



Critical analysis of the objectives of punishment: deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation and reform

N Shrivardhini¹, Lekshmi²

¹ Anvikshiki School of Law, SCSVMV University, Tamil Nadu, India

² Assistant Professor, Anvikshiki School of Law, SCSVMV University, Tamil Nadu, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66856/ijl.2026.12.4.12341>

Abstract

Penology is a branch of criminology centered on understanding punishment, how it gets planned and executed, and how lawbreakers are handled within the legal system. Since organized society began, thinkers, lawmakers, and change makers have cared deeply about how to handle wrongdoers. This study explores what penology means, how it is defined, and the subjects it covers. It also investigates how penology connects with criminology and victimology. It traces how punishment evolved from ancient revenge to modern correctional systems, and carefully analyzes the four core reasons for punishing people: stopping others from wrongdoing, ensuring offenders get what they deserve, helping them improve, and bettering society. The paper then examines how these concepts operate in the Indian criminal justice system by reviewing significant statements from the Supreme Court and High Courts of India. A comparison of the four theories evaluates their effectiveness and continuing relevance in today's criminal policy. The study demonstrates that no single punishment type can completely achieve criminal justice aims on its own. Instead, applying a mix of deterrence, fair retribution, and offender rehabilitation, based on the specific crime and person, is the best path to fair justice. Suggestions are offered to improve prison management and sentencing decisions in India.

Keywords: Penology, punishment, deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation, reformation, criminal justice, sentencing policy, indian penal code

Introduction

Crime has existed since the dawn of human society, alongside society's methods for dealing with it. Every human group, from small tribes to large modern countries, faces two main questions: why a rule-breaker should be punished, and how that punishment should occur. Penology is the scientific field that examines these topics clearly. It draws on law, sociology, psychology, philosophy, and criminology to study the nature, purpose, and impact of punishment on both offenders and society. Penology carries immense value in the modern world. With rising crime, crowded prisons, and a growing societal focus on human rights during punishment, a government's chosen punishments reveal its beliefs about law and fairness. India, operating as a welfare state bound by its constitutional framework to reform offenders, offers a unique example of how traditional punishment concepts have shifted, adapted, and faced judicial rethinking. This study creates a clear understanding by examining penology's meaning, definition, scope, and ties to related fields like criminology and victimology. It reviews past uses of punishment, evaluates the four main punishment theories, investigates how punishment works in India through key court decisions, and concludes with a careful evaluation, change suggestions, and study methods.

Meaning and Definition of Penology

The word "penology" derives from the Latin "poena," meaning "punishment" or "pain," and the Greek "logos," meaning "study" or "science." Penology is essentially the study of punishment. It forms part of criminal science that looks at society's efforts to stop crime and assist lawbreakers.

Experts offer slightly varying definitions, yet the core remains identical. Sutherland and Cressey define penology

as the study of punishing and aiding wrongdoers, including the management of prisons and offender treatment facilities ^[1]. Sir Walter Moberly described penology as the study of the reasons and ideas behind punishment ^[2]. Simply put, penology is the systematic study of offender punishment, the rules guiding it, and methods for helping, changing, and restoring convicted criminals.

Penology extends beyond legal study or sentence suggestions. It investigates the government's right to punish, the goals of punishment, correctional systems like prisons, reformatories, and probation, and the effects of punishment on offenders, victims, and society.

Scope of Penology

Penology covers a wide spectrum, spanning both punishment theory and practical execution. The field generally includes:

- The Philosophy of Punishment examines why society punishes and the moral and intellectual reasons for inflicting pain or removing freedoms.
- It studies punishment theories like deterrence, revenge, prevention, reform, and compensation, comparing their effectiveness.
- Sentence Policy involves examining how courts decide punishments, matching punishments to crimes, aggravating or mitigating factors, and judicial discretion.
- Prison Administration covers correctional facility organization, operation, and prisoner rights.
- Alternatives to jail include probation, parole, community service, open prisons, and other methods avoiding incarceration.
- Rehabilitation services include job training, education, counseling, and mental health support to reintegrate offenders.

- Juvenile Justice handles special care and treatment for young offenders, addressing their unique needs.
- Ongoing debates surround the death penalty, its efficacy, and its legality.

Briefly, penology connects big justice ideas with real-world prisons, court rulings, and the experiences of punished individuals.

Relationship between Criminology, Penology, Victimology

Criminology, penology, and victimology are three connected yet distinct crime studies. Criminology broadly views crime as a social phenomenon, studying its origins, offender profiles, crime patterns, and social causes. Penology is a branch of criminology dealing with governmental reactions to crime through punishment.

Victimology is a newer criminal study field focusing on crime victims rather than perpetrators. It examines victim involvement, injuries, support, compensation, and restitution options. Criminology studies crime causes, penology focuses on offender handling, and victimology examines victim recovery.

These three areas fit together within a bigger picture. Fair criminal policies require complete knowledge of crime causes from criminology, which informs penology. Modern corrections increasingly focus on victim experiences. Financial victim aid, offender-victim reconciliation, and acknowledging crime impact are growing common. Punishment must be viewed alongside victim harm.

Historical Development of Punishment

The history of punishment reveals human civilization's evolution through four distinct stages.

a. The Era of Private Vengeance

In ancient times, individuals handled punishment between the wrongdoer and the victim or their family. Without central government or organized systems, responses came from individuals or tribes. Such punishment lacked fairness, often exceeding the actual wrongdoing and triggering long-lasting family or group feuds.

b. The Era of Lex Talionis

As civilizations grew structured, lex talionis, the law of retaliation, emerged. Captured in the phrase “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth,” this concept stopped people from seeking unguided revenge. Punishments matched the harm done to remain fair and controlled. Found in codes like Hammurabi and early Mosaic law, this marked a move toward balanced punishment.

c. The Era of Divine and Supreme punishment

Under monarchies and theocratic governments, punishment symbolized ruler or divine authority. Medieval European punishments were strict, public, and painful, designed to display absolute control and enforce obedience.

d. The Era of Humanisation and Reform

The eighteenth-century Age of Enlightenment brought a major shift in punishment thought.

Cesare Beccaria's book *On Crimes and Punishments* argued for fairness^[3], ending torture, and certainty over harshness to stop crime. Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism judged punishment by the suffering caused versus societal good.

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries focused increasingly on reforming offenders, shaped by psychology and criminology views seeing criminals as individuals capable of change.

Concept and Nature of Punishment

Punishment occurs when the government, via legal process, deprives a convicted criminal of freedom, comfort, or certain rights. Judicial punishment differs from other pain due to specific reasons.

- First, proper authority like government courts must administer it.
- Second, a wrong must occur alongside a fair guilt-proving process.
- Third, punishment must cause hardship, such as freedom, financial, or life loss.
- Fourth, punishment is intentional, not accidental or cruel.
- Its goals include societal objectives like stopping crime, maintaining safety, and proving law fairness.

Punishment combines offender suffering with broader societal goals.

Objectives of Punishments

The state uses punishment to achieve one or more of four goals, each based on a different reason for exercising criminal authority. These goals, discussed in subsequent sections, aim to stop bad behavior, punish wrongdoers, help them change, and guide better behavior. These goals often overlap, and modern justice systems like India's mix these ideas based on the crime and offender.

Deterrence Theory of Punishment

Deterrence theory assumes punishment stops offenders and others through fear of consequences. It operates via specific deterrence, stopping a specific person from repeating bad acts, and general deterrence, warning society that bad actions have bad results. Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian views inspired deterrence, as he believed people weigh potential benefits against caught consequences^[4]. He argued punishment must be sure, quick, and fair. Cesare Beccaria also noted punishment certainty most strongly prevents crime^[5].

Advantages: Deterrence is easy to understand and practice. It matches the public feeling that wrongdoing requires punishment. It helps in planned crimes like economic offenses where costs and benefits are weighed.

Criticism: Criminology studies question whether severe punishments, including the death penalty, reduce crime. The theory assumes overly logical offender thinking, ignoring that many act from strong emotions, poverty, coercion, or mental issues. Overemphasizing deterrence creates strict, inhumane punishments.

Retributive Theory of Punishment

Retributive theory states punishment is justified by fairness. Lawbreakers should receive punishments matching their caused harm based on desert, independent of future utility. Immanuel Kant^[6], a retributivism supporter, believed punishment belongs only to committed crimes, not societal

utility, as using offenders for society violates their dignity. This idea stems from *lex talionis*.

Its pros include satisfying public anger over wrongdoing and ensuring sentences match crimes without being too soft or harsh. It views wrongdoers as rational, responsible choosers rather than objects for societal control.

Critics argue extreme retributivism mimics government-approved revenge. A good legal system requires broader societal goals beyond mere payback. Calculating exact suffering for specific wrongdoing remains a difficult, often unfair task.

Rehabilitative Theory of Punishment

Rehabilitative theory contrasts with classical deterrence by viewing crime as a symptom of social, mental, or financial problems requiring fixing rather than mere punishment. Criminals can learn lawful living through medical, mental health, educational, and job support. Prison systems should focus on offender change, not just punishment. This positivist approach, backed by Cesare Lombroso and Enrico Ferri ^[7], views criminal actions as products of biology, mental health, and environment rather than simple bad choices, requiring background understanding.

Pros: This future-focused method stops repeat crimes by fixing root issues like drug use, lack of schooling, and mental health problems instead of mere confinement.

Cons: Focusing solely on help may produce light punishments failing to match crime seriousness, eroding public justice trust. Even well-resourced systems face high relapse rates.

Rehabilitation programs demand heavy resources and prove difficult to measure accurately. The reformatory theory is a different idea from the rehabilitative theory but is closely

connected to it. It sees punishment mainly as a way to change how someone thinks and behaves, helping them live a normal, lawful life after they are released. Reformation focuses on improving a criminal's behavior through moral growth, learning, job training, and teaching self-discipline while they are in prison. Rehabilitation, on the other hand, usually means treating health or medical problems that might be causing someone to commit crimes. The rise of the juvenile justice system and the creation of places like borstal schools, open prisons, and probation programs helped make the reformatory approach more popular in the 20th century. These programs aimed to help offenders, especially young or first-time offenders, change their behavior so they can become productive members of society rather than just locking them up or punishing them.

Merits: The reformatory theory believes that people can change and become better, which is especially useful for young or first-time offenders. Their actions might be influenced by things like being too young, pressure from friends, or bad situations, not because they are naturally bad.

Criticism: Like rehabilitation, focusing too much on reform can make people downplay the seriousness of serious crimes. It may not be enough to stop repeat offenders or those who are used to breaking the law. This also places a lot of stress on the state's money and management systems to create major changes and improvements in prisons.

Comparative Analysis of the Four Objectives

When you look at the four theories, it is clear that each one focuses on a different part of the problem with crime and punishment, and none of them works perfectly on its own.

Theory	Primary Focus	Underlying jurisdiction	Principal limitation
Deterrent	Stopping future crimes by both the person who did the crime and by society.	Utilitarian view, fear of getting caught.	Assumes the offender is rational; there is not much real evidence to back this up.
Retributive	Making sure the person who did wrong gets what they deserve in a moral way.	Justice as fair punishment.	There's a chance it could turn into a revenge situation.
Rehabilitative	Fixing the real reasons why someone committed a crime.	Positivist view; crime is a sign of social or medical problems.	It takes a lot of resources and isn't guaranteed to work.
Reformatory	Helping the person become a better person morally and by giving them useful skills to work and live.	People can change.	It might not give enough punishment to those who commit serious or repeated crimes.

The rehabilitative and reformatory theories focus on the person who did the crime, looking at their personal situation and what they could become in the future. On the other hand, the deterrent and retributive theories focus more on the crime itself, stressing how serious the act was and the need to keep society safe and follow the law. In most places, including India, the way laws are handled today uses a mix of different ideas. Courts now look at several things together, like the type of crime, who did it, and what is best for society, instead of just following one set rule strictly.

Punishment under the Indian Criminal Justice System

The four theories mentioned earlier have been intentionally included in the Indian criminal justice system. The punishments mentioned in Section 53 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ^[8] (which are now mostly repeated in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) are death, life

imprisonment, hard or simple jail time, loss of property, and paying a fine. The idea behind the law is to let judges choose punishments that fit how serious the crime was and what situation the person was in, instead of following just one strict idea about punishment. This is clear from the way this clause is written, which lets judges pick from different levels of punishment.

Articles 20, 21, and 22 ^[9] of the Indian Constitution also set up important rules that protect how the government uses its power to punish people. These protections include the rule that you cannot be forced to say something that would harm yourself, and the rule that you cannot be tried more than once for the same crime. Also, it makes sure that no one can lose their life or be held in jail unless the proper legal steps are followed. Over the years, the way courts have understood Article 21 has made the Indian criminal system more focused on reform and protecting human rights,

especially for people who are not yet convicted and the conditions in prisons.

Laws like the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958 ^[10], let courts release first-time offenders on probation instead of sending them to jail. There are also rules for parole and early release based on state prison guidelines. Many states have set up open prisons. There is also the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 ^[11], which makes sure that children who break the law are dealt with in a way that helps them change, not just punishes them.

Important Judicial Decisions

The Indian courts have made important decisions that explain the main idea behind using punishment and set the rules for how sentences should be given.

- Jagmohan Singh v. The Supreme Court of Uttar Pradesh ^[12] said that the absence of sentencing rules does not make the death penalty unfair. It kept the death penalty allowed by the Constitution. The court said judges should choose between life imprisonment and death based on the facts of each case.
- •Bachan Singh v. The Supreme Court ruled in this important case ^[13], creating the "rarest of rare" rule. It said the death penalty should only be used in the most serious situations where putting someone in prison for life is not a possible choice. This indicates a clear judicial preference is for reformative and non-lethal punishment, unless there are extraordinary circumstances.
- Machhi Singh v. The Court ^[14] gave examples to show how the Bachan Singh concept can be applied, by explaining the types of cases that might be seen as falling into the "rarest of rare" category.
- Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration ^[15], The Supreme Court introduced a new way of managing prisons by focusing on reforms and protecting the rights of prisoners. It ruled that prisoners do not lose their basic rights when they enter a prison and that using bar fetters and solitary confinement is not allowed without proper reasons, the guarantee of personal freedom under Article 21 was broken.
- Mohd. Giasuddin v. State of Andhra Pradesh ^[16]: Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer said that only punishing someone for the sake of punishment is not in line with a Constitution that focuses on progress and taking care of people's well-being. He stressed that giving a sentence should be about helping the person change and become better.
- State of Gujarat v. The honorable High Court of Gujarat ^[17] said that the Supreme Court thought about giving wages to prisoners who worked, recognizing that doing useful work while in prison can help them reform and get better.
- Union of India v. V. Sriharan @ Murugan ^[18]: A group of top judges from the Supreme Court looked into whether constitutional courts can give a special type of sentence that includes imprisonment for a fixed period without any reduction, showing the continuing work of the courts in this area. To make sure punishment is not too harsh or too easy between death and normal prison time.

Together, these rulings show that Indian courts have intentionally moved away from a purely. Switching from a punishment approach that focuses on revenge or stopping

future crimes to one that emphasizes helping people change and respecting their human rights, while still considering revenge and deterrence as important, but not the only, goals when deciding sentences for serious and terrible crimes.

Critical Analysis

A detailed look at India's experience shows both significant achievements and ongoing challenges. In a positive way, what was once a strict and colonial punishment system from British rule has become much more humane because of the judiciary's focus on reform, especially through the Bachan Singh doctrine and the legal principles developed under Article 21. There are still many differences between what is talked about in penology and how things are actually done. The goal of reforming the prison system, which is supported by the courts, is being stopped by the continuing problem of overcrowded jails, bad medical and mental health care, and a serious shortage of trained staff who work in prisons. People who are in prison but haven't been convicted yet because their case is still being decided make up a larger share of the prison population than they should. A lot of these prisoners come from families that have little money and few social advantages, which causes serious worries about fairness and equal access to justice when they are sentenced or sent back to court.

Besides that, groups that work on legal changes, such as the Malimath Committee ^[19] and the Madhava Menon Committee, have both pushed for the use of clear sentencing rules. They have often said that in India, there are no full laws that set out how sentences should be given. This causes big differences in how punishments are decided for similar crimes in different courts. Although the death penalty may not be very effective as a deterrent and could lead to mistakes that cannot be undone, it is still a topic of strong disagreement among experts and court officials.

Suggestions and Recommendations

- To reduce unfair differences in sentencing and make sure courts treat similar cases in a fair and consistent way, there should be a set of rules or guidelines that judges follow when deciding sentences.
- To make the reform ideas already backed by the courts work in real life, it is important to invest in prison buildings and services. This includes having enough medical care, mental health support, and training programs for jobs.
- To reduce unfair differences in sentences and make court decisions more predictable and consistent, there should be a set of rules or guidelines for sentencing that are written into law.
- To reduce overcrowding in jails, the rules about bail and making sure trials happen quickly should be followed more strictly, and people who are waiting for their trial should be given priority in processing their cases.
- To help bridge the gap between what is taught in theory and what happens in real life, judges, prosecutors, and people who work in prisons should regularly receive training on modern ideas about punishment and correction.
- To make sure that constitutional principles from cases like Sunil Batra are followed, there needs to be a strong and independent system in place for watching over and checking jails.

- To recognize the real concerns of victims along with those of criminals and the government, victim support programs and restorative justice methods should be more closely included in how sentences are decided.

Hypothesis

The following ideas, which have been studied and mostly backed by the previous research, are the main points of this paper:

- **Hypothesis 1:** To achieve the goals of the criminal justice system, no single type of punishment like deterrence, revenge, rehabilitation, or reform is enough on its own. Instead, a combined approach that includes parts of each is needed.
- **Hypothesis 2:** Indian courts have slowly shifted the focus of criminal policy from punishment based on revenge and fear of punishment to a more reform-based approach. This change is shown through how the courts have interpreted the constitution, especially in matters related to prison management and the use of the death penalty.
- **Hypothesis 3:** The real way prisons are run and punishment is carried out in India is very different from the reform ideas that Indian courts have expressed.

Research Methodology

This study uses a method that focuses on both teaching the rules of law and carefully examining them to understand how they work. The main sources that were referred to include relevant parts of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the Indian Constitution, the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, and important decisions from the Supreme Court of India. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles about sentencing rules and theories of punishment, reports from law commissions and expert committees like the Malimath Committee Report, and textbooks on criminology and penology.

Since the study is mainly about rules and legal principles, it uses a qualitative, descriptive-analytical approach to compare four theories of punishment, instead of relying on data or statistics. One of the study's limitations is that it does not have primary data like prison surveys or recidivism numbers, which would help future research. Also, the study uses secondary sources to compare different regions, which is another limitation.

Conclusion

Punishment is how the rules of criminal law are carried out, and penology, which is the study of punishment, is important in understanding criminal justice. This essay has discussed what penology means and how it is used, its link to victimology and criminology, and how the idea of punishment has evolved from early revenge-based methods to today's focus on reform and rehabilitation. Each of the four main ideas about punishment deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation, and reform explains part of why punishment is used, but none of them alone can fully cover all the problems that today's criminal justice system needs to deal with. The Indian experience shows a clear and positive change towards a more united and caring approach to punishment. This approach does not fully ignore the ideas of deterring crime and punishing wrongdoers, but in some

cases, it puts the idea of respecting human dignity and the chance for reform above those ideas. This is shown in the country's laws and important court decisions such as Bachan Singh and Sunil Batra. The main challenge for changing the prison system in the future will still be the difference between the ideal goals set by the courts and the real situation in Indian jails. The best approach is to have a fair, proven, and well-supported system for dealing with crimes that considers the type of crime, the person who did it, and the needs of the victims and the community.

References

1. Sutherland EH, Cressey DR. Principles of Criminology. AltaMira Press.
2. Moberly W. The Ethics of Punishment. Faber & Faber, 1968.
3. Beccaria C. On Crimes and Punishments, 1764.
4. Bentham J. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, 1789.
5. Beccaria (n 3).
6. Kant I. The Metaphysics of Morals, 1797.
7. Lombroso C. Criminal Man. Duke University Press reprint; Ferri E. Criminal Sociology, 1884.
8. The Indian Penal Code 1860, s 53.
9. The Constitution of India 1950, arts 20-22.
10. The Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.
11. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.
12. Jagmohan Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh. SCC,1973:1:20.
13. Bachan Singh v State of Punjab. SCC,1980:2:684.
14. Machhi Singh v State of Punjab. SCC,1983:3:470.
15. Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration. SCC,1978:4:494.
16. Mohd. Giasuddin v State of Andhra Pradesh. SCC,1977:3:287.
17. State of Gujarat v Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat. SCC,1998:7:392.
18. Union of India v V Sriharan @ Murugan. SCC,2016:7:1.
19. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System. Report. Government of India, 2003.
20. Jagmohan Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh. SCC,1973:1:20.
21. Bachan Singh v State of Punjab. SCC,1980:2:684.
22. Machhi Singh v State of Punjab. SCC,1983:3:470.
23. Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration. SCC,1978:4:494.
24. Mohd. Giasuddin v State of Andhra Pradesh. SCC,1977:3:287.
25. State of Gujarat v Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat. SCC,1998:7:392.
26. Union of India v V Sriharan @ Murugan. SCC,2016:7:1.
27. The Indian Penal Code, 1860.
28. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
29. The Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 / The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.
30. The Constitution of India, 1950.
31. The Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.
32. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.
33. Sutherland EH, Cressey DR. Principles of Criminology. AltaMira Press.
34. Paranjape NV. Criminology and Penology with Victimology. Central Law Publications.

35. Siddique A. Criminology, Penology and Victimology. Eastern Book Company.
36. Beccaria C. On Crimes and Punishments, 1764.
37. Bentham J. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, 1789.
38. Kant I. The Metaphysics of Morals, 1797.
39. Lombroso C. Criminal Man. Duke University Press reprint.
40. Ferri E. Criminal Sociology, 1884.
41. Moberly W. The Ethics of Punishment. Faber & Faber, 1968.
42. Iyer VRK. Perspectives in Criminology, Law and Social Change (Allied Publishers) Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System, Report. Government of India, 2003.
43. https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://blog.ipleaders.in/theories-of-punishment/&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECCcQAQ&usg=AOvVaw0E7ujTIF8SrLlM5rusx88
https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://www.writinglaw.com/5-theories-of-punishment/&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoFCIQBEAE&usg=AOvVaw2-kwgURwGIsacV9qPpCBFJ
44. =AOvVaw2-kwgURwGIsacV9qPpCBFJ
45. https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://ijlmh.com/paper/approaches-to-punishment-in-indian-criminal-jurisprudence-a-focus-on-retributive-deterrent-and-reformative-theories/&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECE4QAQ&usg=AOvVaw1cAtwMIFyOGhtyV1YJPA2M
https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://bnmv.ac.in/images/uploads/Punishment%2520Theory.pdf&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECEoQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2is03pSpYbv58KY9-AV3dj
46. https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://www.drishtijudiciary.com/current-affairs/proper-balance-between-deterrent-and-reformative-punishment&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECE0QAQ&usg=AOvVaw1ooDijSuosTSIQGwmhst5r
https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://epgp.inflibnet.ac.in/epgpdata/uploads/epgp_content/S001608/P001739/M022054/ET/1520919223Etext.pdf&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECESQAQ&usg=AOvVaw3NRXPr92Udqexa_fugTIl
https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://www.mcrhrdi.gov.in/89fc/week2/L%2520Theories%2520of%2520Punishment.pdf&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECEkQAQ&usg=AOvVaw0jG4_pllyyeI0BeH82ijL2
47. 0-
https://www.google.com/url?opi=89978449&q=https://www.manupatra.com/roundup/334/Articles/An%2520eye%2520for%2520an%2520eye%2520will%2520make%2520the%2520whole%2520world%2520blind.pdf&sa=U&sqi=2&ved=2ahUKEwidutbn_sKXAxUzkeEIHYBjF3MQFnoECEwQAQ&usg=AOvVaw3cQQXc2rEllSiPHT41mmKf
48. FnoECEwQAQ&usg=AOvVaw3cQQXc2rEllSiPHT41mmKf