International Journal of Law
www.lawjournals.org
ISSN: 2455-2194
Received: 24-10-2025, Accepted: 23-11-2025, Published: 08-12-2025
Volume 11, Issue 12, 2025, Page No. 56-63

Neuroscience and Criminal Behavior: Can Brain Imaging Redefine Crime and Culpability in India

Abhay Yadav[1], Paras Yadav[2]
[1] School of Law, IILM University Greater Noida, India
[2] Assistant Professor, School of Law, IILM University Greater Noida, India

Abstract
'The mind is its own place, and in itself can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.' – John M. Neurocriminology, a rising intrigue field, combines neuroscience and criminology to analyze the organic premise of criminal behavior. By analyzing brain structures, neurochemical awkward nature, and cognitive disabilities, this field challenges conventional ideas of free will and criminal duty. Progresses in neuroimaging procedures such as useful MRI (fMRI) and PET looks have given experimental prove that brain variations from the norm can impact hostility, motivation control, and decision-making, raising vital legitimate and moral questions. This research digs into the advancing part of neuroscience in India's criminal equity framework, centering on its suggestions for culpability, sentencing, and restoration. It examines point of interest cases such as Selvi v. State of Karnataka, which tended to the protected legitimacy of neuroscientific methods, and universal cases like Individuals v. Weinstein and Roper v. Simmons, where brain imaging impacted legal results. The ponder investigates whether Indian courts ought to consolidate neuroscientific prove in surveying mens-rea (guilty mind) and moderating sentences, especially for adolescents and rationally sick wrongdoers. Moreover, it highlights concerns encompassing the abuse of neuroscience in scientific examinations, the moral problem of prescient policing, and socio-economic aberrations in getting to neuroscientific defenses. The research eventually looks for to set up an adjusted approach to joining neuroscience into India's criminal law. Whereas neuroscientific prove can upgrade the exactness of legitimate judgments, its unregulated utilize may weaken crucial rights, such as the right against self-incrimination beneath Article 20(3) of the Indian Structure. The consider calls for organized legitimate changes, legal preparing, and the improvement of clear acceptability guidelines to guarantee that neuro-criminology is connected morally and successfully. By bridging logical headways with legitimate standards, this investigates advocates for a equity framework that remains reasonable, evidence-based, and cognizant of human cognitive restrictions.

Keywords: Neurocriminology, brain study, crime, criminal mindset, legal perspective

Introduction

Historical Background

The origins of neuroscience in criminal law can be traced back to early philosophical and scientific inquiries into the relationship between the brain and human behavior. Ancient civilizations, including the Greeks and Romans, recognized the brain's role in cognitive functions and moral responsibility, though their understanding remained rudimentary. Hippocrates, often regarded as the father of medicine, proposed that the brain was the center of thought and emotion, challenging the prevailing belief that the heart governed human actions. This foundational idea laid the groundwork for later explorations into the biological basis of behavior and its implications for legal responsibility.

The emergence of neurocriminology as a distinct field began in the 19th century with Cesare Lombroso's theory of the 'born criminal.' Lombroso, an Italian criminologist and physician, argued that criminal tendencies were biologically inherited and could be identified through physical and neurological traits. His work, although now considered pseudoscientific, was among the earliest attempts to establish a link between brain structure and criminal behavior. His theories influenced early legal thought, particularly in the realm of criminal responsibility and the treatment of offenders. However, the deterministic nature of Lombroso's arguments faced strong criticism, leading to the eventual rejection of his ideas in favor of more nuanced approaches. The case of Phineas Gage in 1848 provided one of the first concrete examples of how brain injuries could alter personality and impulse control. Gage, a railroad worker, suffered a severe brain injury when an iron rod penetrated his prefrontal cortex. Though he survived, his personality underwent drastic changes, making him impulsive and aggressive. This case was instrumental in demonstrating that brain damage could impact decision-making and moral reasoning, a notion that later influenced forensic psychology and criminal jurisprudence.

By the early 20th century, advancements in neurology and psychology contributed to a growing understanding of mental illness and its legal implications. Courts began recognizing insanity as a defense in criminal cases, influenced by scientific developments in understanding mental disorders. The landmark case of M'Naghten's Case (1843) established the legal standard for insanity, asserting that a defendant could be excused from criminal liability if they were unable to understand the nature of their actions due to a mental defect. This principle, rooted in early neurological studies, laid the foundation for incorporating scientific evidence into legal proceedings. The mid-20th century witnessed significant strides in brain imaging technologies, such as electroencephalography (EEG) and, later, functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), which allowed scientists to study brain activity in greater detail. These advancements enabled forensic experts to examine how neurological conditions, such as tumors or traumatic brain injuries, could affect criminal behavior. A notable example is the case of Charles Whitman, who committed a mass shooting in 1966. An autopsy revealed that Whitman

had a tumor pressing against his amygdala, a region associated with aggression, raising questions about the extent to which biological factors influence criminal actions. In the latter half of the 20th century, neuroscience began to play a more direct role in courtrooms. The trial of John Hinckley Jr., who attempted to assassinate U.S. President Ronald Reagan in 1981, prominently featured neuroscientific and psychiatric evidence. The defense argued that Hinckley suffered from schizophrenia and a brain abnormality that impaired his capacity to control his actions. His acquittal on grounds of insanity led to widespread legal debates and reforms concerning the admissibility of neuroscientific evidence.

In India, the intersection of neuroscience and criminal law gained attention in cases involving forensic neuropsychology. The Supreme Court's decision in Selvi v. State of Karnataka [(2010) 7 SCC 263] [14] addressed the use of neuroscientific techniques like Brain Electrical Activation Profile (BEAP) and narcoanalysis in criminal investigations. The Court ruled that involuntary use of such methods violated constitutional protections against self-incrimination under Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution, highlighting the legal and ethical concerns surrounding the use of neuroscience in criminal law. The ongoing evolution of neuroscience in criminal law reflects an enduring effort to reconcile scientific discoveries with legal principles. While neuroscience offers valuable insights into the biological underpinnings of behavior, its integration into legal systems remains complex. Courts must balance scientific evidence with fundamental principles of justice, ensuring that neurological findings enhance legal fairness rather than undermine personal accountability. As technology advances, the role of neuroscience in criminal law will likely continue to expand, requiring continuous dialogue between legal scholars, scientists, and policymakers to navigate its implications effectively.

Neurocriminology: Definition & Scope

Neurocriminology, an interdisciplinary field that merges neuroscience with criminology and law, seeks to understand the neurological and biological underpinnings of criminal behavior. Unlike traditional criminology, which primarily focuses on sociological and environmental influences, neurocriminology emphasizes the role of brain structures, cognitive impairments, and neurophysiological functions in influencing criminal conduct. It draws upon advancements in neuroscience, particularly neuroimaging techniques, to study brain abnormalities and their potential correlation with violent or antisocial behavior. The growing recognition of the biological foundations of criminal behavior has led to profound discussions regarding its implications for criminal responsibility, sentencing, and rehabilitation. The historical roots of neurocriminology can be traced back to early biological criminology, particularly the work of Cesare Lombroso in the 19th century. Lombroso theorized that criminality was hereditary and that individuals predisposed to crime could be identified through physiological anomalies. Though his deterministic approach has been largely discredited, it laid the foundation for later studies exploring biological factors influencing criminal behavior. The modern development of neurocriminology is attributed to the pioneering work of Adrian Raine, who used neuroimaging techniques to study brain dysfunction in violent offenders. His research provided empirical evidence that deficiencies in the prefrontal cortex and abnormalities in the amygdala contribute to impaired impulse control and increased aggression. The field has since evolved, incorporating neuroscientific findings into legal frameworks to assess criminal responsibility and develop rehabilitative measures. Neurocriminology is primarily concerned with analyzing the relationship between brain function and criminal behavior. It focuses on specific brain structures such as the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and limbic system, which regulate impulse control, emotional processing, and moral decision-making. Studies have demonstrated that individuals with damage or reduced activity in these regions exhibit increased aggression, diminished empathy, and a lack of behavioral inhibition, which are common traits among offenders convicted of violent crimes. For example, research on individuals with Antisocial - Personality Disorder (ASPD) has consistently revealed deficits in prefrontal cortex activity, which is responsible for executive functions such as judgment, decision-making, and inhibition of socially unacceptable behavior. Prominent neuroscientist Kent Kiehl, in his study on psychopathy, observed that 'psychopaths have significantly reduced activity in brain regions associated with moral reasoning, which may explain their lack of remorse and empathy'. The scope of neurocriminology extends beyond research and has significant implications in forensic assessments, legal defenses, and the criminal justice system. Courts worldwide have increasingly relied on neuroscientific evidence to evaluate criminal responsibility, competency to stand trial, and sentencing considerations. In the landmark case of Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005), the United States Supreme Court ruled that juveniles could not be sentenced to death, citing neuroscientific evidence that the adolescent brain is still developing, thereby affecting decision-making and impulse control. Justice Anthony Kennedy, in delivering the opinion of the Court, observed that 'scientific and sociological studies support the conclusion that juveniles have a lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility'. Similarly, in Miller v. Alabama, 567 U.S. 460 (2012), the Court held that mandatory life sentences without parole for juveniles constituted cruel and unusual punishment, relying on neuroscientific research demonstrating the immaturity of the adolescent brain.

In India, the judiciary has also acknowledged the significance of neuroscientific evidence in criminal trials. The Supreme Court in Selvi v. State of Karnataka, [(2010) 7 SCC 263] [14], ruled that involuntary use of neuroscientific techniques such as Brain Electrical Activation Profile (BEAP) and narcoanalysis violated constitutional protections against self-incrimination under Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan, while delivering the judgment, emphasized that 'the reliance on neuroscientific techniques must be approached with caution to prevent the risk of self-incrimination and potential misuse'. This decision underscored the ethical and legal challenges associated with the application of neurocriminology in criminal investigations.

Another critical area where neurocriminology has impacted legal discourse is in the determination of criminal responsibility. The principle of mens rea, or guilty mind, is a fundamental component of criminal law, requiring proof of intent for establishing culpability. However, neurocriminological findings challenge this traditional notion by demonstrating that certain neurological

impairments may affect an individual's ability to form intent. Prominent legal scholar Stephen J. Morse argues that 'while neuroscience can provide insights into the causes of criminal behavior, it does not negate moral and legal responsibility'. He warns against the 'brain overclaim syndrome,' where neuroscientific findings are misinterpreted to absolve individuals of legal accountability. Similarly, Indian jurist Justice M. Katju has cautioned that 'while neuroscience may assist in understanding behavior, the law must balance scientific findings with legal principles to ensure justice is served'. Despite its potential benefits, neurocriminology raises ethical, legal, and philosophical concerns. A primary concern is the issue of determinism versus free will. If criminal behavior is significantly influenced by neurological factors beyond an individual's control, questions arise regarding the extent to which such individuals should be held accountable. The debate over the role of neurocriminology in criminal law has led some scholars to propose a revised approach to sentencing that considers neurological predispositions while still upholding principles of justice. In jurisdictions such as Germany and the Netherlands, neuroscientific evidence has been incorporated into criminal proceedings to assess diminished culpability, particularly in cases involving offenders with brain injuries or mental illnesses.

Another concern is the potential misuse of neuroscientific evidence in criminal trials. There is a risk that courts may overinterpret or misapply neuroscientific findings, leading to inconsistent legal outcomes. The reliability of neuroimaging techniques has also been questioned, as variations in brain activity can be influenced by external factors such as stress, substance use, and prior trauma. Legal scholar Nita Farahany warns that 'the admissibility of neuroscientific evidence must be scrutinized to prevent its misuse as a tool for exoneration or unjust sentencing'. Neurocriminology also has significant implications for public policy, particularly in the areas of criminal sentencing, juvenile justice, and the rehabilitation of offenders with mental illnesses. Policymakers are increasingly considering neuroscientific insights when formulating laws related to juvenile offenders. For instance, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 in India incorporates provisions for assessing the mental maturity of juveniles before deciding whether they should be tried as adults. Justice Deepak Gupta of the Supreme Court has emphasized that 'scientific advancements must guide legal reforms to ensure that justice systems remain fair and progressive'.

In conclusion, neurocriminology represents a revolutionary shift in understanding criminal behavior, bridging the gap between neuroscience and law. Its scope extends from forensic applications to legal defenses, sentencing considerations, rehabilitation strategies, and public policy initiatives. However, its integration into the legal system must be approached with caution, ensuring that neuroscientific evidence is applied judiciously and ethically. As scientific advancements continue to unravel the complexities of human behavior, the role of neurocriminology in criminal justice will undoubtedly expand, necessitating ongoing dialogue between legal scholars, scientists, and policymakers to navigate its implications effectively.

Neurocriminology: Decoding the Criminal Mind Through Science

Neurocriminology is an emerging interdisciplinary field that applies neuroscientific principles to the study of criminal behavior. It combines insights from neuroscience, psychology, and criminology to analyze how brain structures, neurochemical imbalances, and genetic factors contribute to criminal tendencies. Traditional criminological theories have predominantly focused on social and environmental influences, but recent advancements in brain imaging and genetic research have provided empirical evidence that biological factors also play a crucial role in shaping criminal behavior. The implications of this research extend beyond theoretical debates, influencing legal policies, criminal sentencing, and forensic evaluations.

A landmark case that brought neuro-criminology into the courtroom was People v. Weinstein (1992), where Herbert Weinstein, a man with no prior criminal record, killed his wife in what appeared to be a sudden and impulsive act. During his trial, defense attorneys presented MRI scans revealing a large cyst in his prefrontal cortex, a region responsible for impulse control and decision-making. The defense successfully argued that the cyst contributed to his lack of impulse regulation, leading to a plea deal for a reduced sentence. This case marked one of the earliest instances where neuroscientific evidence influenced judicial outcomes, raising ethical and legal questions about criminal responsibility and sentencing.

Further research into the biological basis of crime has demonstrated that abnormalities in specific brain regions significantly impact an individual's propensity for violence. The prefrontal cortex, which governs rational thinking and self-control, has been found to be underactive in individuals with a history of violent crime. A widely cited study by Adrian Raine (1998) used PET scans to examine the brains of convicted murderers and found significantly lower activity in their prefrontal cortex compared to non-offenders. This deficiency impairs their ability to regulate emotions, assess risks, and control impulses, making them more prone to violent behavior. Additionally, dysfunction in the amygdala, the brain's emotional processing center, has been linked to psychopathy. Studies have shown that psychopaths exhibit reduced amygdala volume and decreased connectivity between the amygdala and the prefrontal cortex, resulting in diminished empathy and fear responses.

A recent case highlighting the role of neuroscience in criminal law is Brian Dugan v. State of Illinois (2009). Dugan, convicted of multiple brutal murders, underwent an fMRI scan that revealed a significantly smaller and less active amygdala. His defense team argued that his psychopathy was rooted in neurobiological abnormalities rather than personal choice. Although the court acknowledged the scientific findings, he was still sentenced to death, illustrating the ongoing debate over the extent to which neuroscience should mitigate criminal liability.

Apart from brain structure abnormalities, genetic factors have also been implicated in criminal behavior. One of the most studied genetic markers is the MAOA gene, often referred to as the 'warrior gene.' This gene is responsible for the regulation of neurotransmitters such as dopamine and serotonin, which influence mood and aggression. Individuals with a low-functioning MAOA variant (MAOA-L) have been found to exhibit higher levels of impulsive

aggression, particularly when exposed to childhood trauma. A pivotal study by Caspi *et al*. (2002) found that individuals with the MAOA-L gene who experienced severe maltreatment in childhood were significantly more likely to engage in violent criminal behavior in adulthood compared to those without the genetic variant.

The judicial system has begun to consider genetic evidence in criminal cases, as seen in State v. Waldroup (2010). Bradley Waldroup, charged with murder and attempted murder, presented genetic evidence indicating that he possessed the MAOA-L variant. His defense argued that, combined with his history of childhood abuse, this genetic predisposition contributed to his violent actions. The jury considered this in sentencing, reducing his charge from first-degree murder to voluntary manslaughter, showcasing how genetic findings are increasingly shaping legal outcomes. However, the introduction of genetic predisposition as a mitigating factor remains controversial, as it raises questions about determinism, free will, and the ethical implications of reducing individual accountability based on genetic makeup.

In addition to genetic influences, epigenetics—a field that studies how environmental factors affect gene expression—has further complicated the understanding of criminal behavior. Recent research suggests that exposure to severe stress, abuse, or neglect during early development can lead to epigenetic modifications that increase aggression and impulsivity later in life. A study published in The American Journal of Psychiatry (2022) found that individuals who experienced extreme childhood trauma exhibited epigenetic changes in genes linked to stress regulation and aggression, increasing their likelihood of engaging in violent behavior. These findings underscore the complex interplay between biology and environment in shaping criminal tendencies.

The legal implications of neurocriminology are profound, particularly in cases involving juveniles and individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders. The U.S. Supreme Court case Roper v. Simmons (2005) set a significant precedent by ruling that the death penalty for juveniles was unconstitutional. The decision was heavily influenced by neuroscientific research demonstrating that the adolescent brain is still developing, particularly the prefrontal cortex. The ruling acknowledged that juveniles lack full cognitive maturity and impulse control, making them less culpable than adults for their actions. Similarly, in Miller v. Alabama (2012), the Supreme Court ruled that mandatory life sentences without parole for juveniles were unconstitutional, reinforcing the growing acceptance of neuroscience in shaping legal policies.

Internationally, neurocriminology has also influenced judicial decisions. In Spain, the case of Antonio Bustamante (2009) involved a man convicted of homicide who presented neuroscientific evidence of a traumatic brain injury affecting his prefrontal cortex. The court took this into account, leading to a reduced sentence. In Italy, a 2009 appellate case accepted neuroimaging evidence as part of an insanity defense, marking one of the first instances in Europe where brain scans played a critical role in determining criminal responsibility.

Despite its growing influence, neurocriminology remains a contentious field, with critics arguing that it risks undermining personal accountability and moral responsibility. There is also concern about the potential misuse of neuroscientific findings in criminal justice, particularly regarding the ethical implications of predictive policing based on brain scans or genetic profiles. While neurocriminology provides valuable insights into the biological roots of criminal behavior, its integration into legal systems must be approached with caution to ensure that it complements, rather than replaces, established principles of justice.

As research continues to evolve, neurocriminology holds promise for advancing forensic assessments, improving rehabilitation programs, and refining sentencing policies. By bridging the gap between science and law, it has the potential to revolutionize our understanding of crime and reshape the way criminal responsibility is determined in courts worldwide. However, the balance between scientific evidence and legal principles must be carefully maintained to uphold justice while recognizing the complexities of human behavior.

Mind on Trial: The Role of Neurocriminology in India's Legal Landscape

The intersection of neuroscience and law has given rise to a revolutionary field—neurocriminology. This emerging discipline delves into the biological and neurological foundations of criminal behavior, challenging the conventional notions of free will and culpability. In a country like India, where the legal system has long relied on classical theories of crime and punishment, neurocriminology offers a fresh perspective. It compels the judiciary to look beyond mere actions and into the minds of offenders, asking: What if the crime is a consequence of a brain disorder rather than moral failure? With advancements in brain imaging and cognitive neuroscience, Indian courts may soon face the question of whether criminal behavior can be attributed to neurological dysfunctions rather than mere intent.

The importance of neurocriminology becomes particularly evident in cases where mental illness or cognitive impairments blur the lines between guilt and innocence. Traditionally, the Indian legal system has applied the concept of mens rea (guilty mind) to determine criminal liability. Section 84 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) provides that a person suffering from a mental disorder that renders them incapable of understanding the nature of their act cannot be held criminally liable. However, proving insanity in court has often been a subjective exercise, relying on testimonies and behavioral analysis rather than empirical evidence. Here, neurocriminology offers an objective approach—functional MRI (fMRI) scans and PET imaging can detect abnormalities in brain regions responsible for decision-making, impulse control, and aggression.

A striking example can be drawn from the Surendra Mishra v. State of Jharkhand, where the Supreme Court ruled that the burden of proving insanity lay on the accused. The court held that a mere history of mental illness was insufficient; there had to be clear evidence that the accused was incapable of distinguishing right from wrong at the time of the offense. However, what if neuroscientific tools could show a direct impairment in brain function at the time of the crime? Would this change how courts perceive culpability? The United States has already seen cases where brain scans influenced sentencing, such as People v. Weinstein, where the presence of a brain cyst was considered a mitigating factor in determining punishment. India, too, may benefit from such scientific assessments, ensuring that punishment is proportionate to the offender's actual cognitive capacity.

Neurocriminology's impact extends beyond the courtroom into the realm of juvenile justice, where the biological underpinnings of adolescent behavior come into play. The Indian Supreme Court, in Anoop Singh v. State of Haryana, acknowledged that the adolescent brain is not fully developed, especially in areas responsible for impulse control. Neuroscientific studies have consistently shown that the prefrontal cortex—the region involved in rational decision-making—continues to mature into the mid-20s. This scientific reality raises ethical questions about the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, which allows juveniles aged 16–18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes. Should a juvenile offender be punished with the same severity as an adult when their neurobiology renders them more prone to reckless decisions?

Internationally, the landmark Roper v. Simmons ruling in the United States abolished the death penalty for juveniles, citing neuroscientific evidence that adolescent brains are not yet fully capable of moral reasoning. If Indian courts adopt a similar approach, juvenile sentencing could become more reformative than punitive, shifting the focus from retribution to rehabilitation. This could pave the way for evidence-based interventions, such as cognitive behavioral therapy and neurofeedback training, to address the neurological deficiencies that contribute to criminal behavior.

Beyond juvenile justice, neurocriminology plays a crucial role in death penalty cases, where the stakes are highest. India retains the death penalty for the 'rarest of rare' cases, as per the precedent set in Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab. However, determining which criminals deserve the death penalty is a complex exercise, often influenced by subjective judicial discretion. Neuroscience could introduce a new layer of objectivity—by distinguishing between offenders who are neurologically incapable of reform and those who possess the cognitive capacity for rehabilitation.

Consider the Mukesh & Anr v. State for NCT of Delhi case, commonly known as the Nirbhaya case, where the convicts were sentenced to death for a brutal gang rape and murder. The crime was so heinous that few questioned the appropriateness of capital punishment. However, in other cases where criminal intent is ambiguous, neuroscientific evidence could provide clarity. In Santosh Kumar Singh v. State, the Supreme Court commuted a death sentence to life imprisonment, considering the possibility of reformation. If neurocriminology were applied in such cases, brain imaging could help determine whether an offender has the neurological traits of a psychopath—characterized by reduced empathy and impulsivity—or whether they are capable of rehabilitation. This approach would not only ensure fair sentencing but also uphold the principle that punishment should be based on the individual's actual mental and cognitive state.

Another critical application of neuro-criminology is in preventive policing and crime risk assessment. Many criminal behaviors have been linked to neurological abnormalities, particularly in the amygdala (which regulates fear and aggression) and the prefrontal cortex (which controls impulse behavior). Research has shown that individuals with reduced prefrontal activity and hyperactive amygdala's are more prone to violent crimes. In Western nations, predictive policing already uses statistical and neuroscientific models to assess potential offenders. India, with its growing crime rates, could similarly incorporate neuropsychological screenings in correctional facilities and juvenile homes to identify individuals at risk of reoffending. However, ethical concerns surrounding such predictive approaches must be addressed—should a person be monitored or rehabilitated based on their brain structure alone? Could this lead to bias or profiling against certain socio-economic groups?

Despite its promising potential, the introduction of neurocriminology in the Indian legal system is fraught with challenges. First, there are no standardized legal frameworks for the admissibility of neuroscientific evidence in Indian courts. Unlike DNA evidence, which is widely accepted, neuroimaging remains controversial due to concerns about its reliability and interpretative ambiguity. Second, neuroscience challenges the traditional legal assumption of free will—if criminal behavior is a product of brain abnormalities, does this absolve individuals of moral responsibility? These questions require a multidisciplinary dialogue between neuroscientists, legal experts, ethicists, and policymakers to ensure that the law evolves in a manner that is both scientifically informed and ethically sound.

Neurocriminology offers an unprecedented opportunity to refine India's criminal justice system, ensuring that legal decisions are not solely based on outdated theories but are also informed by the latest scientific discoveries. Whether in insanity defenses, juvenile justice, capital punishment, or crime prevention, the integration of neuroscience could transform the way guilt, intent, and punishment are determined. However, caution must be exercised in implementing such an approach—while science can guide legal reasoning, it cannot replace the moral and ethical considerations that define justice. If harnessed responsibly, neurocriminology could serve as a bridge between law and science, ensuring that justice is not only served but is also truly understood.

Legal and Ethical Challenges of Neurocriminology at the Ground Level

Neurocriminology, the intersection of neuroscience and criminal law, is rapidly evolving as a discipline that seeks to understand the biological underpinnings of criminal behavior. However, in a country like India, where legal frameworks are still evolving, the use of neuroscientific evidence in the judicial system presents profound ethical and legal challenges. While neurocriminological techniques such as functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), Brain Electrical Oscillation Signature (BEOS) profiling, and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scans promise scientific insights into criminal behavior, their application in real-world legal scenarios remains contentious. The grassroots-level impact of these technologies involves issues related to privacy, consent, misuse of forensic science, socio-economic disparities, and fundamental rights under the Indian Constitution.

1. **Violation of the Right Against Self-Incrimination**
   A significant legal challenge in India arises from the conflict between neurocriminological tests and Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees the right against self-incrimination. The landmark case of Selvi v. State of Karnataka (2010) brought this issue to the forefront. In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that the involuntary use of BEOS, narcoanalysis, and polygraph tests violates an accused's fundamental

rights, as these methods amount to testimonial compulsion.

However, despite the ruling, law enforcement agencies in India continue to employ these techniques, sometimes under coercive circumstances. Reports indicate that police authorities in various states have pressured suspects into undergoing BEOS profiling without their explicit consent, thereby undermining judicial integrity. This raises a significant ethical dilemma: if neuroscientific evidence is used to establish a suspect's guilt without voluntary participation, can it be considered legally admissible?

2. Lack of Standardized Guidelines for Neuroscientific Evidence

Another challenge at the grassroots level is the absence of clear guidelines on the admissibility of neuroscientific evidence in Indian courts. Unlike the Daubert standard followed in the United States, which requires scientific techniques to meet specific reliability and peer-review criteria before being admitted as evidence, Indian courts lack a uniform framework for evaluating neuroscientific evidence.

In the case of Santokben Sharmanbhai Jadeja v. State of Gujarat (2008) [50], the Gujarat High Court accepted the results of narcoanalysis as corroborative evidence, despite the Supreme Court's ruling in Selvi. This inconsistency in judicial interpretation creates legal uncertainty, with lower courts often relying on unscientific forensic reports.

Furthermore, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) has raised concerns over the frequent use of unverified neuroscientific techniques in criminal investigations, highlighting that there is no national accreditation body for forensic neurocriminology in India. This absence of regulatory oversight leads to the unchecked use of unreliable neuroscientific methods, which could potentially result in wrongful convictions.

3. Ethical Concerns: Privacy and Autonomy

From an ethical standpoint, the use of neurocriminological tools raises serious concerns about privacy and autonomy. Indian law recognizes the right to privacy as a fundamental right, as reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017). However, the collection and analysis of neural data without stringent safeguards violate this right, as brain-mapping tests intrude into the most intimate aspects of human cognition.

Legal scholars have cautioned that the commodification of neural data could lead to state overreach. In China, for example, neuroscientific tools have been used to profile individuals based on their likelihood of committing crimes, a practice criticized for violating civil liberties. If India does not establish clear legal protections, there is a risk that similar methods could be employed under the guise of crime prevention, leading to a dystopian model of predictive policing.

Additionally, the lack of consent mechanisms in many neurocriminological tests raises ethical concerns. In grassroots policing, suspects from marginalized backgrounds often do not have the legal awareness or resources to challenge the use of these tests in court, leading to potential human rights violations.

4. Socio-Economic Disparities and Accessibility to Justice

The cost of neuroscientific testing presents another major barrier at the grassroots level. Advanced forensic neuroscience tools, such as fMRI and PET scans, require significant financial resources, making them inaccessible to defendants from economically weaker sections. This creates a scenario where well-funded parties can afford neuroscientific defenses, while indigent defendants are left with traditional, and often weaker, legal defenses.

The case of People v. Weinstein (1992) in the United States is a telling example of this disparity. The defendant, Herbert Weinstein, was able to introduce PET scan evidence showing brain abnormalities, which contributed to a lesser charge. However, in India, the majority of accused individuals lack the financial means to access such technology, thereby reinforcing an unjust legal divide.

Furthermore, caste and class biases within the Indian judicial system exacerbate the problem. Empirical research indicates that lower-caste and tribal individuals are more likely to be subjected to coercive forensic procedures without due process. This raises an important ethical question: Can neuroscience be used equitably in a country where access to justice is already deeply stratified?

5. Potential for Misuse and Judicial Misinterpretation

A final and crucial challenge lies in the misuse of neuroscientific evidence by law enforcement agencies. In cases of custodial violence, Indian police have occasionally employed neurocriminological tools to extract confessions, despite the Supreme Court's ruling in Selvi. This misuse is particularly alarming given the low levels of scientific literacy among judicial officers.

Prominent forensic expert Dr. Sudhir Gupta of AIIMS has argued that Indian courts often accept forensic neuroscience without adequate scientific scrutiny. The risk here is that judges, lacking technical expertise, may interpret neuroscientific findings in a deterministic manner, thereby undermining the role of mens rea in criminal jurisprudence.

Additionally, the growing influence of artificial intelligence (AI) in forensic neuroscience raises concerns about algorithmic biases. If AI-based neurocriminological assessments are deployed in India without transparent oversight, they could disproportionately target marginalized communities, leading to a form of tech-driven social profiling.

Conclusion: The Path Forward

The use of neurocriminology in the Indian legal system presents both opportunities and challenges. While the science offers a promising approach to understanding criminal behavior, its unregulated and unethical application at the grassroots level poses significant risks. The key legal and ethical challenges include:

1. Violation of fundamental rights, particularly the right against self-incrimination and the right to privacy.
2. Lack of standardized guidelines, leading to inconsistent judicial rulings.
3. Ethical concerns regarding autonomy and consent, especially for marginalized individuals.

4. Socio-economic disparities, preventing equal access to neuroscientific defenses.
5. Potential for misuse, including coercion, wrongful convictions, and judicial misinterpretation.

To ensure the responsible use of neurocriminology, urgent legal reforms are needed. Parliament should enact a Neuroscientific Evidence Regulation Act, laying down clear admissibility standards. Judicial training programs should be introduced to enhance scientific literacy among judges, ensuring that neuroscience is interpreted as an evidentiary tool rather than an absolute determinant of guilt.
Ultimately, the integration of neuroscience into criminal law must be guided by a commitment to justice, human dignity, and the rule of law. Without these safeguards, neurocriminology risks becoming an instrument of coercion rather than a means of achieving fair adjudication

Opinion on Neurocriminology in India: A Balanced Approach

Neurocriminology presents an innovative intersection between neuroscience and law, offering a scientific framework to understand criminal behavior. While its potential to aid the judicial process is undeniable, its practical implementation in India remains a complex issue, given the legal, ethical, and socio-economic challenges involved. A neutral perspective on the subject must acknowledge both the opportunities and the risks associated with integrating neurocriminology into the Indian criminal justice system.

Potential Benefits of Neurocriminology

Neuroscientific techniques, such as functional MRI (fMRI), Brain Electrical Oscillation Signature (BEOS), and Positron Emission Tomography (PET), have been used globally to analyze cognitive behavior, detect deception, and study mental disorders linked to criminal actions. Studies suggest that such techniques can be particularly helpful in cases involving insanity defense, recidivism prediction, and juvenile delinquency. Research published in the Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine argues that neuroscientific evidence can provide more objective insights into criminal intent, reducing wrongful convictions based on subjective evaluations. In India, where forensic science infrastructure is still developing, neurocriminology can help enhance evidence-based investigations. However, the absence of standardized legal frameworks to regulate the use of neuroscientific tools creates risks of misuse, as seen in cases where BEOS and polygraph tests were applied without voluntary consent (Dhingra, 2018).

Challenges and the Way Forward

Despite its advantages, neurocriminology faces significant legal and ethical hurdles in India. The right against self-incrimination under Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution, as reinforced in Selvi v. State of Karnataka, limits the scope of such techniques. Additionally, concerns over privacy, false positives in neuroscientific testing, and lack of judicial understanding of neuroscience must be addressed.
To integrate neurocriminology into Indian jurisprudence, a structured legal framework is essential. The Law Commission of India, forensic science institutions, and judiciary should collaborate to:

1. Develop statutory guidelines defining the admissibility and limitations of neuroscientific evidence.
2. Ensure voluntary and informed consent from individuals undergoing tests, aligning with international human rights standards.
3. Train judicial officers and law enforcement personnel on the scientific validity and limitations of neuroscientific tools.
4. Establish independent regulatory bodies to oversee the ethical application of neurocriminology in criminal investigations.

The government and judiciary must balance scientific advancements with constitutional safeguards, ensuring that neurocriminology serves as a tool for justice rather than coercion. With the right legal and ethical safeguards, neurocriminology can enhance criminal investigations while upholding fundamental rights and due process.

References

1. Hippocrates, On the Sacred Disease, trans. WHS. Jones, Loeb Classical Library (Harvard University Press), 1923.
2. Cesare Lombroso, Criminal Man, trans. Mary Gibson and Nicole Hahn Rafter (Duke University Press), 2006.
3. David G. Horn, The Criminal Body: Lombroso and the Anatomy of Deviance (Routledge), 2003.
4. Hanna Damasio *et al*., 'The Return of Phineas Gage: Clues About the Brain from the Skull of a Famous Patient,' Science,1994:264:1102.
5. M'Naghten's Case, Cl Fin,1843:10:200.
6. Daniel Martell, 'Neuroscience and Criminal Law: A Double-Edged Sword,' Law and Human Behavior,2009:33:45.
7. Stephen J. Morse, 'Excusing the Crazy: The Insanity Defense Reconsidered,' Southern California Law Review,1986:59:769.
8. Selvi v. State of Karnataka,2010:7:263.
9. Adrian Raine, The Anatomy of Violence: The Biological Roots of Crime (Pantheon), 2013.
10. David Eagleman, Incognito: The Secret Lives of the Brain (Pantheon), 2011.
11. Cesare Lombroso, Criminal Man (Duke University Press), 2006.
12. Kent A. Kiehl, The Psychopath Whisperer: The Science of Those Without Conscience (Crown), 2014.
13. Roper v. Simmons U.S,2005:543:551.
14. Selvi v. State of Karnataka,2010:7:263.
15. Stephen J Morse, 'Neuroscience and the Law,' Current Legal Problems,2008:15:175.
16. Nita Farahany, The Neuroscience and the Law (Oxford University Press), 2016.
17. Kent A. Kiehl Morris B. Hoffman, 'The Criminal Psychopath: History, Neuroscience, Treatment, and Economics,' Jurimetrics Journal,2011:14:111.
18. Miller v. Alabama U.S,2012:567:460.
19. Laurence Steinberg, 'Adolescent Brain Development and Legal Culpability,' American Psychologist,2003: 59:1009.
20. KG. Balakrishnan, 'Neuroscientific Evidence and Legal Implications,' Indian Journal of Law and Technology,2011:3:45.
21. Stephen J. Morse, Brain Overclaim Syndrome and Criminal Responsibility: A Diagnostic Note Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law,2006:3:397.

22. M Katju, Law and Science: Bridging the Divide (Eastern Book Company), 2015.
23. Joshua Greene Jonathan Cohen, 'For the Law, Neuroscience Changes Nothing and Everything,' Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society,2004: 359:1775.
24. Vincent JM. DiMaio, Forensic Pathology of Trauma (CRC Press), 2001.
25. Henry T. Greely, 'Neuroscience and Criminal Law: Have We Been Getting It Wrong for Centuries?' Journal of Ethics Neuroscience,2008:1:9.
26. Gerben Meynen, Neuroscience and Legal Responsibility (Oxford University Press), 2018.
27. Nita A. Farahany, 'Neuroscience and Behavioral Genetics in U.S. Criminal Law: An Empirical Analysis,' Journal of Law and the Biosciences,2016:2: 485.
28. David Hodgson, 'Neuroscience and Criminal Responsibility,' Melbourne University Law Review,2011:35:237.
29. Deepak Gupta, 'Scientific Advancements and Juvenile Justice Reforms,' Indian Law Review,2019:8:115.
30. Cesare Lombroso, Criminal Man (Mary Gibson Nicole Hahn Rafter tr, Duke University Press), 2006.
31. Damasio AR, Grabowski T, Frank R, Galaburda AM. Damasio H, 'The Return of Phineas Gage: Clues about the Brain from the Skull of a Famous Patient Science,1994:264:1102.
32. Morse SJ. Brain Overclaim Syndrome and Criminal Responsibility. Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law,2004:3(2):397-412
33. Raine A, Buchsbaum M, LaCasse L. Brain abnormalities in murderers indicated by positron emission tomography. Biological Psychiatry,1998: 42(6):495-508
34. Kiehl KA. A cognitive neuroscience perspective on psychopathy: Evidence for paralimbic system dysfunction. Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging,2006: 142(2):107-128
35. Farrow TFD. Neuroscience and Law: Brain Imaging Evidence in Capital Cases. Neuroethics,2011:4(2):185-195.
36. Caspi A, McClay J, Moffitt TE, Mill J, Martin J, Craig IW *et al*. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. Science,2002:297(5582):851-854.
37. Jones O, Wagner AD. Law and Neuroscience in the United States. Oxford Handbook of Neurolaw, 2011.
38. White T, *et al*. Epigenetic Modifications and Aggression in Violent Offenders. The American Journal of Psychiatry,2022:179(4):302-314.
39. Steinberg L. Adolescent Brain Development and Legal Culpability. American Psychological Association, 2009.
40. Sanfey AG. Neurocriminology in European Courts. Journal of Forensic Neuroscience,2015:12(3):190-208.
41. Canali L. Neuroscience in the Italian Legal System: A Landmark Case. Italian, 2009.
42. Joshua W. Buckholtz and David L. Faigman, 'Neuroscience and the Law' Harvard Law Review, 2014:112:193.
43. Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab,1980:2:684.
44. Jeffrey D. Miller *et al*., 'Neurocriminology and Crime Prevention: The Ethics of Using Neuroscience in Criminal Justice' Journal of Law and the Biosciences,2018:25:108.
45. Owen D. Jones *et al*., 'Law and Neuroscience' Journal of Legal Studies,2014:33:85.
46. FE. Legrand, 'The Neuroscience of Criminal Intent: The Future of Mens Rea in Criminal Law' Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology,2020:219:46.
47. Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263
48. NHRC Report on Forensic Science and Human Rights, 2019.
49. Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579, 1993.
50. Santokben Sharmanbhai Jadeja v. State of Gujarat (Guj HC), 2008.