

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL AFFAIRS AND
EXPLORATION**

Volume 3 | Issue 6

2025

Website: www.ijlae.com

Email: editor@ijlae.com

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SHIFT FROM THE INDIAN PENAL CODE (IPC) TO THE BHARATIYA NYAYA SANHITA (BNS), 2023: CONTINUITY OR TRANSFORMATION

Rishika Naha

2nd Year Law Student, IILM University Greater Noida

&

Adv. Paras Yadav

Assistant Professor, IILM University Greater Noida

Abstract

In a revolutionary reform of the entire structure presiding over the criminal laws in India, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) repeals and replaces the law of the Indian Penal Code of 1860 (IPC). It is an overhaul after more than 150 years. The BNS, introduced together with the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA), and the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), however, aims to modernize, decolonize, and Indianize the criminal justice system. The present essay imparts a critical evaluation of whether or not BNS demonstrates the true metamorphosis or is a creature more of an extension of the IPC doctrinally and structurally. This study contrasts both statutes through textual analysis, legislative intent, and relevant judicial precedents. The major innovations identified within BNS evidently codified aggravated crime, terrorist activity, and mob lynching; replaced sedition with offences against the sovereignty, unity, and integrity of India; and formulated community service as a new mode of sentencing. The primary sources stand comprised of India Code publications, notifications in the official Gazette, and such correspondence tables as were made by the MHA, while Law Commission Reports, reports from PRS, and scholarly commentary formed the secondary sources. From the findings, it can be stated that BNS represents moderation in reforms. This has

brought in some changes and innovations-restorative punishments, recognition of collective criminal enterprises, and inclusion of terrorism in the main penal code-while maintaining continuity with the IPC. The presence of some provisions on criminal defamation, the exception-based marital rape, and the traditional doctrines of liability elucidates the structural inheritance from the IPC. In brief, the BNS modernizes crime classification and sentencing, retaining the substance of the IPC, resulting in a blend of continuity and change rather than radical transformation.

Keywords: Sedition, terrorism, organized crime, mob lynching, marital rape exception, community service, criminal law reform.

I. Introduction

The *Indian Penal Code*, formulated in 1860 with the assistance of *Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay*, has reigned supreme for almost a century and a half in the criminal justice system of India. Colonial and post-independent India has witnessed the IPC giving a thorough codification of crimes, punishments, and legal theories that formed the foundation of substantive criminal law. The IPC's colonial roots, Victorian moral foundations, and retributive orientation continued to influence the delivery of criminal justice well into the twenty-first century, despite the passage of a slew of amendments and interpretations by courts. With crimes becoming ever more complex, ranging from organized crime syndicates to cyber offenses; it was both urgent and compelling to usher in reforms pertaining to the IPC. Human rights and procedural justice were farthest from the thoughts of the drafters, who stole from an alien system of justice. In December 2023, the Indian Parliament decided to update the whole criminal justice system. This resulted in the passing of three laws:

1. *The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)* — replacing the **IPC**,
2. The *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)* — replacing the *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* and
3. The *Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA)* — replacing the *Indian Evidence Act, 1872*.

In order to decolonize India's criminal laws, this legislative trial was presented as a historic change. The Ministry of Home Affairs conceived a system that replaced the colonial, punishment-oriented system with a victim-centered, justice-oriented, and technology-enabled one, harmonizing with India's social realities and constitutional values. Although these laws became effective on July 1, 2024, some provisions were still notified in a staggered manner and with a view to allowing states and institutions to prepare. Implementation, nevertheless, became an uneven and slow affair for other reasons, such as requiring new training, digital preparedness, and an infrastructural setup on the part of institutions. The reform nevertheless stands as a watershed in the legal history of India.

II. Methods and Materials

1. The official **BNS** text¹, (cross-checked against the India Code and the MHA Gazette) is used in this doctrinal and comparative study.
2. Official comparison tables and correspondence between IPC and BNS sections.
3. Reputable primers and legislative briefs.
4. Credible news reports and explainer articles to monitor early adoption.
5. The case law on arrests, defamation (written or spoken), adultery, speech offences, privacy, **Section 377**, etc., lay down by Supreme Courts and High Courts of India.

III. Legislative Structure: The Shift from IPC to BNS

A. Implementation and Initiation

- The **IPC**, 1860 is replaced by the **BNS**, 2023, which unifies and modifies substantive criminal law. Along with **BNSS** and **BSA**, it was approved on December 25, 2023, and went into effect on July 1, 2024 (with notice being given gradually for **Section 106(2)** at first).

B. Restructuring

¹ Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, *The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023*, Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Pt. II, Sec. 1, No. 45 (25 Dec. 2023).

- Offenses are renumbered and reorganized into updated chapters by the **BNS** (e.g., separate treatment for organized crime, terrorism, and specific aggravated forms of homicide). Comparison tables were provided by the state police and the **BPRD** (Bureau of police research and development) to ensure consistency in training and interpretation.

C. Policy Justification

- The government prioritized improving victim-centric justice, eradicating colonial remnants, and utilizing technology (e-FIR, e-evidence, and video-links—mostly through **BNSS/BSA**). This orientation is reflected in early state-level trainings and directives.

IV. Continuities: What Stays Consistent

While the **BNS** contains marquee changes, **substantial continuity** persists:

1. Definitions and Components of Core Offenses. By renumbering and making minor linguistic changes, many offenses (such as theft, cheating, hurt, etc.) replicate **IPC** elements while maintaining judicial gloss and precedent, which is beneficial for legal certainty and day-one operability.
2. With regards to retaining criminal defamation, below is a comment on **BNS Section 356**. It is an extension of the provisions of **IPC Sections 499-500** as they relate to criminal defamation and will continue to be retained therein mainly under **BNS Section 356** (definition in sub-section (1), punishment postponed to and aligned herewith). In light of the Supreme Court's ruling regarding the constitutional validity of criminal defamation in *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India* (2016)²; thus the retention of the **BNS** was in consonance with this judgment. Sentence restructuration higher business and lower perplexity: The Supreme Court of India kept that part of the ruling, found it to be in consonance with *de jure* mandates.
3. Retaining the Marital Rape Exception (**BNS Section 63, Exception 2**)³
4. Similar to post-**POCSO** harmonization, the **BNS** maintains the *Exception 2*. Foundational Doctrines and General Exceptions The general exceptions, notions such as common

² *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India*, (2016) 7 SCC 221 : AIR 2016 SC 2728.

³ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s. 63, Exception 2.

intention, attempt, abetment, conspiracy, and private defense remain conceptually continuous, preserving decades of doctrinal development⁴.

Continuity—Result: By minimizing disruption and allowing for focused innovations, the **BNS** guarantees interpretive continuity for courts and practitioners.

V. Transformation: Substantial Shifts

1. All such acts which appear to the BNS to endanger the integrity, unity, or sovereignty of India, are punished under Section 152 of the BNS, and IPC Section 124A (Sedition) is a hereby exception.

- **Section 152⁵** of the **BNS** punishes acts that appear to jeopardize India's integrity, unity, and sovereignty; **IPC Section 124A** (Sedition) is excluded. Whereas the policy charge is a departure from the colonial concept of sedition toward an offense to protect sovereignty. Opponents claim that **Section 152** could very well be overbroad and therefore work much the same way.
- Second, K.Santhakumari, our second contributor on the subject of pornography, has made it quite plain that an aesthetic, rather than anthropological approach to the study of sex, would serve the feminist desire far better. In addition, *Balwant Singh⁶* (1995) advised against using slogans carelessly without inciting others. These guidelines and **Article 19(1)⁷** proportionality will probably be used to gauge how **BNS Section 152** is applied.

2. Terrorism by banking, impersonation of persons while engaged in broad activities of finance and securities, called "terrorism banking, finance, securities" (BNS Section).

- The **BNS** offers terrorism as a crime in the IPC-replacement, and it clearly shows the intention to threaten unity, integrity, and security as a nation, as well as to intimidate the

⁴ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), chs. III-IV.

⁵ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s. 152.

⁶ *Balwant Singh and Anr. V. State of Punjab*, (1995) 3 SCC 709 : AIR 1995 SC 1785.

⁷ The Constitution of India, art. 19(1).

populace or disrupt public order-even though it was basically covered in the UAPA (Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, 1967).

- Issues: the scope (such as "disturb public order") may make it difficult to distinguish it from less serious public order offenses.

3. Organized Crime (BNS Section 111) and Syndicate Liability.

- One noteworthy addition to the central code is **Section 111**⁸, which defines and penalizes organized crime and membership in organized crime syndicates. This section reflects previous special laws like MCOCA (Maharashtra Control of Organized Crime Act, 1999) from Indian states.

4. Mob Lynching as an Intensified Form of Murder (BNS Section 103(2))

- In regard to systemic vigilantism, **Section 103(2)**⁹ recognizes mob lynching when it occurs by conjunction of five or more individuals based on particular criteria of discrimination (caste, community, language, belief, etc.) to make it punishable by death.

5. Leaves out By-law Implementation (BNS section 106) Section 106

- **Section 106 (1)**¹⁰: A person who causes a house by any rash or negligent act that shall amount to a second-degree misdemeanor also can get a punishment for both from the fine and such imprisonments that can last for up to five years. On the other hand, if such an act is committed by registered medical practitioners while doing the medical procedure, both imprisonments shall not last for more than two years and would incur a fine as well.
- **Section 106(2):** Rashness, negligence embrace the death of the victim reported to a police officer or a magistrate soon after his escape. The offender shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and fine 6 Community service as a sentencing innovation.

⁸ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s. 111.

⁹ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s. 103 (2).

¹⁰ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s. 106 (1).

- **BNS Section 4(f)** formally introduces community service as a form of punishment, which is new in Indian central criminal law. Additionally, some offenses specifically offer community service as an alternative or even required punishment (e.g., petty theft first offenses as per **Section 303(2)** proviso; public drunkenness **Section 355**; defamation **Section 356(2)**; attempted suicide in a context of coercion **Section 226**; unlawful trade by public servants **Section 202**; non-appearance under **BNSS Section 84** via **BNS Section 209**). Courts have sentenced offenders in accordance with guidelines that have been communicated by state governments and High Courts.

6. Decriminalization & Omission: Adultery and “Unnatural Offences”

- In accordance with *Joseph Shine*¹¹ (2018), who decriminalized adultery (**IPC Section 497**) while maintaining civil penalties, it is not included. The **BNS** does not reinstate the consensual adult scope of **IPC Section 377**, which was previously overturned in *Navtej Singh Johar*¹² (2018). There are still calls to create sexual offenses that are gender-neutral.

Transformation—Outcome: **BNS** modernizes sanctions (community service) and introduces new harm categories (terrorism, organized crime, lynching) while calibrating penalties (hit-and-run). However, it keeps the contentious offenses and clauses (defamation, marital rape exception), which are the subject of normative discussion.

VI. Doctrinal Analysis through Constitutional Case Law

A. Speech and State Security: Section 152 vs. IPC Section 124A

- According to *Kedar Nath*, sedition is limited to incitement or violence. For the **BNS Section 152** to be constitutional, it must be applied with the same clear-and-present-danger discipline; otherwise, it runs the risk of being overly broad and vague (see *Shreya*

¹¹ *Joseph Shine vs. Union of India* (2018) 3 SCC 39 : AIR 2018 SC 4898.

¹² *Navtej Singh Johar and Others v. Union of India* (2018) 10 SCC 1.

*Singhal*¹³, which declared the **Section 66A IT Act** unconstitutional due to its vagueness).

Proximate incitement and intent should be required by enforcement guidelines.

B. Adultery and Section377: Privacy, Autonomy, and Decriminalization

- *Navtej* and *Puttaswamy* reframed sexual autonomy from the ordinary sense of that word while Joseph Shine decriminalized adultery. By excluding adultery, the **BNS** conforms with these judgments by excluding adultery and not re-enacting Section 377 for consensual acts.

C. Taking into Account Privacy, Autonomy, and Decriminalization: Adultery and Section377

- *Navtej* and *Puttaswamy* redefined the sexual autonomy in the ordinary connotation. Joe Shine made adultery not illegal anymore and thus with these judgments, the **BNS** now excludes adultery and is not enacting **Section 377** again for consensual acts.

D. Privacy, Autonomy, and Decriminalization: Adultery and Section377

- "Navtej" and "Puttaswamy," while Joseph Shine's decriminalization of adultery, indeed redefined sexual autonomy according to common parlance. The **BNS**, therefore, by excluding adultery, means adhering to these judgments, and **Section 377** not being reenacted for consensual acts.

E. Defamation, Reputation, and Section356

- In accordance with *Subramanian Swamy* (2016), the **BNS** maintains criminal defamation. Critics, however, prefer restorative alternatives, takedowns, and civil remedies to criminalization in the digital age. One small reform signal for defamation is the use of community service as a sentencing option.

F. The Marital Rape Exception and Gender Justice

¹³ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015) AIR 2015 SC 1523.

- The principles of equality (**Article 14**¹⁴), nondiscrimination (**Article 15**¹⁵), and bodily autonomy (**Article 21**¹⁶) are all at odds with **BNS Section 63 Exception 2**. Given that ongoing litigation considers this to be unconstitutional, law reform may move toward consent-based, gender-neutral sexual offense drafting.

VII. Thematic Comparisons (Selected Offences)

A. Table: IPC → BNS Key Correspondences (Illustrative)

- **Section 124A** of the **IPC** was omitted; **BNS Section 152** (Acts endangering sovereignty, unity, and integrity) took its place.
- Defamation (**IPC Sections 499–500**) → **BNS Section 356** (definition and punishment carried, with updated structuring; community service possible).
- Public Intoxication/Misconduct (**IPC Section 510**) → **BNS Section 355** (possible community service).
- Divine Displeasure (**IPC Section 508**) → **BNS Section 354** (no significant change).
- Rape (**IPC Section 375/376**) → **BNS Section 63**/related (Exception 2 maintained the 18-year threshold).
- Causing death by negligence (**IPC Section 304A**) → **BNS Section 106 (1)**; **Section 106 (2)** increases the maximum penalty for aggravated fleeing the scene to 10 years.

B. New/Expanded Offences

- Terrorism (**BNS Section 113**)—introduces a fundamental idea into the code, referencing **UAPA** (e.g., what "proceeds of terrorism" means). Discussions center on overlap and breadth.
- **BNS Section 111**, organized crime, centralizes syndicate offenses and imposes membership liability.
- Group murder motivated by bias is considered aggravated by **BNS Section 103(2)**, which addresses mob lynching.

¹⁴ The Constitution of India, art. 14.

¹⁵ The Constitution of India art. 15.

¹⁶ The Constitution of India art. 21.

- Hit-and-Run (**BNS Section 106(2)**): This section clarified that the statute does not specify a fixed ₹7 lakh fine, but it did sharply increase the penalties for running away after a fatally negligent driving incident.

C. Sentencing and Sanctions

- In keeping with restorative justice, community service is made a mandatory punishment. Governments and courts have started putting rules and assignments into practice.

VIII. Case Studies (with Sections and Early Signals)

Case Study 1: From Sedition to Section 152—A Protest Speech

A possible set of facts: The student leader makes a passionate speech denouncing the government's policies and advocating civil disobedience in a peaceful manner. Outside the chant, there is no violence at all.

Legal under IPC (pre-BNS): **Section 124A**¹⁷ invocation risk, but *Kedar Nath/Balwant Singh* needed to have incited or had a tendency to cause public disorder; political dissent alone was not enough.

Section 152 of the BNS may be used if the speech jeopardizes integrity, unity, or sovereignty. Application must adhere to *Kedar Nath*'s proximity/incitement standard in order to pass constitutional muster; otherwise, it is susceptible to *Shreya Singhal*'s vagueness/over breadth challenge. Continuity in doctrine should prevent abuse; if courts follow precedent, changing the label might not change the results.

Case Study 2: Digital Defamation (Early BNS Use)

Facts (actual report):

¹⁷ The Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860), s. 124A.

Police brought a case against a mother-in-law and spouse for making derogatory remarks on social media using the **IT Act** and the **BNS** defamation provisions.

Legal hook: BNS Sections 356(2)/ (3) (punishment, including community service) and **356(1)** (definition). This demonstrates the ongoing criminalization of a new sentencing mechanism.

Case Study 3: Hit-and-Run—Flight After Fatality (BNS Section106)

Facts (typical): A pedestrian is killed by a driver who then runs away.

According to **BNS**: If the driver runs away without reporting, **Section 106(2)** imposes a maximum penalty of 10 years plus a fine (non-bail able, cognizable). If the driver reports right away, **Section 106(1)** baseline liability applies. The fine amount (₹7 lakh is not fixed by the statute) was clarified as a result of public discussion.

Case Study 4: Mob Lynching—Aggravated Murder (BNS Section103 (2))

Facts (speculative based on pattern):

Based on caste, a group of six men lynch a victim.

This is considered aggravated murder under Section 103(2) of the BNS, which carries a life sentence and a fine. This acknowledgment of bias-driven group killings is revolutionary and consistent with the objective of deterring vigilantism.

Case Study 5: Marital Rape Exception—Constitutional Fault line

Doctrinal facts:

A wife claims her husband had extramarital affairs; the marriage is still in place, and she is older than 18.

Section 63, Exception 2 of the **BNS** prohibits rape charges in these situations. The Delhi High Court and others have raised interpretive issues following *Navtej* and *Puttaswamy*, and ongoing

litigation claims that this violates **Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21**. This is an unresolved constitutional question where the policy choice is continuity rather than transformation.

IX. Early Implementation: Administrative Signals

States have been instructed to adopt **e-FIR/e-summons** and video-linkage for testimony, as well as to align investigations and supervision with new categories, such as SP-level oversight for lynching, terrorism, and organized crime. To achieve the transformative goals of the **BNS/BNSS/BSA**, this administrative modernization is essential.

X. Critical Evaluation: Continuity or Transformation?

We assess the **BNS** along three axes:

A. Continuity

- Substantive Carry-overs: A significant portion of the **IPC** doctrine is still in place, including general exceptions, attempted, abetted, and conspiratorial offenses, theft, cheating, injury, and homicide (base form), maintaining established interpretations. The exceptions for marital rape and defamation still apply.

Implication: Limited rupture; predictability in adjudication and prosecution.

B. Recalibration

- **Speech/State Security:** The state-security narrative is reframed when "sedition" is substituted with **Section 152**. To prevent overreach, its application must follow *Kedar Nath* and *Shreya Singhal*; therefore, there should be more recalibration rather than a complete overhaul.
- **Negligent Homicide in Traffic:** **Section 106(2)** addresses flight after an accident, filling a long-standing enforcement void and serving as a significant policy push for accountability.

C. Innovation

- **New Crime Ecosystems:** Section 113¹⁸ against terrorism, Section 111 against organized crime, and Section 103(2) against lynching shift the focus of the code to modern harms and criminal enterprise and collective liability—true additions.
- **Community Service:** Restorative sentencing, which is revolutionary for low-level offenses, is introduced by Section 4(f) and offence-specific provisions. It is currently institutionalized through state guidelines and early court orders.

In summary, the **BNS** is not a complete overhaul or a simple rebranding. It combines targeted transformation (new offenses, sentencing options, aggravated forms), administrative modernization (primarily through **BNSS/BSA**), and continuity (doctrinal backbone).

XI. Reform Agenda: Where Do We Go From Here?

- To avoid stifling dissent, clarify **Section 152** (Sovereignty Offence):
Legislative notes or model guidelines codifying *Kedar Nath* thresholds (intent, tendency, proximity to violence).
- Narrow **Section 113** (Terrorism):
Make sure **UAPA-BNS** harmony is maintained by calibrating the "public order" limb to avoid sweeping in rioting or mob violence that is already covered elsewhere.
- Gender-Just Sexual Offence Drafting:
Go over **Section 63 Exception 2** in order to draft consent-based, gender-neutral language that complies with the law's views on privacy, dignity, and autonomy.
- Criminal Defamation:
In view of the realities of the digital age and its chilling effects, take into consideration decriminalization or a strong shift toward community service, apology/mediation, and civil remedies.
- Implementation Capacity:
Make significant investments in forensic, cyber, community policing, and bias-crime training; employ E-Systems vigorously for new offenses (organized crime, lynching, and terrorism).

¹⁸ The Bharati Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act no. 45 of 2023), s, 113

XII. Conclusion

In India's criminal law system, the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023**, is a hybrid reform that combines continuity and change at the same time. It is not merely a cosmetic renaming of the **Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC)** nor does it represent a significant break from the past. To ensure that the shift from the colonial code to the new Indian code does not undermine the body of existing criminal jurisprudence, it instead shows an effort to strike a balance between the demands of modernization and the requirement of legal continuity.

The **BNS**'s choice to keep most of the **IPC**'s doctrinal underpinnings and structural framework accounts for the continuity. *Mens rea*, *actus reus*, abetment, conspiracy, attempt, and common intention are among the general principles of criminal liability that have not changed. In addition to allowing courts to rely on over 150 years of case law established under the **IPC**, this retention maintains interpretive consistency. By doing this, the **BNS** ensures that judicial precedents are maintained, legal certainty is maintained, and interpretation does not abruptly upend the criminal justice system. This continuity is also pragmatic: in a country as large and diverse as India, with overburdened courts and uneven enforcement capacities, a complete reinvention of criminal law would have been all but impossible.

However, it is impossible to overlook the **BNS**'s transformative aspect. A deliberate attempt to address modern social realities is evident in the addition of mob-lynching as a separate aggravated form of homicide, the official inclusion of organized crime and terrorism in the main code, and the addition of hit-and-run aggravation under **Section 106(2)**. Because the **IPC** was created in a colonial setting, it was unable to foresee the new and developing types of criminal behavior that are addressed by these provisions. Community service as a form of discharge in the legal system is a definite shift from penal thinking of the 19th century toward a restorative and rehabilitative conception of justice. The proposed sentencing scheme is in broad accord with modern criminological theory around the world, whose focus is not on retribution but on rehabilitation.

Citations (Laws, Official Documents and Briefs)

Citations (Laws, Official Documents, and Briefs)

1. *The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023 (No. 45 of 2023) Official Gazette and the **India Penal Code** text.
2. The Indian Code's section-by-section **BNS** (e.g., **Section 111** Organized Crime; **Section 113 Terrorist Act**).
3. Official Comparison/Correspondence Tables that map **IPC** to **BNS (BPRD; UP Police)**.
4. **BPRD** New Criminal Laws Handbook/Primer (**BNS/BNSS/BSA**).
5. PRS Legislative Briefs/Notes on **BNS**.
6. Reuters and reliable news sources on policy framing and commencement.
7. State implementation reports, such as those on NE readiness, community service notifications, early sentences, and Orissa SP oversight.

Case Laws:--

- The case of *State of Bihar v. Kedar Nath Singh*, **AIR 1962 SC 955**
- The case of *Balwant Singh v. State of Punjab*, **AIR 1955 SC 1785**
- The case of *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, **AIR 2015 SC 1523**
- The case of *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, **AIR 2018 SC (CRI) 1169**
- The case of *Joseph Shine v. Union of India*, **AIR 2018 SC 4898**
- The case of *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India*, **2016 7 SCC 221**

Appendix A: Important BNS Citations (with Brief Notes)

- Community service is added as a form of punishment in **Section 4(f)**.
- **Section 63** (Exception 2): Marital rape exception.
- Mob lynching (5+ people, bias grounds) is considered aggravated murder under **Section 103(2)**.
- **Section 106(1)–(2)**: Negligence-related death; evading accident scene (up to 10 years).
- **Section 111**: Liability for syndicates and organized crime.
- **Section 113**: Terrorist Act; uses terms from the **UAPA**.
- **Section 152**: **Acts that compromise sovereignty, unity, and integrity (instead of sedition)**.

- **Induction of Divine Displeasure (Section 354), which is a carryover from Section 508.**
- **Section 355:** Public intoxication (possible community service).
- **Section 356(1)–(4):** Definition of defamation and penalty (option for community service).