PLEA BARGAINING AND JUDICIAL CONTROL: LESSONS FROM INDIA AND THE USA

Tharun R.[*]

ABSTRACT

Plea bargaining is an important component of the criminal justice system worldwide, balancing judicial efficiency with the protection of the rights of the accused. However, the role of the judiciary in overseeing plea bargaining varies significantly across jurisdictions, affecting fairness, voluntariness, and legal safeguards. This article examines the judicial oversight of plea bargaining in India and the USA, focusing on how courts in both countries regulate and interpret plea applications. In India, plea bargaining was formally introduced through the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, but its application is limited to specific offences and subject to stringent judicial scrutiny. Courts play a vital role in ensuring that plea applications are voluntary, informed, and free from coercion. In contrast, the USA extensively uses plea bargaining, with the majority of criminal cases being settled through negotiated agreements. While the judiciary oversees the process, prosecutors hold significant bargaining power, raising concerns about coercion, wrongful convictions, and threats to fair trial rights. This article provides a comparative analysis of judicial intervention in plea bargaining in both countries, analysing key judicial rulings and legal frameworks. It critically assesses the extent to which courts safeguard the interests of defendants while ensuring efficiency in the criminal justice system. By evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of judicial oversight in India and the USA.

Keywords: Plea Bargaining, Judicial Oversight, Criminal Justice, India, USA, Comparative Law.

[*]ADVOCATE.

INTRODUCTION

The administration of criminal justice is a foundation of any civilised society, tasked with balancing efficiency, fairness, and the protection of individual rights. However, in many jurisdictions, including India, the system is afflicted by delays, backlogs, and overcrowded prisons. As the eminent Indian jurist Nani Palkhivala once remarked, *"The greatest drawback of the administration of justice in India today is the delay of cases... Justice has to be blind, but I see no reason why it should be lame. Here it just hobbles along, barely able to work."*[1] This observation underscores the urgent need for reforms to expedite justice without compromising its integrity. One such reform, plea bargaining, has emerged as a potential solution to alleviate the burden on courts and reduce the number of undertrial prisoners.

Plea bargaining, a process where the accused negotiates with the prosecution to plead guilty in exchange for concessions, has been widely adopted in the United States (USA) and was formally introduced in India in 2006 through amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC). The introduction of plea bargaining in India through the 2005 amendments to the CrPC marked a significant shift in criminal procedure, aiming to address systemic delays while maintaining judicial safeguards. The newly enacted Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, which replaces the CrPC, retains the core framework of plea bargaining. While the concept aims to streamline judicial processes, its implementation and oversight vary significantly between these two democracies. In India, plea bargaining is restricted to certain offences and is subject to rigorous judicial scrutiny to ensure voluntariness and fairness. Conversely, in the USA, plea bargaining dominates the criminal justice system, with over 90% of cases resolved through negotiated agreements, often raising concerns about prosecutorial overreach and the erosion of defendants' rights.[2]

The crisis of judicial delays in India highlights the urgent need for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. As per the Prison Statistics India 2022 report by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), undertrials account for 75.8% of the prison population, with 434,302 individuals awaiting trial out of a total 573,220 inmates. Among incarcerated women, 76.33% are undertrials, and 8.6% of all undertrial prisoners have spent more than three years in custody. Indian prisons, as highlighted by a report from the Supreme Court's Centre for Research and

[1] Nani A Palkhivala, We, the Nation: The Lost Decade (UBS Publishers 1994) 215.
[2] George Fisher, Plea Bargaining's Triumph: A History of Plea Bargaining in America (Stanford University Press 2003).

Planning, are operating at 131% of their capacity, housing 573,220 inmates against the intended capacity of 436,266.[3] Despite some progress, with the conviction rate for crimes under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) reaching 30% in 2024,[4] systemic challenges in investigation and prosecution persist. Plea bargaining, introduced to address these challenges, remains limited to minor offences and excludes crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment. Courts are actively involved in ensuring plea agreements are voluntary, informed, and free from coercion while mandating victim compensation. In contrast, the USA's plea-bargaining system, deeply entrenched and driven by prosecutorial discretion, raises concerns about coercion and wrongful convictions.

In the USA, judicial oversight of plea bargaining is relatively minimal. While landmark rulings like Boykin v. Alabama (1969)[5] and Missouri v. Frye (2012)[6] require pleas to be knowing and voluntary, judges rarely question the substantive fairness of bargains. Prosecutors exercise significant power, leading to scenarios where defendants, particularly those from marginalised backgrounds, may plead guilty under pressure to avoid harsher sentences. India, on the other hand, adopts a more interventionist approach. Courts rigorously evaluate plea agreements, as seen in State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor,[7] where the Supreme Court emphasised that plea bargaining must not compromise the sanctity of justice. This fundamental difference in judicial philosophy shapes the efficacy and fairness of plea bargaining in both countries.

This article examines the role of judicial oversight in plea bargaining, comparing the frameworks and practices in India and the USA. It analyses how courts in both jurisdictions regulate plea agreements, safeguard defendants' rights, and address challenges such as coercion, transparency, and the voluntariness of pleas. By critically evaluating key judicial rulings and legal provisions, the study highlights the strengths and weaknesses of each system, offering insights into how plea bargaining can be refined to better serve the interests of justice.

[3] State of Undertrial Prisoners in India (Drishti IAS, 29 November 2024) https://www.drishtiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-analysis/state-of-undertrial-prisoners-in-india accessed 24 March 2025.
[4] Debabrata Mohapatra, '30% Conviction Rate for IPC/BNS Offences in 2024, Reveals Govt Data' The Times of India (Bhubaneswar, 24 March 2025) https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/bhubaneswar/30-conviction-rate-for-ipc/bns-offences-in-2024-reveals-govt-data/articleshow/119436731.cms accessed 24 March 2025.
[5] Boykin v Alabama 395 US 238 (1969).
[6] Missouri v Frye 566 US 134 (2012).
[7] State of Gujarat v Natwar Harchandji Thakor (2005) Cri LJ 2957.7

CONCEPT AND EVOLUTION OF PLEA BARGAINING

Definition of Plea Bargaining: Plea bargaining, as defined in Black's Law Dictionary, is a negotiated agreement where a defendant pleads guilty to a lesser charge or fewer counts in exchange for concessions from the prosecution, such as a reduced sentence or dropped charges.[8] The Oxford Dictionary further clarifies the term by breaking it down etymologically: "plea" refers to a formal appeal by the defendant, while "bargaining" implies a negotiated settlement. Together, they describe a process where justice is administered through compromise rather than trial.

This practice, endorsed by U.S. Chief Justice Warren Burger in Santobello v. New York[9] as 'an essential component of the administration of justice,' prioritises efficiency. However, critics argue it risks coercing defendants into waiving their right to a fair trial, especially in systems like the U.S., where 90% of cases end in plea deals. In India, by contrast, plea bargaining operates under strict judicial scrutiny (as seen in State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor),[10] reflecting cultural and legal reservations about its fairness.

The Concept of Bargaining in Criminal Cases: The question arises whether convictions can be negotiated and sentences reduced without imposing excessive burdens on the state. Plea bargaining offers one such solution. Also referred to as plea agreements, plea deals, or "copping a plea,"[11] this process involves an agreement between the prosecutor and the defendant, where the defendant pleads guilty in exchange for concessions from the prosecution. It operates as a pre-trial mechanism, facilitated by the active participation of the trial judge, to resolve cases efficiently.

Plea bargaining can take several forms:

Withdrawal of Charges: The prosecution may drop one or more charges in return for a guilty plea.

Reduction of Charges: A more serious charge may be downgraded to a lesser offence in exchange for a guilty plea.

[8] Bryan A Garner, Black's Law Dictionary (10th edn, Thomson Reuters 2014) 1339.
[9] Santobello v New York 404 US 257 (1971).
[10] State of Gujarat v Natwar Harchandji Thakor (2005) Cri LJ 2957.
[11] KVK Santhy, 'Plea Bargaining in U.S. and Indian Criminal Law: Confessions for Concessions' (2013) 7 NALSAR Law Review 87.

Sentence Leniency: The prosecutor may recommend a lighter sentence to the judge in return for the defendant's admission of guilt.

A key aspect of this process is charging bargaining, where concessions are exchanged between the prosecution and defence. This may involve the defendant pleading guilty to a less serious charge or to only one of multiple charges, leading to the dismissal of others. Alternatively, the defendant may plead guilty to the original charge in return for a reduced sentence.

Another variant is sentence bargaining, which has been introduced in India. Here, the accused, with the consent of both the prosecutor and the victim, negotiates for a sentence lighter than the statutory maximum for the offence. Beyond these, other forms include count bargaining (pleading guilty to a subset of charges) and fact bargaining (admitting to specific facts that influence sentencing).[12]

However, plea bargaining is not without criticism. Coercive plea bargaining has been challenged for violating individual rights, particularly under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Critics also argue that it may not always reduce the costs of justice administration.[13] For example, if a defendant is charged with a drug crime that carries a mandatory minimum sentence, they might agree to a plea deal for a lesser charge to avoid a long prison term. Even if they believe they are innocent, they may feel pressured to accept the deal rather than risk a harsher punishment at trial. This can weaken the principle that everyone is innocent until proven guilty and make defendants feel like they have no real choice but to plead guilty.

For plea bargaining to function justly, there must be voluntariness and judicial scrutiny. The accused must enter the plea freely, without coercion, and the court must rigorously oversee the process to ensure fairness and transparency. These safeguards are essential to maintain the integrity of the criminal justice system while addressing its inefficiencies.

BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Plea bargaining is often perceived as a modern legal innovation, but its origins trace back centuries. Historical records suggest that negotiated resolutions in criminal cases existed as

[12] Jona F Meyer, 'Plea Bargaining - Benefits of Plea Bargaining' (Britannica, 6 March 2025) https://www.britannica.com/topic/plea-bargaining/Benefits-of-plea-bargaining accessed 24 March 2025.
[13] ibid

early as 800 years ago, long before formal legal systems recognised them. In the United States, plea bargaining gained formal acceptance after the Civil War, when appellate courts began addressing cases involving negotiated guilty pleas. Initially, judges viewed these agreements with scepticism, often allowing defendants to withdraw guilty pleas under traditional legal principles that discouraged coerced confessions. Many feared that plea deals could compromise the integrity of the justice system.[14]

Despite early resistance, plea bargaining persisted and gradually became indispensable. By the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it was sometimes associated with corruption, but its practical benefits could not be ignored. As legal procedures grew more complex and trials became lengthier, courts struggled with overwhelming caseloads. Plea bargaining emerged as a solution, offering a way to expedite cases, reduce court burdens, and provide relief to defendants languishing in jail while awaiting trial.[15] A pivotal moment came in Brady v. United States,[16] where the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of plea bargaining, cementing its role in modern legal systems. Over time, what was once a contentious practice evolved into a cornerstone of criminal justice, balancing efficiency with the imperative of fairness.

Historical Background in the USA: The roots of plea bargaining in the United States stretch back even further, to the early 19th century, though its foundations lie in the common law jury trials of the 1700s. During this era, trials were swift and judge-dominated, conducted without the need for lawyers. The simplicity of these proceedings made plea bargaining unnecessary. However, as adversarial procedures and evidence laws grew more intricate, jury trials became protracted and cumbersome. This shift created a pressing need for a more efficient alternative, paving the way for plea bargaining to take hold.[17]

By the mid-1800s, plea-bargaining had become a routine practice in American courts, driven by the sheer volume of criminal cases overwhelming the judiciary. Prosecutors and defence attorneys increasingly relied on plea deals to resolve cases quickly, avoiding the unpredictability and expense of trials. The late 19th and early 20th centuries saw plea

[14] Sonam Kathuria, 'The Bargain Has Been Struck: A Case for Plea Bargaining in India' (2007) 19 National Law School of India Review 139.
[15] Ishan Chhokra, 'Impact of Plea Bargaining on Criminal Justice System in India and USA: A Comparative Analysis' (2023) 4 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research 1.
[16] Bradley v United States 104 US 442 (1881).
[17] Meyer (n 12).

bargaining gain further traction, particularly during Prohibition and the "War on Drugs," when criminal caseloads surged. These developments solidified plea bargaining as a fundamental feature of the American legal landscape.[18]

The legal legitimacy of plea bargaining was firmly established in the 20th century through landmark Supreme Court rulings. In Santobello v. New York,[19] the Court affirmed that plea agreements were binding contracts, obligating the government to uphold its terms. Another critical decision, North Carolina v. Alford,[20] permitted defendants to plead guilty while maintaining their innocence if they believed it served their best interests. These rulings underscored the judiciary's acceptance of plea bargaining as a necessary tool for managing caseloads and ensuring judicial efficiency.

Yet, despite its widespread adoption, plea bargaining has not been without controversy. Critics argue that it can coerce innocent defendants into pleading guilty, particularly when evidence is weak or legal representation is inadequate. Others contend that it undermines the adversarial nature of justice by prioritising swift resolutions over thorough examinations of the facts. Nevertheless, plea bargaining remains deeply embedded in the U.S. legal system, reflecting its dual role as both a pragmatic solution to overcrowded courts and a subject of ongoing debate about equity and justice.

Historical Background in India: In contrast, plea bargaining is a relatively recent introduction to India's criminal justice system. While the United States has practised it for over two centuries, India formally adopted plea bargaining only in 2006, through the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005. Before this, the Indian legal system adhered strictly to trial-based convictions, with every accused person entitled to a full judicial process. The introduction of plea bargaining marked a significant departure, aimed at alleviating the crippling backlog of cases plaguing the judiciary.[21]

The concept was first proposed by the Law Commission of India in its 142nd Report, which recommended "concessional treatment" for defendants pleading guilty but cautioned against adopting the American model of prosecution negotiations. Despite these reservations, the 2005

[18] Chhokra (n 15)
[19] Santobello (n 9)
[20] North Carolina v Alford 400 US 25 (1970).
[21] Rosle Athulya Joseph, 'Plea Bargaining' (Manupatra) https://www.manupatra.com/roundup/326/articles/plea%20bargaining.pdf accessed 24 March 2025.

amendment incorporated plea bargaining into the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) under Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A to 265L). This framework permitted accused individuals to plead guilty in exchange for reduced charges or lighter sentences, though it excluded offences punishable by death, life imprisonment, or terms exceeding seven years.[22] India's journey with plea bargaining has been one of cautious experimentation. While it offers a pragmatic solution to case overload, its implementation continues to evolve as lawmakers and courts strive to balance efficiency with the principles of justice.

JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT OF PLEA BARGAINING IN INDIA

Legal Provisions: Chapter XXIII, Sections 289 to 300 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) deal with plea bargaining. *Section 289*[23] categories the class of offences to which the plea bargain shall apply and the class of offences to which it shall not apply. It shall not apply to such an offence that affects the socio-economic condition of the country or involves an offence committed against a woman, or a child below the age of fourteen years. It applies to all other offences where either the report has been forwarded by the officer in charge of the police station under section 193 or a Magistrate has taken cognisance of an offence on complaint, after examining the complainant/witnesses under section 223 and issuing the process under section 227.

Section 290[24] lays down the manner of submission of the application for plea bargaining along with certain stipulations:

- The application must be made within 30 days of framing of the charge.
- A brief about the case and offence committed is to be stated.
- An affidavit stating that the applicant has voluntarily opted for the process of plea bargaining and that he/she has not been convicted for the same offence earlier is to be submitted.
- The court then fixes a date and sends notices to all parties for their appearance.
- The court then examines the accused in camera to satisfy itself that the application was filed voluntarily.

[22] K Yeswanth Kumar, 'Plea Bargaining: Its Brief History, Types and Procedure and Why It Is Redundant in India' (2023) 26 Pena Claims Law Journal 1.
[23] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 289.
[24] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 290.

- Where the court is satisfied, it provides 60days to arrive at a Section 290 laid down manner of submission of application for plea bargaining along with certain stipulations.
- The application must be made within 30 days of framing of the charge.
- A brief about the case and offence committed is to be stated.
- An affidavit stating that the applicant has voluntarily opted for the process of plea bargaining and that he/she has not been convicted for the same offence earlier is to be submitted. if the court is unsatisfied, it proceeds with the trial as per the provisions of the Sanhita.

Section 291:[25] lays down certain guidelines for the mutually satisfactory disposition. The legislature has made it evident by the words used in the provision that it is the duty of the court to ensure that the disposition is arrived at voluntarily. Further, the accused had been given the option to participate in the meetings with his/her pleader to protect his rights.

Section 292:[26] A report of the mutually satisfactory disposition is to be prepared by the court and signed by the presiding officer and all other parties involved. If no disposition can be arrived at, the court will proceed with the trial from the application stage.

Section 293:[27] deals with the procedure for case disposal after resolution under Section 292. It mandates compensation to the victim as part of the resolution process. The court is also empowered to release the accused on probation of good conduct or admonition, under specific provisions of the law, including the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958. Additionally, the section allows for reduced sentences, where the court may sentence the accused to half of the minimum punishment prescribed by law, or, in the case of first-time offenders, one-fourth of the minimum punishment. For offences not falling under specific categories, the punishment may be reduced to one-fourth of the prescribed sentence, or for first-time offenders, one-sixth.

Section 294:[28] The presiding officer signs and delivers the judgment in open court as per the agreement under section 293.

[25] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 291.
[26] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 292.
[27] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 293.
[28] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 294.

Section 295:[29] To ensure that there is an end to judicial proceedings, the section bars any appeal against a judgment resulting from a mutually satisfactory disposition. However, an appeal by way of special leave petition or writ petition is still available by virtue of constitutional rights.

Section 296:[30] Powers with respect to bail, trial of offences and other matters relating to the disposal of a case shall prevail with the court while dealing with cases under this chapter.

Section 297:[31] Period of detention shall be set off against the period of imprisonment, by applying the provisions of section 469.

Section 298:[32] Acts as a savings clause protecting the provisions of this chapter, irrespective of any inconsistencies which may prevail

Section 299:[33] The provision acts as a safeguard to the accused by protecting his/her privacy. Any statement made in the application cannot be used for any other purpose except for the purposes stated in this chapter.

Section 300:[34] Juveniles and children, as defined in section 2 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, are excluded from the scope of this chapter.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATIONS

The concept of plea bargaining can be described as a double-edged sword, even from the perspective of the judiciary, as there have been contradicting opinions over the years about its legality in our country. While some judges have opined regarding its need due to the overburdening of the criminal justice system, others have labelled it as unconstitutional. Therefore, it can best be described as a necessary evil that has to be used with due care and caution.

Pronouncements in Favour of Plea Bargaining: In both State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor[35] and State of Maharashtra v. Ravi Kant S. Patil,[36] the Apex court reiterated

[29] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 295.
[30] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 296.
[31] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 297.
[32] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 298.
[33] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 299.
[34] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 300.
[35] State of Gujarat v Natwar Harchandji Thakor (2005) 1 GLR 709.
[36] State of Maharashtra v Ravikant S Patil (1991) 2 SCC 373.

that the concept of plea bargaining is a useful mechanism and valuable tool to reduce the burden/ backlog of cases in our criminal justice system

In Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar[37] the Supreme Court shed light on the gravity of the issue regarding under trials, where it was observed that a majority of under trials, which were being tried for petty offences, had to wait years on end without any sentence/acquittal. One of the primary reasons was a lack of resources to afford bail. It was further noted that the core of criminal justice is a speedy trial, and there is no question that a trial delay alone amounts to a denial of justice.

JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS PROMISING FOR A BALANCED APPROACH

Vijay Moses Das v CBI:[38] The case involved supplying inferior materials by the defendant to ONGC, causing huge losses to the company. The defence set up good arguments, due to which the prosecution agreed to a negotiation and entered into a plea-bargaining agreement. However, the trial court rejected the plea-bargaining agreement as the procedural requirements were not strictly adhered to. The defendant failed to submit an affidavit as required under Section 265B of the CrPC.

Ranbir Singh v State:[39] The offence committed was that of homicide by reckless and careless driving. The law prescribes one-fourth of the minimum punishment upon a successful plea-bargaining agreement. However, the Delhi High Court observed that, regardless of such an agreement, mitigating factors should be considered before deciding the sentence. The high court further reduced the sentence to four months, taking due note of the fact that there are two young children and elderly parents dependent on the defendant.

The two cases showcase the flexible approach adopted by the courts. Applicability/ non-applicability of plea bargaining depends entirely on the facts and circumstances of each case. The courts must exercise due care and caution before accepting a plea-bargaining application.

Plea Bargaining in the United States: The Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the right to a fair trial, but does not explicitly recognise plea bargaining. Instead, the American judiciary established its legitimacy through landmark rulings such as Santobello v.

[37] Hussainara Khatoon v State of Bihar (1980) 1 SCC 81.
[38] Vijay Moses Das v CBI (Criminal Misc. Application No 1037 of 2006) Uttarakhand High Court, 29 March 2010.
[39] Ranbir Singh v State (Criminal MC 1705 of 2011) Delhi High Court, 5 September 2011.

New York,[40] which led to its widespread adoption. Today, plea bargaining resolves approximately 90% of criminal cases in the U.S., functioning as an efficient case-disposal mechanism. It operates as an implied confession rather than a formal admission of guilt before a jury, creating a contractual agreement between the accused and the prosecution for a specific case. Courts, however, are not obligated to accept plea bargains and must ensure that the defendant's plea is voluntary and free from coercion.[41]

In the U.S., defendants can enter three types of pleas: guilty, not guilty, or nolo contendere (no contest). The nolo contendere plea, derived from Latin meaning "I do not wish to contend," acts as an implied confession, equivalent to a guilty plea for that particular case but without a formal declaration of guilt.[42] Key cases like Lott v. United States[43] and United States v. Risfeld[44] clarified that while such a plea does not establish guilt, it permits sentencing. Judges play a limited role, primarily assessing whether the plea agreement was negotiated voluntarily before approving or rejecting its terms.

LEGAL PROVISIONS

Governing Law and Procedural Framework: The legal provisions relating to plea bargaining in the United States are primarily governed by Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which outlines the procedures for entering and accepting pleas. The rule specifies that a defendant may plead not guilty, guilty, or, with the court's consent, Nolo Contendere. A conditional plea is also permitted, allowing the defendant to reserve the right to appellate review of adverse pre-trial motions.[45] Before accepting a Nolo Contendere plea, the court must consider the views of the parties and the public interest in justice administration. If a defendant refuses to enter a plea, the court must enter a plea of not guilty on their behalf.

Role of the Court in Plea Proceedings: The court plays a critical role in ensuring that pleas are entered voluntarily and intelligently. Before accepting a guilty or Nolo Contendere plea, the court must personally address the defendant in open court to confirm their understanding of the charges, the rights they are waiving, and the potential penalties, including maximum and

[40] Santobello (n 9).
[41] Baivab Chakraborty, 'Plea Bargaining: A Comparative Analysis between USA and India' (2022) 4 Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research 1.
[42] Santhy (n 11) 87.
[43] Lott v United States 367 US 421 (1961).
[44] United States v Risfeld 340 US 914 (1951).
[45] Adil Mahender Singh, Plea Bargaining (Concept And Precept) (Capital Law House 2007) 12.

minimum sentences, restitution, and sentencing guidelines. Under Rule 11 (b) (2), the court must also determine that the plea is voluntary and not the result of coercion or improper promises, except those included in a plea agreement.[46] Additionally, the court must establish a factual basis for the plea before entering judgment.

Plea Agreements and Judicial Oversight: Plea agreements under Rule 11(c) are negotiated between the prosecution and the defence, with the court prohibited from participating in these discussions. The agreements may involve the dismissal of charges, sentencing recommendations, or binding sentencing terms. Once reached, the plea agreement must be disclosed in open court unless good cause permits in camera disclosure. The court may accept, reject, or defer a decision on the agreement, particularly for "Type A" or "Type C" agreements, until reviewing the presentence report. For "Type B" agreements, the court must inform the defendant that it is not bound by the prosecution's recommendations. If the court rejects a plea agreement, the defendant must be allowed to withdraw their plea.[47]

Withdrawal of Pleas and Procedural Safeguards: Withdrawal of a guilty or Nolo Contendere plea is permitted before sentencing if the defendant shows a fair and just reason. After sentencing, withdrawal is only allowed through direct appeal or collateral attack. The admissibility of plea discussions and related statements is governed by Federal Rule of Evidence 410. The plea proceedings must be recorded to ensure compliance with Rule 11 requirements. Any procedural errors are deemed harmless if they do not affect substantive rights.[48]

Judicial Scrutiny and Sentencing Guidelines: The application of Federal Rule 11 ensures a structured plea-bargaining process in federal courts. Judges must verify that defendants understand the consequences of their pleas and that the pleas are voluntary. The rule also mandates judicial scrutiny of plea agreements to prevent manipulation of sentencing outcomes. The U.S. Sentencing Guidelines further regulate plea bargaining by prescribing fixed sentencing ranges and requiring judges to justify departures from these ranges. The guidelines

[46] ibid 13.
[47] Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, r 11 https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcrmp/rule11 accessed 24 March 2025.
[48] ibid.

discourage charge bargaining that undermines sentencing objectives and emphasise the use of presentence reports to evaluate plea agreements.[49]

Prosecutorial Guidelines in Plea Bargaining: The U.S. Department of Justice issues guidelines to promote uniformity in plea bargaining practices among federal prosecutors. These guidelines emphasise charging defendants with the most serious offences supported by evidence and consider factors such as the defendant's cooperation, criminal history, and the public interest. Prosecutors are encouraged to ensure that plea agreements reflect the totality of the defendant's conduct and the goals of criminal justice, including deterrence and rehabilitation.[50]

Variations in State-Level Plea Bargaining: At the state level, plea bargaining practices vary, with some states imposing restrictions or prohibitions on plea bargaining for specific offences, such as drunk driving or sex crimes. Many states require prosecutors to inform victims of plea agreements and consider their input.[51]

Key U.S. Case Laws on Plea Bargaining: The U.S. Supreme Court has played a key role in shaping plea bargaining by balancing judicial efficiency with defendants' rights. One of the most important cases, North Carolina v. Alford,[52] introduced the "Alford plea," which allows defendants to plead guilty while still claiming innocence if they believe they would likely be convicted at trial. The Court ruled that as long as the plea is voluntary and informed, it is valid. This decision expanded the scope of plea bargaining by allowing defendants to avoid the risks of trial without formally admitting guilt.

In Santobello v. New York,[53] the Court ruled that prosecutors must honour the promises they make in plea agreements. This reinforced the idea that plea bargains are legally binding contracts, ensuring fairness in negotiations. Similarly, in Brady v. United States,[54] the Court held that plea deals remain valid even if defendants plead guilty to avoid the risk of a harsher sentence, such as the death penalty. However, the Court warned that plea bargaining should not become a tool for systemic coercion.

[49] Samuel Strom, 'Plea Bargaining: State Provisions' (FindLaw, 17 December 2023) https://www.findlaw.com/criminal/criminal-procedure/plea-bargaining-state-provisions.html accessed 24 March 2025.
[50] ibid.
[51] ibid.
[52] North Carolina v Alford (n 20).
[53] Santobello (n 9).
[54] Bradley v United States (n 16).

The Supreme Court further strengthened prosecutorial discretion in Bordenkircher v. Hayes,[55] ruling that prosecutors can threaten harsher penalties if a defendant refuses a plea deal, as long as the defendant's choice remains voluntary. This case emphasised the tough nature of plea bargaining but also raised concerns about fairness, especially for poor defendants. Other cases, such as Lott v. United States,[56] and State ex rel. Clark v. Adams,[57] clarified that a nolo contendere plea (where a defendant does not admit guilt but accepts punishment) is legally valid and can be used strategically in some cases.

In Missouri v. Frye,[58] the Court ruled that defendants have the right to effective legal representation during plea negotiations. If a defence lawyer fails to properly inform their client about a plea offer, it could be grounds to challenge the conviction. This decision aimed to ensure fairness and prevent defendants from being unfairly pressured into guilty pleas due to poor legal advice.

These rulings show that plea bargaining is both a necessary tool for managing court caseloads and a process that requires safeguards to protect defendants' rights.[59] While plea deals help reduce trial backlogs, critics argue they sometimes pressure innocent defendants into pleading guilty.[60] Compared to India, where plea bargaining is more restricted, the U.S. system gives prosecutors greater discretion, reflecting its focus on finality in criminal cases.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PLEA BARGAINING IN INDIA AND THE USA

Plea bargaining, a mechanism designed to accelerate criminal case resolutions, is a key feature in both the Indian and American legal systems. However, significant differences exist in their implementation, shaped by legal traditions, judicial philosophies, and institutional frameworks. While the U.S. system is characterised by prosecutorial dominance and broad applicability, India imposes strict judicial oversight and limitations to prevent misuse.

Initiation of Plea Bargaining: A fundamental difference lies in who initiates the plea-bargaining process. In the United States, the prosecution has the discretion to offer plea deals, allowing prosecutors to manage caseloads efficiently. Conversely, in India, only the accused

[55] Bordenkircher v Hayes 434 US 357 (1978).
[56] Lott v United States (n 43).
[57] State ex rel Clark 148 Fla 452 (1941).
[58] Missouri v Frye (n 6).
[59] Sahil Beniwal, 'Plea Bargaining: A Comparative Analysis of India and the USA' [2022] Jus Corpus Law Journal 140.
[60] Chhokra (n 15).

can initiate the plea-bargaining process, as per Section 289 of the BNSS 2023. This distinction reflects India's cautious approach to ensuring fairness and preventing coercion. Additionally, the U.S. model prohibits judicial involvement in plea negotiations, limiting the judge's role to reviewing and approving agreements. In contrast, India's judiciary plays a central role in overseeing the process, ensuring voluntariness, and safeguarding against coercion.

Scope and Eligibility: The United States allows plea bargaining across nearly all offences, including serious crimes such as homicide. This broad application has made it the dominant mode of criminal case resolution, with over 90% of cases settled through plea deals.[61] India, however, imposes strict limitations on plea bargaining. Under 289 of the BNSS 2023, it is not available for:

- Offences punishable by death, life imprisonment, or terms exceeding seven years.
- Crimes against women and children under 14.
- Socio-economic offences, where public interest is a concern.

These restrictions reflect India's focus on judicial fairness and victim rights, ensuring that grave offences undergo full trials. However, they also reduce plea bargaining as a case backlog reduction tool.

Role of the Victim: A notable distinction between the two systems is the role of the victim in the plea-bargaining process. India mandates victim consent for a plea bargain to proceed. Victims play an active role in negotiations and have the authority to veto agreements. Furthermore, compensation for victims is an integral part of plea settlements. The United States, by contrast, sidelines victims in plea negotiations. Prosecutors and defence attorneys dominate the process, with victims having little formal say. While some states allow victim impact statements, these are typically advisory rather than determinative.

Procedural Framework and Judicial Oversight: The procedural structure of plea bargaining further distinguishes the two systems:

In the United States, plea bargaining is prosecutor-driven, occurring informally before any court involvement. Judges play a limited role, primarily ensuring that the defendant's plea is voluntary before approving it. Once a deal is struck, judicial interference is minimal.

[61] Beniwal (n 59).

India follows a judiciary-centric model. The accused must formally apply for plea bargaining, triggering a court-led review to confirm voluntariness. The process involves the judge, prosecution, and victim, ensuring fairness and preventing coercion. Judges retain the discretion to reject agreements if they find them unjust or exploitative. This active judicial oversight in India enhances transparency but also slows down the process, reducing its appeal as a fast-track mechanism.

Judicial Discretion and Finality: Once a plea deal is reached, the level of judicial discretion in reviewing it differs significantly:

- In America, judicial intervention is minimal. Judges approve plea deals unless procedural violations or coercion are evident. Finality is prioritised, and there are limited avenues for appeal.
- In India, courts actively assess whether the agreed-upon punishment is just. If a judge finds a plea bargain excessively lenient or unfair, it can be challenged through Special Leave Petitions or writ petitions.

Similarities Between the Indian and American Plea-Bargaining Systems

Despite their differences, both systems share common principles:

Voluntariness: Defendants must enter plea bargains willingly, without coercion.

Judicial Oversight: Courts ensure that accused individuals understand their pleas.

Right to Withdraw: In both systems, defendants may retract guilty pleas under certain conditions before final judgment.

Case Management Tool: Both countries recognise plea bargaining as a means to reduce judicial backlog, albeit with different levels of success.

CHALLENGES AND REFORMS

The plea-bargaining system in the United States is often seen as unfair because it tends to benefit wealthy and powerful people. In the U.S., an accused person can get a lesser charge if they agree to plead guilty early. While this helps in settling cases quickly, it may not be suitable

for India's legal system, which strongly protects the rights of accused individuals.[62] In India, trials do not always end in conviction, so many people prefer going to trial instead of accepting a plea deal.

One major problem with plea bargaining in India is that it is allowed only for offences with a maximum sentence of seven years. Expanding it to cover more cases could help speed up the justice process. However, for plea bargaining to work well, the benefits of accepting a plea deal must be greater than the risks of going to trial. The U.S. system, which allows for reducing charges, provides a useful idea, but India must be careful to ensure that it does not end up favouring the rich and influential.

Another challenge is that victims in India often want strict punishment rather than a settlement. This makes it harder for prosecutors and accused individuals to reach a fair agreement. The current plea-bargaining system in India was introduced to help victims get justice, but its strict rules have made it less effective. If India allows plea deals while still ensuring fairness for victims, the system could work better.

To improve the system, India could adopt some ideas from the U.S., such as letting prosecutors offer plea deals to speed up cases. However, there should be strong court supervision to prevent misuse. A balanced approach where plea bargaining is expanded but closely monitored could make the system more effective. At the same time, the U.S. could also improve by adding more judicial oversight to prevent wrongful convictions. By learning from each other, both India and the U.S. can develop a plea-bargaining system that is both fair and efficient.

CONCLUSION

Plea bargaining plays an important role in the criminal justice systems of both India and the USA, helping to speed up cases while also protecting the rights of defendants. However, there are major differences in how each country approaches it. In the USA, plea bargaining is mostly controlled by prosecutors with little court supervision. This helps clear cases quickly but can sometimes pressure defendants, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, into unfair deals. On the other hand, India's system is more focused on fairness, with strict court oversight

[62] Aditi Roy and Sanjana Gupta, 'Plea Bargaining: A Comparison Between USA and India' (Criminal Law Studies, 20 May 2022) https://criminallawstudiesnluj.wordpress.com/2022/05/20/plea-bargaining-a-comparison-between-usa-and-india/ accessed 24 March 2025.

and rules to protect victims. However, its use is limited because of strict eligibility requirements.

Both systems have challenges that need reform. India could improve its plea-bargaining system by allowing more types of cases while keeping strong legal safeguards to prevent misuse. The USA, on the other hand, could make the process fairer by increasing court involvement and giving victims a bigger role, reducing the risk of prosecutors having too much power. By learning from each other, both countries can make plea bargaining more effective and just. In the end, any changes should ensure that efficiency does not come at the cost of fairness, transparency, and individual rights.