International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-8, Issue-6, November 2021
https://doi.org/10.55524/ijirem.2021.8.6.162
www.ijirem.org

Elements Men's Rea and Inchoate Crimes

Arzoo Bishnoi,
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
Email Id- arzoo.bishnoi@vgu.ac.in

ABSTRACT
The common law was slow to recognize attempted murder as a crime. Early English law was founded on the premise that attempting to injure someone was not a crime. Of process, if a man damages someone in the process of attempting to kill him, he might be punished. But it was not a penalty for committing a more severe crime, and it seems that if no bodily harm was done as a result of the effort, no prosecution was conceivable or considered appropriate: 'It was not until the fifteenth century that the penal law was systematically expanded to attempted, and only to committed offences, in the Tribunal of the Star Chamber. According to the author, prosecuting crimes frequently necessitates a sophisticated examination of culpability in individuals who engage in organized criminal activity. People have long been divided on whether or not a person should be prosecuted for attempting to commit a crime without actually committing one. It is claimed that the offenses that the person wishes to perpetrate are of like a severe nature that, even if the offense is not accomplished, prosecuting the activities taken in the process of the offense is in the general interests.

KEYWORDS
Attempt, Crimes, Mens Rea, Law, Prosecution

1. INTRODUCTION
Offense rule punishes not just finished corruptions, but also offenses that are not completed. Incomplete crimes are occasionally mentioned to as "inchoate crimes." Attempt, Conspiracy, and Abetment are the three offenses to which the theory of inchoate crimes applies[1]. The crime of criminal conspiracy is committed when 2 or more people agree to conduct a crime. In this sense, incomplete criminal behavior raises the dilemma of whether it is appropriate to punish someone who has done no harm to anybody or to release someone who has been found guilty of committing a crime[2].
An effort causes anxiety, which is a harm in and of itself, and the offender's moral culpability is the same as if he had succeeded. Because of its near to the completed offence classified as a crime, the conduct might be adequately damaging to civilization. As a result, unlike civil law, criminal law notices and punishes efforts to conduct chargeable wrongs, depending on the type and seriousness of the attempted offense[3].
Attempted offenses, on the other hand, are defined differently in each state. In certain jurisdictions, activities or acts performed in preparation for an attempted crime must go beyond "mere preparation." Other jurisdictions, on the other hand, allow a conviction based on a broader range of activities committed toward the completion of a crime[4].

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 In the past, there has been a history of unsolved crimes
Anticipatory, incipient, unfinished, and preliminary crimes are all terms for inchoate crimes, which entail a desire to commit a crime even if it is never carried out. The term "inchoate" refers to something that is undeveloped or unripe. Due to the social need to prevent crimes before they happen, the common law devised three separate types of inchoate crimes: attempt, conspiracy, and solicitation. There has been little addendum to this segment of crime over the years, with the potential with exception ownership (as in custody of robber techniques, explosives equipment, weapon spurs, etc.) and othere , rarely-heard offense meant predicated on the concept of prepping, which is ordinarily not connected with incoherent offences.
In the past, inchoate crimes were deemed misdemeanors, but as society has given law enforcement and prosecutors greater authority to deal with refractory problems like organized crime, white collar crime, and drug crime, they have been merged into felonies.

- According to the so-called Merger doctrine, a person should not be prosecuted with both the inchoate and choate offenses, with the exception of conspiracy, which can be tried separately.
- While inchoate crimes should ideally be punished less harshly, in many situations the sentence should be the same as for the completed offense.
- Incomplete crimes should contain explicit purpose, stating clearly what the mens rea ingredients are, and
- some evert action or major move in the direction of completing the crime should be necessary. The concept of inchoate crimes is a term used to describe this collection of laws.

In general, the Indian Penal Code of 1860 encompassed all inchoate offenses. Preparation, abetment, plot, and attempt, for example. However, criminal conspiracy was not included in the Indian penal code until 1960. It was established in 1913 under Chapter V A of the Indian Penal Code of 1860.
The fundamental motivation for making preparation, abetment, conspiracy, and attempt crimes criminal is to prevent the crime from occurring in the first place. Because prevention is preferable than treatment, it is appropriate to make the very early stages of a crime punished.

2.2 The Attempt Concept
The term "attempt" is not defined elsewhere in the IPC; instead, Chapter XXIII, titled "Of Attempts to Commit Offenses," This establishes a penalty for trying to perpetrate a crime punished by life incarceration or imprisonment for a period of time. The phrase, on the other hand, refers to a straight step toward

committing a crime once all required preparations have been made.

Acts entirely leading to the conduct of the offence are not to be treated as attempts to commit, but acts directly associated with it are, according to Park B in R. v. Eagelton.

The Supreme Court pointed out that attempting to define the term "attempt" is useless. The offender enters the attempt stage when he or she takes intentional overt measures to commit the crime, and this overt act does not have to be the final act.

In most cases, conduct that is simply preliminary to the commission of a crime is not considered criminal. However, if it is one of a set of preparatory offenses, simple preparation to conduct an offence is illegal. A person must always be shown to have meant to perform an act or a sequence of acts that, when completed, will amount to the alleged attempted offence[5].

An attempt is rendered criminal since every effort, even if it fails, must produce fear, which is a harm in and of itself, and the offender's moral culpability is the same as if he had succeeded. To justify punishment, moral culpability must be linked to damage. Because the harm is not as severe as it would be if the act had been done, only half of the penalty is given.

2.3 Attempting to Commit a Crime in Violation of the IPC

Although the IPC does not define this term, it does include several sections that deal with attempts.

- In some circumstances, both the commission Both committing an offence and attempting to commit one are treated with in the identical paragraph, and the penalty is the identical for either. Both the actual conduct of the crime and the attempt to do it are criminal under such rules.
- In the case of four serious offenses, however, efforts are stated separately but alongside the offenses, and a different punishment is recommended for them. Attempts to kill, culpable homicide, suicide, and robbery are among the offenses listed[6].

2.4 Sections 511 and 307 of the Code of Federal Regulations

In Sections 511 and 307, the term "attempt" has distinct meanings. If there is a particular provision for attempted murder under Section 307, it makes no sense to try it under Section 307/511 IPC, and it is also against the interests of justice. As a result, Section 307 is extensive, and Section 511 cannot limit its reach.

Limitations in Section 522 apply to offenses like as attempting to commit murder, suicide, or obtaining illicit pleasure, all of which are expressly prohibited by other sections of the Code.

2.5 An Attempt's Actus Reus

The actus reus of a criminal attempt is the point at which non-criminal planning of an offense becomes a criminal attempt. Not only does the actus reus of each offense change, but each crime can also be committed in a number of ways and under a variety of situations. It all depends on what the reason for penalizing efforts is.

In Houghton v Smith, it was held that determining whether the accused has gone beyond simple preparation must be left to common sense in each situation. Even if an actus reus is required, Although if the entire offence reus that were intended has not being performed, there might be a criminal [2].

2.6 Men's Rea of a Failed Attempt

An attempt's mens rea is the intent to perform the crime. There is no crime if just mens rea exists. A simple bad purpose or design that isn't accompanied by any overt conduct (prohibited act), also known as actus reus, in pursuit of that design isn't punished.

As a general rule, if mens rea is merely followed by some conduct that does not go beyond manifest mens rea, there is no criminal responsibility. Only after the perpetrator has done anything that not only displays his mens rea but also moves him closer to carrying it out does he become liable.

In terms of the crime, the mens rea involves purpose as to the conduct and suspicion as to the circumstances. In those circumstances, the defendant would have to commit the entire concealing charge if he went forward with his plan. When he takes more than a merely preliminary step toward that aim, he should be charged with an attempt.

2.7 Is it common for efforts to be prosecuted

The police and other prosecuting authorities typically do not want to add to their workload by prosecuting all efforts. It's often difficult to demonstrate that the requisite attention was given, and the police may believe that a warning is adequate. If they file a charge, it's possible that they'll prefer to charge you with a specific offense, such as carrying a handgun. Attempts to conduct major crimes are, nevertheless, punished from time to time, and the law of attempt is regularly used to justify detaining a would-be criminal[7].

2.8 Penalties for Attempting

With a few exceptions, the Court may impose any sentence that would be appropriate for the completed offense upon conviction of attempt. In practice, however, the penalty for attempting to commit a crime will be less severe than the penalty for committing a crime. If a man shoots another man with the intent of killing him and succeeds, he is condemned to "life in prison." If he misses, he may face a life sentence, although he will be handled much more leniently in practice.

2.9 The Difference Between Attempt And Preparation

The term "preparation" refers to the process of arranging or devising essential means or measures, whereas "attempt" refers to the actual action taken when preparation is complete. The Supreme Court decided in Sudhir kumar Mukharjee v. State of West Bengal that an effort to commit an offence begins when the preparation is complete and the perpetrator begins to do anything with the aim of committing the offence, which is a step toward the commission of the offence.

However, there is a fine line between preparation and attempt, and when that line is crossed, a person is guilty. An effort to commit a crime begins when the preparation is complete and the perpetrator takes action to perform the crime. This act does not have to be the penultimate act in the commission of the crime, but it must occur while the crime is being committed. 17 At other words, if a person has gone too far and missed the chance to repent, he is in the stage of attempting to repent[4].

It is an attempt if the act is close enough to the real offence, and it is preparation if the act is too far away from the actual offence. As a result, while preparation is not punishable at the beginning, attempt is always criminal at the end[8].

The test to see whether the two are different is to see if the previous acts are such that if the offender changes his mind and does not continue, the previous acts are entirely harmless. If that is the case, it is just preparation; if it is not the case, it is an effort[9]. The key question is whether the final act, if carried out uninterrupted and successfully, would be considered a crime. 18 However, because one blends into the other, a sharp clear cut distinction between the two is impossible to make, and

the dividing line can only be determined based on the facts of each instance.

An effort to commit a crime must be separated from the desire to conduct the crime or the preparation for its commission. When comparing preparation and attempt, the latter requires more resolve[10].

2.10 Conspiracy

When two or more individuals agree to perform an unlawful crime and take some steps toward completing it, it is called a conspiracy. Conspiracy is an amorphous crime since it does not need the completion of the criminal act. For example, a group of people can be found guilty of conspiring to commit burglary even if the crime never takes place. Conspiracy is also distinct in that, unlike attempted crimes, a person can be charged with both conspiracy and the crime itself if the crime is carried out[7].

3. CONCLUSION

To be found guilty of an offense, the defendant must have the mens rea and have done the actus reus. The core of the crime of attempt is that the defendant has failed to perform the actus reus of the complete offence; thus, it is only necessary to establish that the defendant has the mens rea since the offence has not been committed, even if the defendant intended it to be. However, there are sure to be conceptual issues, especially when the principal offense encompasses a variety of mental states and the commission of the crime involves both result and situation outcomes. None of this, however, can change the plain meaning of purpose when it comes to the imposition of attempted criminal responsibility.

Hundreds of crimes, including many of the oldest and most serious, ban action that is simply preliminary to the commission of other crimes. In a similar vein, forgery is only a felony if it is used to prepare for acquiring through deceit or other forms of fraud. A person who tries and fails to commit a criminal offense deserves to be punished just as much as someone who succeeds.

To sum up, the author agrees with the definition of "attempt" stated in the preceding sentence, because it is always an attempt rather than a full-fledged crime. The law indicates that the defendant is still guilty, and it also argues that, depending on proximity, there isn't much of a difference between attempting and committing a crime because the mens rea for both is the same, regardless of the act, which the author also agrees with.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors acknowledge the immense help received from the scholars whose articles are cited and included in references to this manuscript. The authors are also grateful to authors/ editors / publishers of all those articles, journals and books from where the literature for this article has been reviewed and discussed.

REFERENCES

[1] L. J.-B., F. H., and S. F., “Androgen deprivation and bone,” Current Osteoporosis Reports, vol. 9, no. 1. pp. 20–24, 2011, [Online]. Available: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=emed10&NEWS=N&AN=2011069113.

[2] M. R. Lippman, “Genocide in International Law: The Crimes of Crimes (review),” Hum. Rights Q., 2001, doi: 10.1353/hrq.2001.0058.

[3] G. Della Morte, “De-mediatizing the media case. Elements of a critical approach,” J. Int. Crim. Justice, 2005, doi: 10.1093/jicj/mqi064.

[4] G. Yaffe, “Mens rea by the numbers,” Crim. Law Philos., 2018, doi: 10.1007/s11572-017-9430-0.

[5] D. L. Nersessian, “Comparative approaches to punishing hate: The intersection of genocide and crimes against humanity,” Stanford Journal of International Law. 2007.

[6] R. A. Williams, “Law Commission Consultation Paper No. 183 on Conspiracy and Attempt - Comments on Conspiracy,” SSRN Electron. J., 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1155136.

[7] J. E. Carroll, “Brain Science and the Theory of Juvenile Mens Rea,” North Carol. Law Rev., 2016.

[8] R. G. Casey, D. J. Rea, T. McDermott, R. Grainger, M. Butler, and J. A. Thornhill, “Prostate cancer knowledge in Irish men,” J. Cancer Educ., vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 120–131, 2012, doi: 10.1007/s13187-011-0256-5.

[9] A. Rea, Middlebrow Wodehouse: P.G. Wodehouse’s work in context. 2016.

[10] D. W. Denno, “Concocting criminal intent,” Georgetown Law J., 2017.