

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES**
[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 9 | Issue 5

2026

© 2026 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact support@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to submission@ijlmh.com.

Double Jeopardy and the Limits of State Prosecution in India: Article 20(2), Section 337 of the BNSS

SAAPURAM MADHULATHA*  AND GORANTLA UDAI DEEPAK** 

ABSTRACT

The prohibition of double jeopardy expresses a limit on the State's power to prosecute, but Indian law does not contain a single rule against every repeated investigation, trial or sanction. Article 20(2) of the Constitution requires a previous prosecution and punishment for the same offence. Section 337 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, protects a person previously tried and convicted or acquitted by a competent court, and extends in specified circumstances to alternative charges based on the same facts. This doctrinal paper examines the text, historical case law under Section 300 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and judicial treatment of offence identity, finality, multiple statutory regimes and repeated proceedings. It argues that constitutional and statutory protection must be analysed in sequence rather than collapsed into a loose appeal to fairness. The constitutional guarantee sets a narrow, entrenched minimum; the procedural statute provides the more useful defence against a successive trial after acquittal. Neither generally converts an administrative penalty, departmental inquiry or a second investigation into a previous criminal trial. At the same time, a formally distinct charge should not permit the State to evade the statutory rule concerning charges available at the first trial. The paper proposes a decision framework that identifies the first adjudicative forum, the disposition, the ingredients of each offence, the facts and charges available in the first trial, the statutory exceptions and the proper remedy. Properly applied, these inquiries preserve lawful prosecution for distinct wrongs while preventing the State from repeatedly exposing an accused person to the burdens of a concluded criminal case.

Keywords: Double jeopardy, Article 20(2), BNSS Section 337, *autrefois acquit*, criminal finality, successive prosecution

I. INTRODUCTION

The State may investigate crime, select charges, prosecute and seek appellate correction. Those powers have limits when it has already put a person through a criminal trial. A concluded

* Author is a Student at Aurora Deemed to be University, Bhongir, Telangana, India. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9749-0805>

** Author is a Student at Aurora Deemed to be University, Bhongir, Telangana, India. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2798-4088>

prosecution consumes years, money, evidence and personal liberty. If an acquittal or conviction can be answered with a newly labelled case based on substantially the same accusation, the first judgment offers little security. Conversely, a person who commits two legally distinct offences in one transaction cannot demand immunity from the second merely because some evidence overlaps. Double jeopardy doctrine must draw a defensible line between these situations.¹

Indian law provides two principal starting points. Article 20(2) states that no person shall be prosecuted and punished for the same offence more than once. Section 337 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), in force since 1 July 2024, continues the procedural protection previously contained in Section 300 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC). Its opening subsection protects a person once tried by a competent court and convicted or acquitted while that determination remains in force. It also addresses certain different charges on the same facts that could have been made or sustained in the first trial. The difference between a constitutional requirement of prior punishment and a statutory rule embracing acquittal is central, not merely verbal.²

The research problem is how to identify the effective limit on a second prosecution without treating every successive state action as double jeopardy. Courts must decide whether the previous process was a prosecution, whether it produced the relevant disposition, whether the later allegation concerns the same offence, whether a different charge was available at the first trial, and whether a statutory exception applies. Arguments that omit one of these stages risk two opposite errors: protecting a second trial by changing the legal label, or immunising a separate crime simply because both proceedings concern the same commercial transaction, document or physical event.

Much commentary presents the doctrine through a list of cases or the maxims *autrefois acquit* and *autrefois convict*. Historical and comparative scholarship usefully identifies finality, state harassment and the risk of mistaken conviction as underlying values. Yet a current Indian account must place those values inside the specific language of Section 337, including its cross-references to BNSS charging provisions and its express exceptions. It must also explain why principles controlling repetitive first information reports or abusive process can protect an accused even before the double jeopardy threshold is crossed.³

¹ GEORGE C. THOMAS III, DOUBLE JEOPARDY: THE HISTORY, THE LAW 1–8 (1998).

² INDIA CONST. art. 20(2); Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, No. 46 of 2023, § 337(1), INDIA CODE (2023).

³ Akhil Reed Amar, *Double Jeopardy Law Made Simple*, 106 YALE L.J. 1807, 1807–09 (1997), <https://doi.org/10.2307/797320>; Code of Criminal Procedure, No. 2 of 1974, § 300, INDIA CODE (1974).

This paper uses doctrinal analysis of the Constitution, the BNSS and predecessor provisions, Supreme Court decisions and selected scholarly literature. It does not report empirical findings. Part II establishes the constitutional and statutory architecture. Part III examines how the courts identify a previous prosecution and the same offence. Part IV addresses acquittals, alternative charges and statutory exceptions. Part V distinguishes multiple proceedings and remedies that do not fit the strict bar. Part VI proposes an ordered judicial test. The argument is that Section 337 should be read as a concrete rule of criminal finality, informed by constitutional liberty and fairness, without rewriting Article 20(2) or extinguishing prosecution for distinct offences.

II. THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY ARCHITECTURE

A. Article 20(2) as a constitutional minimum

Article 20(2) has three express elements: a person must previously have been prosecuted, punished, and then exposed to prosecution and punishment for the same offence again. The conjunction matters. An acquittal does not itself meet the prior-punishment requirement, although other law protects against a second trial after acquittal. Nor does every regulatory demand, seizure or employment sanction constitute a criminal prosecution. Article 20(2) is therefore a powerful but limited constitutional plea. Its protection cannot be taken away by ordinary legislation; its wording also should not be silently expanded to absorb every procedural rule concerning finality.⁴

Maqbool Hussain v. State of Bombay illustrates the institutional threshold. The customs authorities confiscated gold, offering the option of paying a fine in lieu of confiscation, and a criminal prosecution followed. The Supreme Court held that the customs proceeding did not amount to prosecution and punishment before a court or judicial tribunal in the constitutional sense. It was not enough that the first proceeding imposed a serious financial consequence. The decisive inquiry concerned the authority's function and the character of its procedure. The result has continuing importance for revenue, regulatory and other specialised enforcement systems.⁵

S.A. Venkataraman v. Union of India similarly rejected an Article 20(2) plea based on an earlier departmental inquiry. Employment consequences following an inquiry were not the criminal prosecution and punishment contemplated by the provision. These cases do not establish that administrative penalties are inconsequential or that their accumulation is always fair. They establish the narrower proposition that the specific constitutional bar requires its own

⁴ INDIA CONST. art. 20(2); *T.P. Gopalakrishnan v. State of Kerala*, (2022) 14 SCC 323.

⁵ *Maqbool Hussain v. State of Bombay*, AIR 1953 SC 325, 328–30.

prerequisites. Questions about proportionality, statutory construction or abuse of process may remain even where the double jeopardy plea fails.⁶

This limited text should be located within constitutional criminal procedure more broadly. Article 21 requires a lawful procedure for deprivation of liberty; Article 14 forbids arbitrary state action. A person whose acquittal is followed by repetitive process may invoke the statutory bar and, in an appropriate case, constitutional review of abuse. But the distinct sources should be identified rather than represented as though Article 20(2) itself prohibits every second investigation or every trial after acquittal. That discipline makes an argument more persuasive to a court and makes its remedy more precise.

B. Section 337 and the greater reach of the trial bar

Section 337(1) BNSS requires an earlier trial by a court of competent jurisdiction and a conviction or acquittal that remains in force. It prohibits trial again for the same offence. It further prevents a later trial on the same facts for another offence where a different charge might have been made under Section 244(1), or the accused might have been convicted under Section 244(2). The provision thus addresses a prosecutorial attempt to reserve an available alternative characterisation for a subsequent case. It is more protective than Article 20(2) after an acquittal and more specific than a general claim about the same transaction.⁷

The language derives substantially from Section 300 CrPC, whose interpretation remains important where materially corresponding wording survives. Continuity does not eliminate the need to check new cross-references: the old rule referred to Section 221 CrPC, while the BNSS points to Section 244. Nor should the two procedural codes be confused in pending cases. The BNSS commencement and savings provisions may determine which code governs a particular pre-commencement proceeding; the judgment relied upon should be used for the legal principle it actually decides, with attention to the applicable statutory text.⁸

Section 337 does not assert that the first prosecution forever bars every case arising from a single narrative. Subsection (2) permits later trial, with State Government consent, for a distinct offence for which a separate charge might have been made at the former trial under Section 243(1). Subsection (3) addresses an act whose later consequences constitute a different offence when those consequences had not happened or were unknown to the court at the first conviction. Subsection (4) concerns an offence the first court was incompetent to try. Subsection (5) imposes a consent requirement for retrial after the specified discharge. Subsection (6) preserves

⁶ *S.A. Venkataraman v. Union of India*, AIR 1954 SC 375, 377–78.

⁷ *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita* § 337(1); *id.* § 244.

⁸ *Id.* §§ 244, 337, 531; Code of Criminal Procedure § 300.

Section 26 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, and Section 208 BNSS. Finally, the Explanation states that dismissal of a complaint or discharge is not an acquittal for this section.⁹

These qualifications show why a defence cannot rest merely on the phrase “same facts.” The statutory issue is whether the second case is the same offence, a charge available by the particular alternative-charge rule, or a genuinely distinct offence governed by a permissible exception. The first judgment’s continued legal force is also essential. An appellate reversal, retrial ordered according to law or other change to the disposition requires analysis on its own terms. A court should record which part of Section 337 does the work, rather than loosely treating all its subsections as one absolute prohibition.

C. Finality as a public-law limit

Finality protects more than an individual preference for repose. It constrains a repeat player with investigators, experts and charging discretion. The prosecution can usually plan a coherent charge sheet, examine available evidence and seek review of an adverse judgment. The accused must bear each arrest risk, appearance, legal bill and reputational cost. Permitting the State to try one version, inspect the defence and then proceed on a slightly revised version would skew the structure of a fair criminal process. Scholarly analyses by George C. Thomas III and Akhil Reed Amar illuminate the history and competing theories of protection, though their treatment of the United States cannot be transplanted as Indian doctrine.¹⁰

The public also has an interest in effective law enforcement and in correction of serious errors through authorised procedures. Section 337 accommodates this interest through rules for distinct offences, later consequences and court competence. Its finality is not an immunity for all misconduct connected to the original episode. The more disciplined principle is that the State must ordinarily bring charges that can properly be resolved in one competent criminal trial, while retaining the avenues Parliament expressly leaves open. This principle connects criminal defence to public law: it limits how governmental power may be repeatedly exercised over one person after a final adjudication.

III. THE JUDICIAL TESTS FOR PROSECUTION AND OFFENCE IDENTITY

A. What was the first proceeding?

The first task is to reconstruct the previous proceeding, not merely compare the captions of two complaints. Counsel should obtain the complaint or police report, charge, order framing charge,

⁹ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(2)–(6) & Explanation; General Clauses Act, No. 10 of 1897, § 26, INDIA CODE (1897).

¹⁰ Thomas, *supra* note 1, at 1–8; Amar, *supra* note 3, at 1807–09.

evidence where necessary, final judgment and any appellate order. These documents disclose whether there was a trial before a competent criminal court and whether the outcome was conviction, acquittal, discharge or a different procedural disposal. The classification may determine the case. A failed complaint or discharge is not automatically an acquittal under Section 337.¹¹

The word “punished” in Article 20(2) creates a further question. The fact that an administrative authority described a sanction as a penalty does not decide its constitutional character. *Maqbool Hussain* and *Venkataraman* insist on the character of the earlier adjudication. Similarly, a service disciplinary process can coexist with a criminal case although the same alleged conduct appears in both. Its evidentiary standard, object and consequence are different. The relevant rule governing parallel proceedings may be one of fairness in the particular case, rather than the constitutional prohibition of double jeopardy.¹²

This forum inquiry is especially important where special laws combine confiscation, civil penalties and criminal offences. A single regulatory incident may lead to taxation, licensing action and prosecution. Article 20(2) does not automatically collapse these into a single criminal case. Section 337 likewise addresses previous trial by a competent court, not simply earlier official scrutiny. A defender may have serious objections to cumulative sanctions; those objections should be pleaded under the applicable statute and broader constitutional controls after the court identifies what happened first.

B. Same offence is not synonymous with same occurrence

State of Bombay v. S.L. Apte supplies the orthodox offence-identity approach. Where two offences arise from the same act, the critical question is whether their ingredients are identical. A factual overlap alone does not answer it. Each provision may require proof of a different legal element even though the same witnesses or documents are relevant. The “same offence” inquiry therefore begins with the legal elements, the applicable definitions and the particular charges, rather than a broad description such as “the same transaction.”¹³

Sangeetaben Mahendrabhai Patel v. State of Gujarat demonstrates the distinction in a commercial setting. A previous prosecution under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act concerned dishonour of a cheque; the later allegations of cheating and criminal breach of trust under the Indian Penal Code required different ingredients. The Supreme Court rejected a blanket bar merely because the transactions overlapped. The decision must not be abbreviated

¹¹ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(1) & Explanation.

¹² *Maqbool Hussain*, AIR 1953 SC at 328–30; *Venkataraman*, AIR 1954 SC at 377–78.

¹³ *State of Bombay v. S.L. Apte*, AIR 1961 SC 578, 584–85.

into the proposition that changing statutes always authorises retrial. Its result depended on comparison of the offences and the contours of Section 300 CrPC.¹⁴

The converse difficulty arises where the second charge uses a different label for what the first court could already have dealt with as an alternative charge on the same facts. Section 337(1) expressly reaches that situation by reference to Section 244. A rigid ingredients-only test would underread this additional statutory phrase. The court must make two inquiries: whether the offences are legally the same, and, if they are not, whether the alternative charge was nevertheless available under the charging rule on the same facts in the earlier trial. This two-stage analysis respects both the constitutional expression “same offence” and the procedural statute’s broader protection.¹⁵

State of Rajasthan v. Hat Singh is a reminder that separate statutory offences may target different acts or stages of wrongdoing even within one episode. A court should explain the distinct ingredients rather than assume that multiple sections always mean multiple offences. The actual question concerns what the State must prove to secure each conviction, not how many numbers appear in the charge sheet. Conversely, formal differences in drafting should not distract from the alternative-charge provision where its conditions are met.¹⁶

C. The evidentiary and temporal comparison

Offence identity is a legal question, but applying Section 337 often requires a disciplined factual comparison. A later prosecution may allege facts that arose only after the first conviction, as in the statutory exception for later consequences. It may allege a different victim, period or transaction, despite similarity of method. Or it may simply restate the same incident with a new statutory label. The court needs a comparison sufficiently precise to distinguish these situations without conducting the second trial in advance.

An efficient method is to place the first charge and judgment beside the proposed second charge, mark the indispensable elements of each, and then identify the facts available to the first court. This is a legal analysis, not a mechanical word count. The phrase “on the same facts” in Section 337(1) is tied to the specified alternative-charge route. It does not establish a universal rule that all offences sharing evidence must have been joined. The exceptions in subsections (2) through (4) would be largely pointless if every common factual background by itself ended the inquiry.

¹⁴ *Sangeetaben Mahendrabhai Patel v. State of Gujarat*, (2012) 7 SCC 621, 627–30.

¹⁵ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita §§ 244, 337(1).

¹⁶ *State of Rajasthan v. Hat Singh*, (2003) 2 SCC 152, 158–60.

The defendant should ordinarily raise the plea with authenticated records of the first case. The prosecution should identify the distinct element, newly arisen consequence, jurisdictional impediment or statutory permission on which it relies. A reasoned order can then show whether the court assessed a same-offence bar, an alternative-charge bar, or a separate claim of harassment. This separation is valuable on appeal because it shows exactly what finding must be reviewed.

T.P. Gopalakrishnan v. State of Kerala illustrates the value of comparing periods, charges and the prosecution's knowledge rather than reciting the formula "same offence" in isolation. The Supreme Court considered successive corruption and misappropriation prosecutions arising from the accused's work in the same post and overlapping periods. It examined whether the later allegations formed part of the previously prosecuted transaction and whether the prosecution already had the relevant material. The decision is especially useful when the State divides a course of alleged misconduct into separate trials after it could have presented a coherent case. It does not turn every recurring pattern of conduct into one offence: the specific charges, period and factual basis still require examination.¹⁷

IV. ACQUITTAL, ALTERNATIVE CHARGES AND STATUTORY EXCEPTIONS

A. Acquittal and the wider statutory protection

Acquittal is the clearest instance in which the statutory and constitutional texts part company. The accused cannot usually say that a previous acquittal was a previous "punishment" under Article 20(2). Section 337(1), however, names both conviction and acquittal. After an acquittal by a competent court that remains in force, a new trial for the same offence is barred. The State's lawful recourse to challenge an acquittal is ordinarily the appellate route subject to its conditions, not a fresh prosecution that ignores the first judgment.¹⁸

This distinction has practical force for criminal defence. A petition that cites only Article 20(2) after an acquittal invites an unnecessary objection about its wording. The stronger argument identifies the trial, competent court, acquittal, continued force of the decision and identity of the later charge under Section 337. Constitutional liberty and non-arbitrariness can support interpretation or a separate abuse-of-process ground, but they do not replace proof of the statutory elements.

The rule also protects a conviction from a second trial for the same offence while it remains in force. It does not make lawful appeal, revision or retrial following a valid appellate order

¹⁷ *T.P. Gopalakrishnan*, (2022) 14 SCC 323; Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(1)–(4).

¹⁸ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(1); INDIA CONST. art. 20(2).

conceptually identical to a new prosecution initiated after final disposition. The State cannot evade an adverse result through a fresh case; nor can the defence transform the ordinary correction of the first case into a wholly separate second case. The procedural posture and the effect of the reviewing court's order matter.

B. Alternative charges available at the first trial

Section 244 BNSS addresses uncertainty about which offence the proved facts will constitute. The corresponding second limb of Section 337(1) prevents the State, after the first trial, from using that uncertainty as a reason to prosecute another charge that could have been made or supported under the relevant rule. This is the paper's most significant statutory finding. It makes finality meaningful where the criminal law offers overlapping descriptions of one set of proved facts.¹⁹

The inquiry is nevertheless bounded. The court must identify why the proposed later charge falls within Section 244(1) or Section 244(2), and why the facts are the same. Mere convenience in joining two distinct offences is not the same as the alternative-charge situation addressed in subsection (1). Section 337(2) separately allows a later trial for a distinct offence for which a separate charge might have been made under Section 243(1), subject to State Government consent. Reading the latter permission out of the statute would incorrectly convert an important protection into blanket transactional immunity.²⁰

There is a public-law reason to enforce the alternative-charge limb seriously. Where the State knew the relevant facts and had a competent forum, successive trials can become a method of improving its case after observing a failed prosecution. The rule places the cost of that charging choice primarily on the prosecuting authority. It encourages careful initial investigation and coherent presentation of charges. Yet judicial discipline requires the defence to demonstrate statutory availability of the first-trial charge, rather than assert in the abstract that the prosecutor "could have charged everything."

C. Later consequences, competence and discharge

Section 337(3) addresses consequences of an act that had not happened, or were not known to the court, at the time of the first conviction. Suppose a victim dies after a trial for injury and the death changes the legal character of the offence. A categorical bar would give the first conviction an effect it could not rationally have had when the later consequence did not yet exist or was unknown. The subsection recognises this temporal problem. The later prosecution must actually

¹⁹ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita §§ 244, 337(1).

²⁰ *Id.* §§ 243(1), 337(2).

satisfy the statutory condition; it cannot simply invoke “new evidence” without identifying the relevant consequence and why the subsection applies.²¹

Subsection (4) permits a later trial for another offence constituted by the same acts where the first court was not competent to try that later offence. The reason is jurisdictional, not a general licence to divide cases. Competence must be determined from the first court’s legal powers at the relevant time. If it could have tried the alleged offence, this exception cannot be made available by the prosecutor’s earlier decision not to charge it.²²

Discharge demands particular care. The Explanation denies that discharge or dismissal of a complaint is an acquittal for Section 337. Yet subsection (5) imposes a court-consent requirement before a person discharged under the specified provision is tried again for the same offence. Thus “discharge is not acquittal” does not mean that every second attempt following discharge is unrestricted. The exact statutory route and the court whose consent is required must be identified. Generic invocations of double jeopardy obscure this finer protection.²³

D. Multiple statutory provisions and Section 26

Section 26 of the General Clauses Act permits prosecution under either or any of two enactments where an act or omission constitutes an offence under both, but forbids liability to be punished twice for the same offence. Section 337(6) preserves this provision. The two statutes therefore need to be read together, not used as competing slogans. The fact that two enactments reach related conduct does not itself establish that the offences are identical, and the preservation of Section 26 does not erase the finality rule of Section 337(1) after a qualifying trial.²⁴

Cases concerning a cheque, economic conduct or specialised regulatory statutes frequently generate this problem. A statutory offence may protect the reliability of a payment instrument, while the offence of cheating, now under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, requires dishonest intention at an earlier stage. The public interest may justify prosecuting both where each has a distinct element. The accused may nevertheless contest duplicate punishment for a truly identical offence or a second trial for a charge already foreclosed by Section 337. These are related but separate arguments. A court should specify whether it is addressing successive prosecution, cumulative punishment, or both.

²¹ *Id.* § 337(3).

²² *Id.* § 337(4).

²³ *Id.* § 337(5) & Explanation.

²⁴ General Clauses Act § 26; Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(6).

V. THE OUTER BOUNDARY: REPETITIVE INVESTIGATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

A. A second FIR before any concluded trial

Repeated police reports about the same occurrence can expose a suspect to coercive process before any conviction or acquittal. The traditional pleas under Article 20(2) and Section 337 may not yet be available. *T.T. Antony v. State of Kerala* addresses the impermissibility of a second FIR for the same incident in the setting it considered; subsequent case law requires care concerning counter-complaints and genuinely different transactions. This line of authority controls investigation and abuse of process, not a fictional earlier acquittal.²⁵

The distinction matters. Calling every duplicate FIR “double jeopardy” is rhetorically attractive but legally imprecise. The accused should plead the rule governing repeated registration, the identity of occurrence and any appropriate quashing ground. Where a first trial has ended, Section 337 may provide an additional and more direct bar. The legal stage determines the relevant safeguard.

Similarly, successive complaints after procedural dismissal require analysis of the dismissal and applicable principles governing a second complaint. Because Section 337 explicitly excludes dismissal of a complaint from acquittal, one cannot treat a dismissal as a final merits verdict without examining the order. A complainant may have a permissible statutory route, but repeated filings to harass an accused can still attract judicial control. Public law supplies tools against abusive state or court process beyond the precise constitutional double jeopardy clause.

B. Disciplinary, fiscal and regulatory proceedings

Parallel departmental and criminal proceedings commonly concern the same employee conduct. An employer’s disciplinary inquiry asks whether employment rules were breached under its applicable procedure; a criminal court determines whether the prosecution proves a statutory offence to the criminal standard. *Venkataraman*’s constitutional holding prevents the mere fact of a departmental inquiry from becoming a bar to criminal prosecution. The same reasoning does not answer every issue concerning prejudice, access to evidence or the timing of parallel processes. Those concerns must be argued on their proper legal basis.²⁶

Customs and tax administration pose a similar issue. Confiscation or a civil penalty can be onerous but need not be criminal prosecution and punishment within Article 20(2). The function

²⁵ *T.T. Antony v. State of Kerala*, (2001) 6 SCC 181, 195–97.

²⁶ *Venkataraman*, AIR 1954 SC at 377–78.

and legal character of the authority, rather than the ordinary-language severity of its sanction, govern the traditional constitutional analysis. Where a special statute expressly regulates the relationship between penalty and prosecution, that statute must also be read. It would be a mistake either to constitutionalise every economic sanction as double jeopardy or to assume that all cumulative sanctions are automatically authorised.

The line can be contested in modern regulatory states, which increasingly use substantial monetary penalties and adjudicative procedures. Comparative scholarship offers reasons to worry about accumulated coercive burdens. But an Indian court applying Article 20(2) must start with binding constitutional interpretation. Reform could examine whether unusually punitive administrative proceedings require stronger procedural protection; such a proposal should be identified as reform, not misreported as the present holding of *Maqbool Hussain*.²⁷

C. Remedy and procedural timing

Where the statutory bar is apparent from the earlier judgment and the proposed charge, the accused should seek a determination before being made to undergo the full second trial. A court can consider the issue at the appropriate stage under the BNSS, and the High Court's powers may be invoked to prevent abuse where the record justifies intervention. The request should attach the earlier disposition and explain the exact subsection. A conclusory assertion that "the matter was decided" is weaker than an element-by-element comparison tied to the first court's competence and the legal force of its judgment.

The State should also have a fair opportunity to show a genuine distinction, newly arisen consequence or other exception. An early ruling need not convert into a miniature trial on disputed facts. If a pleaded exception depends on evidence that cannot yet be resolved, the court should identify the factual issue and the procedural basis for deciding it later. Early scrutiny is most valuable where the decisive documents are undisputed and a second trial would itself inflict the injury the rule aims to prevent.

An appeal against acquittal, a lawfully ordered retrial and a fresh complaint are procedurally different. A court should specify which mechanism the State has used. The doctrine cannot be invoked to abolish appellate correction, but appellate power also cannot be bypassed by presenting a new case as a convenient substitute for an appeal. This procedural distinction protects both the authority of the first judgment and the legislature's designed review process.

²⁷ Thomas, *supra* note 1, at 1–8; *Maqbool Hussain*, AIR 1953 SC at 328–30.

VI. A COHERENT FRAMEWORK FOR DEFENCE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

A. Six questions in their proper order

First, identify the earlier proceeding and its forum. Was there a criminal trial before a court of competent jurisdiction, an administrative adjudication, a disciplinary inquiry, or only an investigation? Second, identify the disposition. Was the person convicted, acquitted, discharged, or subject to a complaint dismissal, and does the conviction or acquittal remain in force? Third, compare the legal ingredients of the earlier and proposed offences. If they are the same, Article 20(2) may apply following prior prosecution and punishment; Section 337 may apply following a qualifying conviction or acquittal.²⁸

Fourth, if the offences differ, compare the actual facts and the first trial's available alternative charges under Section 244. The first limb of Section 337 is not exhausted by an ingredients test. Fifth, consider the specific statutory exceptions: a distinct offence with required State consent, subsequently occurring or unknown consequences, lack of competence of the first court, and the tailored rule governing discharge. Sixth, if neither double jeopardy source applies, consider an independent objection to a repetitive FIR, abusive complaint, disproportionate cumulative sanction or unfair procedure. This ordered approach avoids making one doctrine carry work assigned to another.

The sequence has a corresponding evidentiary discipline. The accused should identify the first charge and final order, not merely cite a news report or the existence of a prior FIR. The State should identify precisely which different ingredient or statutory exception preserves its second case. The court should give reasons on the relevant statutory clause. The resulting decision will be narrower and more reliable than a general statement that the two matters are "connected" or "different."

B. A practical example

Consider a person acquitted after a competent court tried an allegation arising from a cheque dishonour. A later complaint alleges that the person dishonestly induced delivery of property before issuing the cheque. The defence cannot succeed simply by pointing to the same cheque. A court must compare the ingredients of the negotiable-instrument offence with those of cheating and identify the conduct and intention alleged. *Sangeetaben* illustrates why a distinct offence may survive. But if the second prosecution merely changes the label of the same proven

²⁸ INDIA CONST. art. 20(2); Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(1).

acts to an alternative charge that Section 244 allowed in the first trial, Section 337(1) requires separate and serious consideration.²⁹

Now suppose instead that the first proceeding was a customs confiscation. The accused later faces a criminal charge. *Maqbool Hussain* instructs that the earlier customs process does not necessarily amount to a previous constitutional prosecution and punishment. The defence may still challenge statutory noncompliance or another unfairness, but it must not present the customs order as though it were a criminal-court acquittal under Section 337. The examples show why the order of inquiry matters more than broad statements about whether the events are “the same.”³⁰

C. The proposed interpretive position

Courts should read Section 337 as giving independent effect to its second, alternative-charge limb. An interpretation confined to identical legal ingredients would make that limb redundant. At the same time, its precise reference to Section 244 must be respected; a general theory of all offences in one transaction cannot override subsection (2)’s controlled permission for later prosecution of distinct offences. Constitutional values of finality and liberty support faithful application of this design. They do not license deletion of the statute’s exceptions.

The prosecutor’s responsibility follows directly. Where the facts support alternative descriptions within the first court’s competence, charges should be considered together under the BNSS charging rules. Investigators should record whether another alleged offence belongs to the same facts or concerns a distinct victim, consequence or time. When seeking a later prosecution following conviction or acquittal, the State should identify the statutory route in advance. These steps reduce both unjust repetition and avoidable litigation about the first case’s scope.

For defence counsel, the most effective submission is short and document-based: identify the earlier trial and disposition; show the charge or alternative that was actually or legally available; compare essential ingredients and facts; confront any exception the prosecution invokes; and seek the remedy at the earliest suitable stage. Article 20(2) should be pleaded where its prosecution-and-punishment elements are satisfied. Section 337 should be the central provision after a final acquittal. Other constitutional or procedural objections should be presented separately where the first process does not meet either test.

²⁹ *Sangeetaben*, (2012) 7 SCC at 627–30; *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita* §§ 244, 337(1).

³⁰ *Maqbool Hussain*, AIR 1953 SC at 328–30.

VII. CONCLUSION

Double jeopardy in India is a set of related protections with different triggers. Article 20(2) establishes an entrenched bar against prosecution and punishment twice for the same offence. Its language does not itself cover a person merely acquitted earlier, and the Supreme Court has refused to equate administrative or departmental action automatically with a previous criminal prosecution. Section 337 BNSS supplies the operative rule of criminal-trial finality after a competent court's conviction or acquittal. It also prevents a later trial on the same facts for an alternative charge within the specified charging rule. Treating these protections as interchangeable weakens an otherwise sound defence argument.³¹

The cases further show that “same offence” is a legal inquiry into ingredients, while factual overlap is relevant to the statute's alternative-charge limb and particular exceptions. One episode may support distinct offences, as the cheque-dishonour and cheating example demonstrates. A new legal label cannot, however, automatically rescue a later prosecution when the statutory conditions for an available alternative charge were already met. The text requires attention to the first court's competence, the continuing force of its judgment, State consent where mandated, consequences arising later and the special treatment of discharge.³²

The paper's proposed sequence makes the rule workable. Determine the forum and disposition; compare offence ingredients; test the same-facts alternative-charge provision; evaluate each invoked exception; and then address any independent objection to repeated investigation or abusive process. This preserves criminal finality without creating immunity for genuinely separate wrongs. For a criminal defence lawyer, the strongest plea is built from the first case's charge, judgment and statutory charging rules. For public law, the larger principle is that the State must use its considerable prosecutorial powers through the procedures Parliament established and accept the legal effect of a concluded trial, subject only to lawful review and carefully defined exceptions.

³¹ INDIA CONST. art. 20(2); Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(1); *Venkataraman*, AIR 1954 SC at 377–78.

³² *S.L. Apte*, AIR 1961 SC at 584–85; *Sangeetaben*, (2012) 7 SCC at 627–30; Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita § 337(2)–(5).