

News

The Supreme Court affirms the boyfriend's conviction in the actress Prathyusha death case, punishing the survivor of a suicide pact.



According to this ruling, the individual who survives the attempt or chooses not to carry out the suicide pact bears responsibility.

The conviction of Gudipalli Siddhartha Reddy in the 2002 suicide of Telugu actress Prathyusha was maintained by the Indian Supreme Court on Tuesday.

Reddy, Prathyusha's lover, was ordered by the court to turn himself in within four weeks.

Importantly, the Court also explained the law's stance on accountability in situations involving suicide pacts, which are agreements to terminate one's life with another.

According to the ruling, the individual who survives the attempt or chooses not to proceed is responsible in these situations.

The Court ruled that suicide by pact is responsible.

In further detail, the Court stated,

In a suicide pact, both parties pledge to die together and support one another. The Court decided that the deceased's actions were directly triggered by the survivor's participation and presence.

In this instance, the court observed that Reddy had bought the pesticide knowing it was deadly and that, notwithstanding Prathyusha's survival, he had also absorbed the poison. The appellant-accused in this instance purchased the pesticide knowing it was deadly, so aiding and abetting the offense under Section 306 of the IPC. Additionally, the Court stated that if the accused did not provide a reason for why they and the deceased drank poison, it would be assumed that they did so with the intention of committing suicide.

According to Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), he was therefore found to have participated in a suicide pact and was therefore guilty of aiding and abetting suicide.

The decision ended a 23-year court case concerning whether Reddy was responsible for Prathyusha's suicide or if the occurrence was a suicide pact.

A bench consisting of Justices Manmohan and Rajesh Bindal ruled that rape could not be substantiated and that the evidence refuted allegations that Prathyusha had been strangled. However, the Court discovered unmistakable proof that she had been poisoned.

The accused's actions justified judicial repercussions, the court noted.

According to Justice Manmohan, "The accused was the target of negative imputation.

The case began in February of 2002. Reddy's parents were against Reddy and Prathyusha being married, despite the fact that they were in love.

They both ingested poison, and Reddy lived while Prathyusha perished.

The incident was handled as a case of abetment of suicide rather than murder in the first investigation.

Following the investigation, Reddy was accused of crimes including aiding suicide and was put on trial. He was found guilty of abetment of suicide under Section 306 of the IPC by the trial court and given a five-year prison sentence.

The matter subsequently went to the High Court, which maintained Reddy's conviction but lowered his sentence to two years and raised the fine.

The Supreme Court later received two distinct appeals.

Reddy filed one contesting his conviction and the conclusions against him.

In contrast, Prathyusha's mother contested the High Court's decision and findings as well as the sentence reduction.

The Supreme Court examined a number of important topics throughout the hearing.

The Court considered whether Prathyusha and Reddy had made a suicide pact based on the facts. It also took into account whether driving someone to commit suicide had been established to be a crime.

Ultimately, the Court examined whether the High Court erred in altering the trial court's sentence.

The Supreme Court stated after reviewing the available evidence that it was evident from the facts and evidence that the deceased and the accused had established a suicide pact.

According to the Court, a suicide pact is a mutual agreement by both parties to end their lives that gives the other the motivation or support they need to carry out the act.

The Bench emphasized that "the act would not occur if it were not for the active participation of both parties."

Because the State has a basic interest in protecting life, the law views such behavior as abetment. The Bench decided that any assistance in ending life is considered a crime against the State.

The Court came to the conclusion that the accused was liable under Section 306 read with Section 107 (abetment of a thing) of the IPC for his actions in making and carrying out the suicide pact. The deceased's suicide was directly made possible by his involvement. Therefore, his guilt is established," the Bench decided.

The Court came to the conclusion that the prosecution had satisfactorily proven Prathyusha's poisoning and that Reddy was legally liable.

Additionally, it decided that there was no basis to doubt the High Court's handling of the case.

Thus, it upheld the conviction and sentence of the High Court while dismissing both of the appeals pertaining to this case.

Reddy was told to turn himself in within four weeks so that he may finish his sentence.