

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES: STRICT CONSTRUCTION OF PENAL STATUTES

Parvani Marwah

Abstract

Strict construction of statutes is a fundamental principle of statutory interpretation that emphasizes the literal and exact reading of legal provisions, leaving minimal room for broader or purposive interpretations. This approach is particularly significant in the realm of penal statutes, where the liberty and rights of individuals are at stake. Under strict construction, courts are bound to interpret statutory provisions in accordance with their plain, grammatical meaning, and any ambiguity must be resolved in favor of the accused. This ensures that no person is subjected to criminal liability unless their conduct clearly and unambiguously falls within the defined scope of the law. In the context of penal provisions, the principle serves as a safeguard against arbitrary punishment, upholding the legal maxim *nullum crimen sine lege* (no crime without law). Strict construction prevents courts from extending the scope of penal laws by inference, implication, or equitable considerations. It also mandates strict compliance with procedural requirements prescribed in statutes before imposing a penalty. This paper explores the meaning, scope, and significance of strict construction, with a particular focus on its application to penal statutes. It highlights the rationale for adopting this conservative interpretive approach and examines its role in ensuring fairness, protecting individual rights, and maintaining judicial restraint in criminal jurisprudence.

Introduction

The interpretation of statutes is one of the most critical functions of the judiciary, as it determines how legislative intent is understood and applied to real-life situations. Within this broad field, the principle of “strict construction” occupies a distinct position. Strict construction refers to the interpretation of statutory provisions in their narrowest sense, giving words their plain, ordinary, and grammatical meaning without inferring anything beyond the text. This interpretive method is particularly relevant in the context of penal

statutes, where the consequences involve deprivation of liberty, imposition of fines, or other punitive measures.

The rationale for strict construction lies in the idea that penal laws must be explicit and precise so that citizens are aware of the conduct that may attract criminal liability. Ambiguities or uncertainties in the statutory language are to be resolved in favor of the accused, reflecting the fundamental criminal law principle that guilt must be proven beyond reasonable doubt. This ensures that individuals are not punished under vague or overly broad interpretations of the law.

This paper examines the meaning, scope, and significance of strict construction in statutory interpretation, focusing on its application to penal provisions, and underscores its importance in safeguarding fairness, justice, and the rights of individuals.

What actually is the meaning of strict construction of statutes? This is a separate term under the subject of “construction of statutes” and the word “strict” itself means reading out or understanding or interpreting the statute in its *literal meaning* and no or extremely narrow space for any different interpretation if so possible. So by this definition we can conclude that this terminology means that interpreting exactly by the rules and literally as written in the statute. Judges are often called upon to make a construction or interpretation of an unclear term in cases that involve a dispute over the term’s legal significance. Strict construction occurs when ambiguous language is given its exact and technical meaning and no other equitable consideration or reasonable implications are made.

A judge may make a construction only if the language is ambiguous or unclear. If the language is plain and clear, a judge must only apply the *PLAIN MEANING* of the language and cannot consider otherwise which can change the meaning altogether. If however, the judge finds that the words produce absurdity, ambiguity, or literalness never intended, the plain meaning does not apply and a construction may be made. Going by the definitions as explained above, this type of Construction is also called “*Conservative Construction*” the term being self explanatory already.

Strict construction of penal statutes:

The word penal statute means the statute book which lays down the provisions for punishment for various illegal acts that are committed by individuals of the society. In the Indian context it may be the Indian Penal Code or any other Special Statute that has been enforced for that purpose respectively.

While constructing a provision in a penal statute if there appears to be a reasonable doubt or ambiguity, it shall be resolved in favour of the person who would be liable to the penalty. In normal words this means that when there exist any kind of doubt or conflict between two provisions basically in understanding or interpreting and basing the decision upon the same, then the benefit of doubt shall go to the person accused of any charge.

If a penal provision reasonably be so interpreted as to avoid the punishment, it must be so constructed. This basically means that because of any confusion or ambiguity between provisions, as mentioned previously, the accused shall be released or acquitted for the same reason rather than holding him guilty. Therefore for any irrationality or doubt between statutes or wordings the construction shall be such that the punishment is set aside or avoided completely, however serious the charge may be, upon the accused. The guilt needs to be established beyond reasonable doubt or it shall be visible prime facie.

In other words, if there are two reasonable constructions of a penal provision, the more lenient should be given effect to, without any doubt or discussions.

As per the general and specific rule of strict construction of penal provisions, punishment can be meted out to a person only if the plain words of the penal provision are able to bring that person under its purview. No extension of meaning of the words is permissible. Unless the words of a statute clearly made an act criminal, it shall not be constructed as criminal in any sense or ways. So this means that, Court will inflict punishment on a person only when the circumstances of the case unambiguously fall under the letter of law.

When certain procedural requirements have been laid down by a statute to be completed in a statute dealing with punishments, the Court is duty bound to see that all these requirements have been complied with before sentencing the accused and if at any time any kind of ambiguity is established from the side of the Court, then the entire benefit shall lie with the accused even up to the extent of acquitting him on some technical grounds. In criminal cases there can be no presumption that a crime has been constructively committed. If there is a reasonable interpretation by which a penalty can be avoided, that interpretation has got to be accepted. Where a particular provision can be interpreted by the Court in various ways that particular interpretation must be avoided which causes hardship or injustice. So the sole purpose of this rule of strict construction rounds up to being fair and protecting the rights of the person in question. An accused can always argue that even though his conduct falls within the express language of the statute the same is against its spirit.

Conclusion

Strict construction of statutes, particularly in the realm of penal law, serves as a critical safeguard in the administration of justice. It ensures that no person is punished unless their conduct clearly falls within the plain language of a penal provision. By mandating that ambiguities be interpreted in favor of the accused, it upholds the presumption of innocence and the legal maxim that there can be no crime or punishment without a clear law.

In practice, strict construction restrains judicial overreach and prevents the expansion of criminal liability beyond what the legislature explicitly intended. It requires strict compliance with procedural safeguards, thereby protecting individuals from arbitrary or unjust punishment. This approach aligns with the broader constitutional principles of fairness, due process, and equality before the law.

However, while strict construction offers strong protection to the accused, it also demands precise and unambiguous legislative drafting to avoid loopholes that could hinder justice. Courts must therefore strike a careful balance between adhering to the literal meaning of statutory provisions and preventing injustice that may arise from overly

rigid interpretation. Ultimately, strict construction remains a cornerstone of criminal jurisprudence, preserving both the rule of law and the fundamental rights of individuals in a democratic society.

References

1. *Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay*, AIR 1954 SC 496.
2. *State of Maharashtra v. Mohd. Yakub*, AIR 1980 SC 1111.
3. *Keshav Mills Co. Ltd. v. CIT*, AIR 1965 SC 1636.
4. Maxwell, P. St. J., *On the Interpretation of Statutes* (12th ed., 1969).
5. *Tuck v. Priester* (1887) 19 QBD 629.
6. *State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar*, AIR 1952 SC 75.
7. Crawford, Earl T., *The Construction of Statutes* (1940).
8. *Nand Lal v. State of Rajasthan*, AIR 1987 SC 2402.