the Home Office, but applicants must meet stringent eligibility criteria. A 2014 amendment introduced a requirement for exonerees to prove "beyond reasonable doubt" that they did not commit the offences a standard that many critics argue is excessively burdensome.

Compensation amounts in the UK are capped, with the maximum payment set at £1 million for those wrongfully imprisoned for more than 10 years, and £500,000 for shorter periods of imprisonment. Critics argue that this cap fails to account for the full extent of the harm caused by wrongful convictions, including psychological trauma and social stigma. Furthermore, the focus on economic loss, rather than on holistic remedies such as rehabilitation services, has been a subject of ongoing debate.

Canada

In Canada, there is no federal statutory framework specifically addressing compensation for wrongful convictions. Instead, compensation is typically awarded on a case-by-case basis, often following an investigation by the Minister of Justice under Section 696 of the Criminal Code. While this ad hoc approach allows for flexibility, it also results in uncertainty and delays for exonerees.

One of the most notable cases in Canada is that of David Milgaard, who was awarded C\$10 million after spending 23 years in prison for a crime he did not commit. While this payout was substantial, the lack of formal guidelines for compensation means that many exonerees face a lengthy and uncertain process. Furthermore, the system's reliance on ex gratia payments, rather than on a formal statutory scheme, has been criticised for its inconsistency.

France

France has a long history of compensating wrongful convictions, dating back to the Loi du 8 juin 1895. Under French law, individuals who have been wrongfully convicted can seek redress from the Court of Cassation. The amount of compensation awarded is based on the length of imprisonment and the damage caused to the exoneree's life. However, the process is not without its critics. While France does not impose significant procedural barriers, such as proving actual innocence, the compensation amounts are often seen as inadequate, particularly when addressing non-economic harms such as reputational damage and psychological trauma.

India

India's legal framework for compensating wrongful convictions is underdeveloped. While the Constitution of India guarantees the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21, there is no comprehensive statutory framework for compensating wrongful convictions. Section 399 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) provides for compensation in cases of wrongful arrests but does not extend to wrongful convictions.

In the absence of a formal legal framework, courts have occasionally awarded compensation in cases of egregious wrongful convictions. For instance, in *Rudal Shah v. State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court of India ordered compensation for wrongful detention, setting a precedent for judicial remedies in such cases. However, the lack of a systematic approach to compensation, combined with procedural hurdles, remains a significant gap in India's criminal justice system.

CHALLENGES OF EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Barriers to Compensation

One of the most significant challenges in accessing compensation for wrongful convictions is the procedural barriers that exonerees must navigate. In many jurisdictions, proving actual innocence is a stringent requirement that places an unnecessary burden on individuals who have already suffered through years of wrongful imprisonment. In the UK, for example, the requirement to prove innocence "beyond reasonable doubt" makes it exceedingly difficult for exonerees to qualify for compensation.

In the United States, states without compensation statutes often force exonerees to file civil lawsuits to seek redress, adding another layer of complexity to an already burdensome process. Even in states with compensation statutes, exonerees face procedural hurdles, such as short statutes of limitations and complex filing requirements. In India, the absence of a formal statutory framework means that exonerees must rely on judicial orders, which are often discretionary and difficult to obtain.

Under-Compensation

A common criticism of existing legal frameworks is that they often fail to provide adequate financial compensation for the harm suffered by exonerees. In many jurisdictions, compensation amounts are capped, limiting the financial redress available. In the UK, the maximum compensation available for wrongful imprisonment is capped at £1 million,

regardless of the length of imprisonment or the severity of the harm caused.

In the United States, compensation schemes vary widely, with some states providing generous benefits and others offering little or no compensation. For example, while Texas provides \$80,000 per year of wrongful imprisonment, states like Wisconsin cap compensation at \$25,000, regardless of the length of imprisonment. These discrepancies raise serious questions about the fairness and adequacy of compensation schemes, particularly when exonerees in different states receive vastly different levels of compensation for similar harms.

Lack of Uniformity

The lack of uniformity in compensation frameworks is another significant challenge. Within countries like the United States, there are vast disparities between states in terms of eligibility criteria, compensation amounts, and procedural requirements. These discrepancies create unequal outcomes for exonerees based on where they were wrongfully convicted.

Internationally, there are also significant variations in how wrongful convictions are compensated. While countries like France and Canada have relatively flexible compensation systems, others, like India, have no formal framework in place. This lack of consistency leads to inequities in the treatment of exonerees across different jurisdictions.

REFORM PROPOSALS

To address the shortcomings of existing compensation frameworks, several reforms are necessary.

- 1. *Enhancing Adequacy of Compensation:*** Compensation schemes should reflect the full extent of the harm suffered by exonerees. Caps on compensation should be removed or adjusted to account for both economic and non-economic damages, such as psychological trauma, reputational harm, and the loss of personal relationships. Non-monetary remedies, such as healthcare and vocational training, should also be provided to help exonerees rebuild their lives.
- 2. *Ensuring Fairness and Equity:*** Compensation frameworks should be designed to ensure fairness and equity for all exonerees, particularly those from marginalized groups. Gender, race, and socio-economic status should be taken into account when determining compensation, and specific provisions should be made to address the

unique challenges faced by women, racial minorities, and individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

3. **Legislative Reforms for Consistency:** Jurisdictions without formal compensation laws, such as India, should enact comprehensive statutes that define the state's obligation to compensate exonerees. In countries like the United States, federal legislation should be introduced to standardize compensation schemes across states, ensuring consistent treatment for all exonerees. Independent compensation commissions should be established to streamline the process and ensure that claims are handled efficiently and fairly.

CONCLUSION

The issue of compensating victims of wrongful convictions is a critical aspect of ensuring justice and fairness in legal systems worldwide. Despite the recognition of the need for compensation, existing frameworks often fall short in addressing the full range of harms experienced by exonerees. Financial compensation is frequently inadequate, and non-monetary remedies are either insufficient or absent. The lack of uniformity in compensation schemes, both within and between jurisdictions, further exacerbates these issues.

Reforming these frameworks is essential to ensure that exonerees receive the justice and support they deserve. Governments must prioritize the enhancement of compensation systems by removing caps, providing comprehensive support services, and creating independent bodies to assess claims. Additionally, international standards should be adopted to create consistency across jurisdictions, ensuring that exonerees are treated fairly, regardless of where they were wrongfully convicted. By addressing these issues, we can move closer to a system of justice that fully acknowledges and compensates for the profound harm caused by wrongful convictions.

REFERENCES

1. *David Milgaard v. Her Majesty The Queen*, [1999] 1 SCR 183 (Canada) – A high-profile case involving compensation for wrongful imprisonment in Canada.
2. *Iraqi v. United Kingdom* (2009), ECHR 326, where the European Court of Human Rights ruled on compensation claims for wrongful imprisonment.

3. *Adams v. Texas* (2011), Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, dealing with compensation frameworks for exonerees in Texas.
4. *John Thompson v. Connick*, 563 U.S. 51 (2011), a U.S. Supreme Court case discussing prosecutorial immunity and compensation.
5. United Nations General Assembly, Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law (2005).
6. European Convention on Human Rights, Article 5(5), providing for compensation for wrongful imprisonment.
7. UN Commission on Human Rights, The Right to a Fair Trial: Study on Compensation for Wrongful Conviction (1989).
8. The Innocence Project. (2022). Compensation for the Wrongfully Convicted in the United States: A Report on the Current Framework and Proposed Reforms.
9. National Academy of Sciences (2009). *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward* – discusses wrongful convictions in the context of forensic errors.
10. Criminal Cases Review Commission (UK) – Established under the Criminal Appeal Act 1995, provides oversight in wrongful conviction cases.
11. National Compensation Statutes (U.S.) – Varied state laws such as Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 103.051 (regarding compensation for exonerees).

IJLRA