

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

A case where kidnapping of a major boy was made by the accused for ransom and before the Court argument was raised that demand of ransom has not been established. The Court referred to Section 364A and in paragraph 12 following was observed:-

“12. To attract the provisions of Section 364-A what is required to be proved is: (1) that the accused kidnapped or abducted the person; (2) kept him under detention after such kidnapping and abduction; and (3) that the kidnapping or abduction was for ransom. Strong reliance was placed on a decision of the Delhi High Court in *Netra Pal v. State (NCT of Delhi)* [2001 Cri LJ 1669 (Del)] to contend that since the ransom demand was not conveyed to the father of PW 2, the intention to demand was not fulfilled.”

The court in paragraphs 13 to 15 dealt with demand for ransom and held that demand originally was made to person abducted and the mere fact that after making the demand the same could not be conveyed to some other person as the accused was arrested in meantime does not take away the effect of conditions of Section 364A. In the above case, this Court was merely concerned with ransom, hence, other conditions of Section 364A were not noticed.

Malleshi Vs. State of Karnataka, (2004) 8 SCC 95.

Tags: [IPC S. 364A](#), [IPC s. 364A - Ingredients of](#), [IPC S. 364A - Not Guilty](#)