Page 3937 - 3948 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119443*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 2

2025

Plea Bargaining: Ethics and Legal Consequences

SHIVANGI DWIVEDI[1] AND DR. TARU MISHRA[2]

ABSTRACT

Plea bargaining has become a vital tool in contemporary criminal justice systems, providing a workable answer to backlogs of cases and drawn-out trials. In exchange for the prosecution making concessions, the accused consents to enter a guilty plea to a reduced charge or accept a lighter punishment. Plea bargaining poses serious ethical and legal issues that require careful consideration, despite its pragmatic benefits, which include easing court overcrowding, accelerating justice, and conserving state funds. This study investigates the ethical and legal ramifications of plea bargaining in order to better understand its dual aspects. Plea bargains can, from an ethical perspective, lead to injustices in the administration of justice, particularly when the balance of power between the defence and the prosecution is off. Accused people may be forced to accept bargains out of fear, a lack of funds, or a lack of legal knowledge, especially if they come from marginalized backgrounds. Such situations run the risk of compromising the voluntary consent concept and could result in erroneous convictions. Additionally, because bargaining moves the emphasis from factual guilt to negotiated solutions, the approach raises concerns about the dilution of truth-seeking in criminal cases. In terms of law, the study examines the ways in which different countries have enacted laws and applied plea bargaining, with a focus on the US, UK, and India. It explores the statutory frameworks, judicial supervision, and procedural safeguards intended to defend against abuse while maintaining equity and openness. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, established plea bargaining in India, however it is only applicable to specific types of offenses

Keywords*: contemporary criminal, lighter punishment, dual aspects, negotiated solutions, statutory frameworks.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Arjun Ram Meghwal, India's recently appointed Law Minister, told the Rajya Sabha that there are now more than 5 crore cases languishing in Indian courts. The Supreme Court of India, 25 high courts, and lower courts are still considering these matters. These cases may be pending

[1] Author is a student at Amity Law School Lucknow, Amity University Lucknow Campus, India.
[2] Author is an Assistant Professor at Amity Law School Lucknow, Amity University Lucknow Uttar Pradesh, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

for a variety of reasons, including a lack of infrastructure, delays in the legal process, insufficient legal aid, holidays and vacations, a shortage of judges, a delay in the appointment of judges, and many more. The participants to the lawsuit must ultimately bear the consequences, regardless of the primary cause of this.

It can take years for the victim to receive justice, and regrettably, they may not be alive when it does. However, even if the accused is innocent until the court rules otherwise, he must deal with social condemnation in addition to the harsh actions of the officials. In order to address all of these issues, Indian lawmakers included a separate chapter on "plea bargaining" in the 1973 Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC). There are already about 90 countries with legal systems that have provisions for this idea, therefore it is not a novel idea.

(A) What is plea bargaining?

We can better comprehend the concept of plea bargaining if we divide this term into two pieces. The terms "plea" and "bargaining" refer to "request" and "negotiation," respectively, in this context. In short, it refers to a procedure wherein an individual facing criminal charges pleads guilty to a less serious offense in order to bargain with the prosecution for a sentence that is less severe than what is stipulated by law. Its foundation is the idea of "Nolo Contendere," which translates to "I do not wish to contend."

The first of the many components in this explanation is that this idea can only be applied in the event of a criminal offense. The victim is not permitted to employ this instrument in civil actions. Second, in this approach, the prosecutor and the accused or defendant engage in negotiations. Thirdly, in this case, the prosecutor agrees to make certain concessions in his penalty and to somewhat reduce it in exchange for the defendant's pledge to enter a guilty plea in front of the court.

It should be highlighted that the judge plays no active role in any of this process. His duty is limited to that of supervisor.

Plea bargaining is defined as "an agreement set up between the plaintiff and the defendant to come to a resolution about a case without ever taking it to trial" by Black's Law Dictionary.

II. ILLUSTRATION TO PLEA BARGAINING

(A) Charge reduction

To obtain a more compassionate sentence, a defendant may occasionally choose to enter a guilty plea to a charge that is less serious than the first accusation. For example, a person facing aggravated assault charges may decide to enter a guilty plea to simple assault in order to receive

a lighter sentence.

(B) Rejecting the charges

In exchange for the dismissal of some charges, a defendant may decide to accept a lower sentence or enter a guilty plea to a lesser offense. For example, as part of a negotiated arrangement for a reduced sentence, a person charged with several theft counts may enter a guilty plea to only one count and have the other charges dropped.

(C) Suggestion for a particular sentence

The prosecution may recommend a certain sentence if the defendant enters a guilty plea. For example, if the offender enters a guilty plea to embezzlement charges, they may be given probation with the requirement that they make full restitution.

III. HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF PLEA BARGAINING

The history of plea bargaining is extensive and diverse worldwide. It has roots in both ancient Rome and modern-day America, and it is currently permeating the legal systems of many developed and emerging nations.

(A) **Ancient beginnings**

Rome in antiquity

The term "in iure cessio" was used in ancient Rome to describe the practice of plea bargaining. By admitting his guilt and voluntarily accepting the penalty, the defendant in this system may avoid a formal trial. Because of this, the criminal frequently avoided more severe consequences, like death, or obtained lighter sentences.

Athens in antiquity

A comparable technique known as "sycophancy" was common in ancient Athens. In order to circumvent or avoid the official legal proceedings, defendants had the chance to negotiate with the accused by either acknowledging their wrongdoing or making amends. The goal of this unofficial procedure was to resolve conflicts without putting undue strain on the legal system.

The Germanic Law

Plea bargaining was first used in European medieval times under Germanic legal systems. In order to make amends for the crimes they committed, defendants had the chance to negotiate with victims or authorities; these agreements frequently led to lighter sentences or fines. The upholding of social order in society was greatly aided by these agreements.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Islamic Law

Negotiated settlements were also an element of Islamic legal traditions, especially when it came to instances requiring monetary reparations or compensation. Instead of focusing only on punitive measures, the goal was to achieve justice and make reparations.

Europe in the Middle Ages

During Europe's medieval period, which roughly lasted from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries, the legal systems were remarkably diverse. They occasionally lacked the centralized systems that are common in contemporary society. Informal discussions and agreements were common in nature at the time, despite the fact that plea bargaining was not a recognized procedure. Below are descriptions of a handful of them. The act of compurgation

One well-liked and frequently used method was called "compurgation" or "ordeal by compurgation." Under this approach, the defendant would adamantly affirm their innocence and, with the support of a few oath-helpers who would serve as witnesses, testify on their stellar reputation. The defendant would be released or cleared of the accusations if a sufficient number of oath-helpers were found. Negotiations between the guilty and their supporters were part of this process in order to avoid harsh punishments.

participation of the church.

Ecclesiastical courts, often referred to as court Christian or court spiritual, were an important part of the medieval judicial system and frequently had close ties to the church. In addition to encouraging forgiveness and reconciliation, the church occasionally advocated mediated settlements as a way to seek self-punishment and steer clear of serious spiritual repercussions.

These approaches are 'informal means' for people to discuss or settle disputes, not formalized plea bargaining processes. The groundwork for the creation and growth of more structured plea bargaining procedures in the centuries that followed was established by these early negotiation and settlement techniques.

1. United States

The history and influence of plea bargaining on the American legal system are noteworthy. Below is a detailed examination of its development:

Early application

In the United States, the idea of plea bargaining dates back to the 1800s. Trials were often drawn out and costly during the time, and the courts were overloaded with cases. Consequently, around this time, the defendants and prosecutors started having informal conversations or negotiations.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Ascent in the 20th century

Due in part to the rise in cases resulting from illegal activity during the "prohibition era," the idea of plea bargaining gained prominence in the years that followed. Plea agreements became a tool used by prosecutors to guarantee convictions while also lowering the uncertainty surrounding trial results. However, the increasing number of guilty pleas with reduced charges suggests that the prosecutors may have felt it was appropriate to make more concessions in exchange for guilty pleas.

2. India

a) **India's historical background**

The ancient and medieval periods of India's legal history are marked by a multitude of legal customs. During these times, techniques like arbitration and mediation were frequently used to settle conflicts without the need for drawn-out judicial proceedings, among other things. India's legal system underwent significant changes during British colonial control, incorporating elements of British common law. However, the colonial legal system did not use the official process of plea bargaining as it is practiced today. Plea bargains have existed historically, but the contemporary idea didn't come into being until the 19th century, although there are vestiges of it in the American judiciary.

Until the 1960s, when legal representation was allowed, India did not feel the need for plea bargaining because of the jury system.

The Law Commission of India's 142nd report, which was published in 1991, then proposed "concessional treatment" for people who voluntarily enter guilty pleas, being cautious to emphasize that this would not include any "haggling" or plea bargaining with the prosecution. The effectiveness of the American model served as the foundation for its suggestion. The report went on to say that this kind of activity is in line with the Fairness Principles and the Constitution. It also addressed well-reasoned arguments and carried out a study that revealed the majority of the legal community supported the practice.

IV. PLEA BARGAINING'S INTRODUCTION IN INDIA

Plea bargaining was formally implemented in an effort to simplify the legal system and lessen the workload on India's overburdened courts. Its primary goal is to give the accused a chance to voluntarily acknowledge their guilt in return for a lesser charge or punishment. Plea bargaining was once limited to specific offenses, especially those with lower terms, like minor misdemeanors, but over time, its scope has continued to grow.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

(A) Challenges and implementation

Even though it was incorporated into Indian law, the use of plea bargaining has often run into problems. Its acceptance has been hampered by a number of factors, including socioeconomic conditions, cultural pressures, and the accused's ignorance. The judges' and prosecutors' judgment, as well as the readiness of both sides to negotiate, determine how successful plea bargaining is.

(B) Current circumstances

Plea bargaining is still a crucial component of India's criminal justice system today, and it is mostly used to expedite trials and reduce the court's burden in instances involving minor infractions. It has had a variety of effects on case resolution, leading to the quick and effective resolution of certain cases.

V. TYPE OF PLEA BARGAINING

Plea bargaining can take many different forms, and each one has subtleties that can be used based on the specifics of each case. Here are a handful of them:

(A) Charges bargaining

This type of negotiation occurs when the defendant consents to enter a guilty plea to the crime in exchange for a less serious charge than the one that the prosecution first filed, which contained far more serious accusations. When the maximum penalty is seven years in prison or less, this type of negotiating is acceptable.

(B) Sentence bargaining

In this type of negotiation, the accused or defendant consents to enter a guilty plea to the initial accusations brought by the prosecution in the hopes of being given a lighter punishment than they could if found guilty at trial.

(C) Fact-bargaining

Since it is viewed as being in opposition to the criminal justice system, this type of negotiation is typically not supported by the courts. It entails an agreement between the prosecution and the defendant over particular facts or evidence that will be included or excluded during the trial. In this manner, the court is simply shown a specific collection of facts. This might impact the case's strength, and there's a potential the defendant might win a more favourable verdict.

(D) Count bargaining

A In this form, the defendant pleads guilty to only some charges filed by the prosecution, while

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

others are dropped. This is mainly prevalent when someone is facing many charges and thus agrees to admit only a few of them to avoid more serious consequences.

(E) Alford plea

Under this plea, the defendant maintains his innocence but also admits that the prosecution has enough evidence that is likely to secure his conviction. This way, the defendant makes a plea deal without explicitly admitting his guilt. Thus, the defendant here is able to maintain his innocence in the eyes of the court.

VI. LEGAL PROVISIONS THAT PROVIDE FOR PLEA BARGAINING

As previously stated, a unique chapter was inserted to the CrPC in 2005 to introduce the idea of plea bargaining to the Indian judicial system. The entire plea bargaining process is explained and covered by a total of 12 provisions, which are covered in detail below:

(A) Application of the Chapter

Section 265-A explains when the concept of plea bargaining would come into picture. According to this section, plea bargaining can be made where a report under Section 173 of the CrPC is made or a magistrate has taken cognizance of an offence. After examining the complaint under Section 200 of the CrPC, he issues the process under Section 204 of the CrPC for the offences that are punishable with less than seven years of imprisonment. But this plea cannot be taken in the case of offences that affect the socio-economic condition of the nation or that are committed against a woman or a child under 14 years of age. And the Central Government shall establish the crime under the current applicable legislation that will impact the socio-economic status of the country.

(B) Plea bargaining application

According to **Section 265-B**, the individual wishing to use this plea must submit an application to the court where the trial for the offense is still ongoing. The defendant must include a brief explanation of his case in the application, and it must be accompanied by an affidavit in which he attests that he is making the application voluntarily and after fully comprehending the ramifications of entering this plea. The defendant must also state that he has never been found guilty by a court in a case where he was accused of the same crime.

Following receipt of the application, the court will notify either the public prosecutor or the complainant, as applicable, and the accused must show up on the scheduled date. In order to confirm that the accused filed the application freely, the court will then record the accused's statement in front of a camera without the opposite party present when everyone has shown up

for the case. A date for the next hearing might be set once the court is satisfied that the accused entered the plea willingly and asks the parties to reach a mutually agreeable resolution in which the accused compensates the victim. However, the court will follow the Code of Criminal Procedure from the point at which the application was made if it believes that the accused has been charged with the same crime before or that the application was not submitted freely.

(C) Mutually satisfactory disposition (MSD) guidelines

According to **Section 265-C**, the court must notify the parties and, if necessary, the public prosecutor and police officer to attend the meeting and complete an MSD if it is convinced that the plea bargaining application was submitted voluntarily under a case that was started on a police report or not. The court has an obligation to make sure that all parties are acting willingly during this procedure. It is the court's responsibility to make sure that all parties are willingly taking part in the proceedings, and the victim or accused may attend the meeting with their pleader if they so choose.

The court will receive a report of the mutually satisfactory disposition (MSD)

In accordance with Section 265-D, the court must then prepare a report of the successful MSD disposition, which must be signed by the presiding officer of the court and all parties involved. However, if the MSD failed, the court must document its findings and then continue the case in line with the CrPC's requirements from the point at which the plea application was submitted.

Resolution of the case

After the case has been satisfactorily resolved under the preceding section, the court will proceed under Section 265-E to compensate the victim in accordance with the resolution reached while also hearing from the parties on pertinent issues, such as the severity of the sentence. The accused may then be placed on probation in order to benefit from any applicable laws, such as Section 360 of the CrPC, the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958, or another statute. The accused will then be sentenced to half of the minimum punishment for that offense if the court determines that there is a provision stating the minimum punishment for that offense. Additionally, in some situations, the term is reduced by one-fourth of the penalty stipulated or, if applicable, extended for that offense.

Court's Ruling

According to Section 265-F, the court must render its decision in public and have the presiding officer sign it in accordance with the conditions of the preceding section.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

The Judgment's Finality

According to Section 265-G, the court's decision will be regarded as final. Additionally, no court may hear an appeal against such a ruling other than through a writ petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Indian Constitution or a Special Leave Petition (SLP) under Article 136 of the Constitution. The court's authority in plea negotiations

According to Section 265-H, the court will have all the authority required to carry out its duties under this chapter, including the authority to grant bail, hold trials for offenses, and handle other case-resolution-related issues as specified by this Code of CrPC.

The accused's period of incarceration will be deducted from their jail term. According to **Section 265-1, Section 428 of the CrPC** will be applied in this instance, and the accused's prior custody period will be deducted from the amount of time they have been imprisoned. This will operate similarly to how it does with regard to incarceration under other sections of this Code.

Savings

According to **Section 265-),** the provisions in this Chapter will be enforceable regardless of any conflicting provisions in other sections of this Code, and no interpretation of this Chapter's contents will be constrained by any of the competing provisions indicated above. Additionally, the word "public prosecutor" will have the same meaning as defined in clause (u) of Section 2 for the purposes of this Chapter, including an assistant public prosecutor appointed under Section 25 of the CrPC.

Lack of use of the chapter

According to Section 265-L, no juvenile or child as defined in clause (k) of Section 2 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000, shall be covered by anything in this Chapter.

VII. BENEFITS OF PLEA BARGAINING

(A) Advantages for the accused

One of the main reasons a person chooses to accept his guilt under the concept of plea bargaining is because he thinks that by accepting the charges and entering a plea, he will receive some relief in the punishment, and there may be a possibility that, even if he receives punishment, it will not be the maximum amount allowed for that offense. Additionally, he might be punished for some less serious counts even if the sentence is not lowered.

It is a well-known reality that despite the legal system's many reforms, the average person still

faces several challenges. Therefore, a person would rather swiftly complete the trial by admitting his guilt and entering into a plea agreement in order to avoid being overwhelmed by the system and dealing with worry and anxiety.

A guilty person who enters a plea will undoubtedly still receive some penalty, but it will be significantly less than what he would typically receive. And this offers him the chance to keep his family relationships intact and fulfill his duties to them.

(B) Advantages for the lawyer

Why By forcing the defendant to enter a guilty plea, the prosecutors (state-appointed victim side attorneys) and defense attorneys lighten their caseload and save time in getting ready for future cases. In this manner, they may take some time for themselves and concentrate on other, more serious matters that are still pending with them.

If the defendant accepts his guilt, the prosecutor's conviction rate likewise increases.

The lawyer's resources, which would otherwise be used to finish the trial, are also conserved and can be used to expedite and streamline the resolution of other cases.

(C) Advantages for the judges

By admitting the charges, the trial is abbreviated, saving the judges' time because these cases are resolved swiftly.

The courts' caseload is also decreased by the speedy resolution of cases through plea bargains. This lowers the case pendency ratio per judge, increasing their efficiency by allowing them to devote enough time to other serious offense cases.

The court may choose to redirect resources to other important crime cases whose trials must be finished more quickly rather than using them for the investigation, document management and organization, etc.

(D) Advantages for the victim

If the lawyers are able to persuade the defendant to admit his guilt through the plea bargaining process, which may result in a reduced sentence, the victim will no longer have to worry about whether he will receive justice because, if other circumstances also support it, the defendant will be found guilty with certainty.

If the defendant decides to enter into a plea bargain, the victim will also receive some respite from the emotional stress, trauma, and worry that they endured during the court procedures. Sometimes, individuals would rather have mental peace than see the accused person punished

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

for his wrongdoing.

(E) Potential disadvantages of plea bargaining

By entering a plea of bargaining, the accused undoubtedly acknowledges his guilt and even receives punishment for his wrongdoing; yet, it is frequently seen that the accused frequently evades penalty in exchange for a fair one, which has no effect on his behaviour. Due to the opportunity to enter a guilty plea to a lower charge without going to trial, plea bargaining can also result in the accused individual evading responsibility for their acts. In certain situations, this kind of forbearance might not be warranted.

The victim is typically an ordinary person who is unaware of his rights; if he does not hire a competent lawyer who can provide him with better counsel, the choices he takes will have long-term effects on both society and himself. Thus, choosing a good advocate is usually advised. After coming forward without receiving the appropriate punishment, the guilty party may attempt to harm the victim once more.

VIII. LANDMARK CASE LAWS

Re: Policy Strategy for Grant of Bail (2022)

In this recent ruling, the Supreme Court of India established a number of rules for the resolution of cases, incorporating ideas such as compounding offenses, plea bargaining, and the use of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.

Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra (1976)

Although plea bargaining as a formal legal process is not specifically addressed in this case, it does subtly draw attention to several aspects of negotiation and leniency expectations that may be connected to plea bargaining. Notably, this was the first instance when the Indian Supreme Court recognized the idea of plea bargaining. The court emphasized the potential value of plea bargaining in suitable circumstances for the effective and timely resolution of criminal cases, albeit acknowledging that the idea is not included in the Code of Criminal Procedure.

IX. CONCLUSION

In the Indian criminal justice system, plea bargaining is both an essential function and a useful instrument. It facilitates communication between the prosecution and the accused, opening the door to a win-win solution that offers a different way to resolve criminal cases, encourages court efficiency, and protects judicial resources. Plea bargains can assist resolve criminal cases fairly and quickly while also accelerating the legal process. Judges must, however, use their discretion carefully and sensibly when granting plea deals, keeping in mind the nature and gravity of the

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

offense, the victim's requirements and interests, and the effect on the administration of justice. By taking these things into account, judges may make sure that plea bargaining preserves the integrity of the legal system while helping to resolve criminal cases in a fair and effective manner. Therefore, this plea bargaining tool has two sides, good and negative, just like any coin. Whichever side can make a stronger case in front of the court will determine the final result. Therefore, it is important to employ this tool sparingly and carefully while considering the public interest.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]