



## Capital Punishment: Legal and Religious Perspectives

**Muhammad Amer Kamran** (Corresponding Author)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: [aamer.kamran@ucp.edu.pk](mailto:aamer.kamran@ucp.edu.pk)

**Muhammad Abdullah Hussain**

Final Year LL.B Student, Department of Law, Islamia University of Bahawalpur

Email: [m.abdullahussain02@gmail.com](mailto:m.abdullahussain02@gmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Barkat Ali**

Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: [barkatali27@gmail.com](mailto:barkatali27@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The right to life is one of the natural and basic human rights. It is not only provided; it is also guaranteed by the constitutions concerned in the contemporary world. However, this right is not absolute; rather, it is a qualified, and is subject to law. Murdering a person without justification is against natural justice and prohibited in almost all laws of land and religions. This act is considered to be a heinous crime on earth, and its punishment is also severe, as the death penalty. This type of punishment is prevalent in most countries, including Pakistan, and has become a dominant issue of contemporary jurisprudence. Different religions, such as Islam, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Jainism and Judaism, have different set of punishments, including the death penalty. Several religions support capital punishment, while some do not; it has been influenced by the law of the land. Islam, Christianity and Judaism mostly favors the capital punishment (death penalty), but some other disfavours the same. The question arises that what may be the plausible interpretation of different approaches concerning capital punishment regarding execution thereof, in Islam comparing with other religions in contemporary jurisprudence. Currently, different countries of the world are observing it in different ways. To answer the question, the authors have adopted a qualitative way of research using both primary and secondary methods for data collection. The data analysis is descriptive in nature to elaborate the conclusion of the study. This research study suggests that the sentence to death may be executed, keeping in view the background of the law of land.

**Keywords:** Capital Punishment; Death penalty; Religion; Retentionist; Abolitionist; Islam; Pakistan.

### Introduction

Life is the most valuable and precious blessing of Allah Almighty. The very first movement of life begins in the womb of the mother. This moment is not merely the beginning of biological life but also confers legal rights to the unborn baby. The



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imaging Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

foremost legal right established simultaneously in the womb of the mother is that of life. The status of the unborn becomes that of a legal person. No controversy in holding that an unborn child whose existence in the mother's womb exceeded five months till its birth was treated no other but a child in existence, such a child could be called a person ("Wahidullah v. State," 2021).

The right to life is a fundamental human right. It is an inalienable right which is inherent to all human beings (Dragne, 2013). In contemporary state laws, this right has been enshrined as a basic fundamental right. Almost all the civilized states, including both religious and secular states, prohibit the violation of the right to life. According to social contract theory, it is the duty of the state to safeguard the lives of its citizens. In religious states like Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Bhutan, and Monaco etc., the right to life has been safeguarded. Likewise, in secular states such as the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and India, etc., have also protected the right to life. Similarly, different religions like Islam (Al-Ma'idha, 5: 32), Christianity (Leviticus, 24:17), Judaism (Exodus, 20:13), and Hinduism (Yog, 10: 4-5) etc., preach the protection of one's life and dignity. The United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) also establish the right to life of individuals (UDHR, 1948)

Although the right to life has been universally established as a basic fundamental right by the various religions and contemporary legal systems, this right is not absolute in nature. The right to life is qualified. Most legal systems and religions across the world acknowledge this right as subject to certain lawful limitations. The purpose is to impose such a limitation in pursuit of justice, security, and social order. This qualified nature of the right implies that while every person is entitled to protection of life, the law may, in some circumstances, authorize to end of such right. Such as in the wake of justice through capital punishment when a heinous offence is committed Thus, the law seeks to balance individual rights with societal interests, ensuring that the sanctity of life is respected without undermining justice and public safety.

This research work aims to look into the jurisprudence of capital punishment. Furthermore, to analyze and study the concept of capital punishment from both religious and legal perspectives The work also investigates the perspectives of major world religions and contemporary legal systems. The researchers seek to answer the question that how different religions and legal systems reconcile the ethical sacredness of life with the lawful imposition of capital punishment. The research study undergoes a doctrinal method, focusing on legal theories, religious principles and legal provisions. This study relies on both secondary sources, such as case laws, enacted laws, religious texts, and academic writings.

### **Capital Punishment: Juristic Overview**

The death penalty has always held a significant position in the history of punishment. The death penalty was a highly popular form of punishment in the English legal system. Even for what piety offences death penalty was imposed (Mahajan, 1987). During the reign of George III, there were as many as 220 capital offences (Johnson, 2016). These offences include shoplifting, cattle-stealing and cutting down of trees, etc. Sir Samuel Romilly proposed the abolition of the death penalty for petty offences ("Sir Samuel Romilly and the Abolition of Capital Punishment," 1931). However, attorneys, judges, and legislators resisted this plan, arguing that the death sentence served as a deterrent to the conduct of such crimes.(Mahajan, 1987). In 1810, a bill was brought to abolish the



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

death penalty in Britain for the offence of stealing in a shop to the value of 5 shillings. Lord Ellenborough opposed the bill in these words, “My Lord, if we suffer this bill to pass, we shall not know where we stand...”(Courts Of Quarter Session—County Courts, 1838). Nevertheless, the bill was approved in spite of the resistance, and fewer cases involving the death penalty were decided. The death penalty was only applied to serious crimes like treason and murder.(Mahajan, 1987).

The draftsman of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which was later amended as the Pakistan Penal Code (PPC), Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, maintained that no other punishment deters man so effectually from committing crimes as the punishment of death ("Rajendra Prasad v State of Uttar Pradesh," 1979) . This is a similar point of view as that of proponents of deterrent theory. According to Salmond, the most crucial part of punishment is its deterrent effect. According to Salmond, “Punishment is before all things deterrent and the chief end of the law of crime is to make the evildoer an example and a warning to all that are like-minded with him”(Mahajan, 1987). Locke also has a similar view, as he stated that the commission of every offence should be made a bad bargain for the offender. The deterrent hypothesis is not in line with Lord Denning's views on the death penalty. According to him, the strongest defence of any penalty is not its deterrent, reformatory, or preventative effects, but rather its empathic denunciation (Mahajan, 1987). The truth is that some crimes are so heinous that it is enforced irrespective of whether they are a deterrent or not (Mahajan, 1987).

There is a debate going on between those who stand for the abolition of capital punishment and those who want to retain it. Some people who support the death penalty contend that certain criminals are not only irreformable but also extremely hazardous to society. Maintaining such individuals should not be a burden on society for whatever reason. If any offenders cannot be cured, and is harmful to human society. Another argument in favour of capital punishment is that punishment by the state is a substitute for private revenge. Similar is the view of Lloyd George that, “the first function of capital punishment is to give emphatic expression to society’s peculiar abhorrence of murder. It is important that murder should be regarded as a peculiar horror...I believe that capital punishment does, in the present state of society, both express and sustain the moral revulsion for murder.”(Mahajan, 1987). However, proponents of abolishing the death penalty contend that it has completely failed to fulfil its deterrent purpose. There are fewer severe crimes in the US in states where the death penalty has been abolished than in those where it is still in place. It is also happy that there is no guarantee that a killer would do the same thing again.

Historically, capital punishment has progressed from a means of deterrence and control to a replication of moral and legal philosophy. Philosophers like Lord Denning emphasized its role as a moral denunciation rather than simple retribution. This development provides the foundation for examining legal perspectives on capital punishment, where the focus shifts from historical practice to contemporary legal interpretation and human rights considerations.

### **Capital Punishment: Legal Perspective**

Capital punishment is the sentence of death for a serious crime, and it is considered the most severe punishment in the criminal justice system. Almost every country exercises capital punishment in its own way, while some have abolished it. Countries may be categorized as Retentionist and Abolitionist.



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

### **Retentionist Countries**

Countries like China, the USA, Pakistan, etc. have retained capital punishments ("Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries," 2025), considering it as a tool for reducing crime in society. These countries believe in the theory of deterrence, according to which sentencing the offender with the death penalty not only justifies its act but also creates terror and an example for like-minded.

### **Capital Punishment: Case of China**

In the 1950s, in China, only a few criminal laws provided a capital penalty. However, in 1956, more than 10 crimes, including murder, assault resulting in death, hardened thief, rape, and maltreatment resulting in death. Later in 1979, a death penalty system with a unique Chinese character was established (Zhou, 2012). Since 2005, China has seen various constructive reforms in the death sentence system. The latest is the abolition of the death penalty for 13 crimes in Amendment VIII to the Criminal Law. Meanwhile, China stated that it carried out all these reforms with the final aim of completely abolishing the death penalty (Zhou, 2012). But still in China, capital punishment is being awarded. Recently, in 2025, the People's Court of Changchun awarded capital punishment to the former Agricultural Minister of China, who was sentenced to death in the \$38 million graft case ("China sentences former agricultural minister to death with reprieve," 2025). The court ruled that the bribes caused severe losses to the interests of the state and the people, and therefore, such offences are warranted to be dealt with the death penalty ("China sentences former agricultural minister to death with reprieve," 2025).

### **Capital Punishment in the USA Legal System**

In the United States, capital punishment has become one of the most controversial aspects of the criminal justice system. The prevalent situation reflects deep divisions in moral, legal, and political thought. Although several states have abolished or suspended the death penalty, others continue to implement it. This situation has underscored the federal structure's allowance for significant state autonomy in criminal justice policy. Judicial interpretations by the U.S. Supreme Court have shaped its modern application. The court has restricted executions of the death penalty for minors and individuals with intellectual disabilities. It deemed such a method of sentencing as "cruel and unusual" under the Eighth Amendment.

Critics argue that the American death penalty system is plagued by racial and socioeconomic disparities, procedural inconsistencies, and the risk of wrongful convictions. It has become a challenge to the legitimacy of the death penalty as a mode of justice. Nonetheless, proponents contend that capital punishment serves as a necessary deterrent and a moral affirmation of societal condemnation for the most heinous crimes. In this way, they are engaged in active debate within both legal and ethical discourse. In this perspective, Donald Trump, the current US President, has called for the death penalty for a man accused of fatally stabbing a Ukrainian refugee aboard a light rail train in North Carolina ("Trump calls for death penalty for man accused of fatal stabbing on N.C. train," 2025). According to the Justice Department, if convicted, the accused will face a maximum statutory sentence of life in prison or death (Justice Department Charges Light Rail Attacker with Federal Crime, 2025).



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imaging Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

### **Capital Punishment: Pakistani Legal System Insight**

Most of the provisions of the criminal system in Pakistan have been adopted from the British colonial system, and the same have also been adopted for capital penalty. Though the Constitution of Pakistan (constitution) 1973, a fundamental law of the country, provides and guarantees the right to life as a fundamental right, a person may be deprived of such right in accordance with the law. For this purpose, there are certain laws which provide capital punishment, taking the life of the person concerned. The Pakistan Penal Code (PPC) 1860 and the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.PC) 1898 serve as the primary sources of Pakistan's laws pertaining to the death penalty. The Constitution of 1973 also has provisions related to capital punishment.

The PPC 1860 still forms the basis for criminal and penal laws in Pakistan. However, it has been amended for number of times for the development of the criminal justice system. The PPC mentions the death as punishment for the offences of murder, treason and blasphemy, etc. (Parveen et al., 2023). In this context, another law, the Hudood Ordinances, 1979, also established capital punishment for offences such as rape, adultery, etc. The Constitution, 1973, the fundamental law of the land, also provides for the capital punishment of persons found guilty of high treason. All of these laws define the offences and provide for the capital penalty. The Cr.PC 1898, and in some cases, special procedural laws have been set out that shall be followed in court trials involving punishments, including the death penalty.

The broadened scope of the death penalty, indeed, has happened in its range and applicability in the socio-political and religious scenario of Pakistan (Parveen et al., 2023). From 2008 till late 2014, Pakistan had stepped one step further and had de facto stopped executions. It happened because of concerns of human rights advocates globally. After 2009, the execution of capital punishment was banned. But, in 2014, after the terrorist attack on the Army Public School in Peshawar, the moratorium was restored. Such restoration was justified in the context of a terrorist attack. But, due to this, most of those were executed to death who were not terrorists were executed. They were the ones who committed offences that were terror- related only in their nature (Parveen et al., 2023).

In prevalent circumstances from 2015 to 2020, in Pakistan, more than 500 prisoners were sentenced and hanged to death. which makes it made Pakistan one of the top executioners in the globe (Parveen et al., 2023). Most of these death sentence trials were tried in the military courts and anti-terrorism courts (Parveen et al., 2023). In most cases, convictions were made on confessional evidence produced by police torture. Critics argue that it was in clear violation of the right to a fair trial as recognized in the Constitution, 1973 (Parveen et al., 2023). This judicial course signals systematic issues in Pakistan's capital punishment system and leaves uncertainty related to human rights compliance.

### **Abolitionist Countries**

The abolition of capital punishment started back in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Venezuela, during the presidency of Juan Crisóstomo Falcón, was the first country to abolish the death penalty ("First abolition of death penalty,"). However, the death penalty has been dramatically decreased worldwide. Over 85 countries have abolished the death penalty for all crimes since 1976, while several have done the same for common offences ("Countries That Have Abolished the Death Penalty Since 1976," 2025). Now more than two-thirds of the countries around the globe, including Australia, Germany, Norway,



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

Turkiye etc. have abolished capital punishment (Death sentences and executions 2022, 2023). This figure amounts to more than 110 countries ("Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries,"), who abolished this punishment for all offences.

Abolitionist argue that capital penalty is against humanity. They are of view that right to life is violated because of capital punishment and it is a barbarous and inhuman act. This stance is based on the idea that the government should not have the authority to take life, even of the offenders. Moreover, abolitionists also raised concerns regarding the jeopardy of wrongful convictions. Furthermore, abolitionists often reject capital punishment on ethical and moral grounds. They debate that the aim of punishment is not deterrence rather it is reformation and rehabilitation of the offenders. If the convicted is sentenced to death, he has no chance of his rehabilitation. The abolitionist nations also argue that it is not just as a legal reform, but as a reflection of their commitment to human dignity and the evolution of justice in a democratic society. The international movement toward abolition has also been restructured by international instruments as discussed next.

### **International Protocols: Supporting Abolition**

In the international context, one of the prominent instruments is the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR-OP2, 1991). This protocol is generally intentional at the abolition of death punishment (ICCPR-OP2, 1991). Likewise, in the American continent, the Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights on the Abolition of the Death Penalty (OAS, 1990) has been ratified by 13 countries ("Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries,"). Both of the documents are vital, and they not only encourage abolition but also give frameworks by which States may bar the capital penalty.

In Europe, the Council of Europe has a leading role through the adoption of two important protocols. First one is Protocol No. 6 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms concerning the Abolition of the Death Penalty. So far 46 European countries have ratified by is also signed by the Russian Federation (Chart of signatures and ratifications of Treaty 114, 2025). Similarly, Protocol No. 13, which has been ratified by 45 countries, provides for the total abolition of the death penalty under all circumstances.

Together, these international protocols shows a development of global consensus on the requisite to abolish the capital punishment. It results, in the safeguarding of the right to life and the developing standards of human life and dignity. Though, variant scope and conditions of abolition exist among these protocols, their ratification by the countries indicate a firm prescriptive for eliminating the capital punishment.

### **Capital Punishment: Religious Perspective**

From religious perspective, different religions have different point of view of capital punishment. Some religions are in favour of capital punishment and argue that it is necessary for maintaining social order. While some are against capital punishment arguing that capital punishment is violent. In next lines, this study has been discussed in detail by the researchers.



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

### **Abrahamic Religions**

The Abrahamic religions are the set of monotheistic religions, which are directly linked with the Prophet Ibrahim. These religions include Islam, Christianity and Judaism. Abrahamic religions have similar concept and jurisprudence regarding the capital punishment as discussed below.

### **Islamic Perspective**

In Islamic discourse capital punishment is majorly related with crimes committed by man against the will of Allah. Islamic jurisprudence classify the offences into Hadd and Tazir. The offences of hadd are disastrous impact for society and cause fasad on earth. Man's self is inclined towards such evilness and they become his second nature (Waliyyullah, 1986). Such criminals are needed to be cursed and punished sternly so such examples remain always before people (Zargar, 2022). Therefore, capital punishment is required for such offences. These offences include murder, adultery etc. For such crimes capital punishments have been expressly mentioned in Holy Quran.

The capital punishment for murder has been expressly mentioned in Quran in Surah Al-Maidha. The Holy Quran says that, (Trans.) "We ordained therein for them: life for life."(Al-Ma'idha, 5:45). Islam has protected every person's right to life and has ensured no one's life is taken without any lawful justification. According to the Quran, Allah says in Surah Al-An'am (Trans.), "Take not life, which Allah has made sacred, except by way of justice and law. Thus, does He Command you, so that you may learn wisdom"(Al-An'am, 6:151). Similarly in Surah Al-Maidha, Allah says (Trans.): "That is why We ordained for the Children of Israel that whoever takes a life—unless as a punishment for murder or mischief in the land— it will be as if they killed all of humanity; and whoever saves a life, it will be as if they saved all of humanity."(Al-Ma'idha, 5: 32).

The Quran emphasizes both the sanctity of human life and the necessity of lawful justice, as seen in verses such as establishing a balance between mercy and justice within Islamic jurisprudence. This principle of preserving justice and sanctity of life through capital punishment is not exclusive to Islam. Other Abrahamic religions also address the concept of capital punishment within their respective religious laws and ethical teachings.

### **Christian Viewpoint**

In Christianity, the Old Testament law commanded the death penalty for several acts. These acts include murder (Exodus, 21:12), kidnapping (Exodus, 21:16), bestiality (Exodus, 22:19), adultery (Leviticus, 20:10), homosexuality (Leviticus, 20:13), false prophet-hood (Deuteronomy, 13:5), prostitution and rape (Deuteronomy, 22:24), and several other crimes. In this context, Bible says "for the wages of sin is death..." (Romans, 6:23).

Christian churches have traditionally seen the death punishment as an important part of the social structures. Several Christians who favor the capital sentence are of view that the state does not act in line with its own authority but rather as the representative of God, who does have the legal authority to decide who lives and who dies. While most of the Christians make arguments in support to opposed the use of death penalty with secular logic They argue that God demonstrates his love for us in not condemning us (Romans, 5:8).



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

Moreover, Christians contend that the death punishment has never been more effective deterrent than any other kind of punishment. Otherwise, it may lead to an increase in the violent crime because it contributes to brutal behaviour. It is said that the best way to prevent crime is not to impose more severe penalties but to guarantee that all crime will be punished (Frédéric, 2019). They also argue killing a human being means eliminating him, not punishing him (Frédéric, 2019).

### **(A) Judaism Version**

While in Judaism, the Torah imposes a death sentence for a range of misdeeds. Murder, idol worship, and desecrating the Sabbath are among the significant sins for which death is the punishment ("The Death Penalty in Jewish Tradition," 2025). Jewish tradition recognizes four different methods of execution, each of which is reserved for the punishment of a particular crime: stoning, beheading, consuming molten copper, and strangulation. It is allowed in the Torah and Talmud but rarely followed by Jewish courts. However, certain number of transgressions are punishable by death according to the Torah in actuality, Jewish courts rarely carried out death penalties (Dohrmann, 2009).

### **1.1 Dharmic Religions**

Dharmic religions, also known as Indian religions, are a group of religions that originated in the Indian subcontinent, including Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism. These religions have common jurisprudence and historical roots centred on the concept of Dharma, which means duty, righteousness, or the natural law.

#### **(A) Hinduism**

Hinduism is the majority followed religion by the people in India. In Hinduism, there is no express command on capital punishment (Hinduism and capital punishment, 2009). The principle of Ahimsa (Yog, 10: 4-5), means non-violence, opposes killing, violence and revenge. Even though it has been historically administered by Hindu kings, Hindu texts such as the Mahabharata provides a foundation for resisting the death sentence, but it additionally demonstrates that the soul be slain, and that death is restricted to the physical body (Wilkins, 1882).

#### **Sikhism**

Sikhism is the 5<sup>th</sup> largest monotheistic religion in the world. According to Sikhism, Sikhs reject the execution of prisoners. This argument is based on the basis of upholding equality and dignity. The people lose their entitlement to dignity when they are put to death. The Guru Granth Sahib makes no mention of the death penalty. The fact that the Sikhs did not apply the death penalty to the offenders they faced suggests that they are opposed to it (Lightning, 2015).

#### **Buddhism**

Buddhism is against the death penalty. Buddhists have great emphasis on non-violence, peace and compassion for all life. The first principle needed for individuals is to restraint from injuring or killing any living creature ("What does Buddhism say about the death penalty?," 2024). According to Buddha, "An action, even if it brings benefit to oneself, cannot be considered a good action if it causes physical and mental pain to another



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

being" ("What does Buddhism say about the death penalty?," 2024).

### **Jainism**

Jainism also do not believe in capital punishment, they are of the same idea as Hinduism. Mahavira preached that, "There is no quality of soul more subtle than non-violence and no virtue of spirit greater than reverence for life" (Ahimsa, 2009). As well, they also believe in the principle of Ashima. One of the important Jain principles and the cornerstone of Jain morality is that of ahimsa. The belief in Jainism is protecting everyone else and it is the only way to save one's own soul.

### **Analysis and Conclusions**

The study of capital punishment through religious and legal perspectives reveals a clear divide between the Abrahamic and Dharmic traditions. All Abrahamic religions generally acknowledge the death penalty for heinous crimes such as murder, adultery, and treason etc. viewing it as a lawful expression of justice when administered under due process. These faiths emphasize divine justice and societal order, recognizing the sanctity of life while permitting its lawful deprivation in extreme cases. In contrast, Dharmic religions reject capital punishment on ethical and spiritual grounds, upholding Ahimsa (non-violence) and compassion as supreme virtues. They advocate for forgiveness and moral reform rather than retribution, reflecting a belief in the inherent sacredness of every life.

Similarly, in the modern legal sphere, nations reflect these religious divisions through their stance as either retentionist or abolitionist. Retentionist countries like China, the United States, and Pakistan continue to enforce the death penalty, considering it a necessary deterrent and a means to ensure justice for victims of grave offences. Conversely, abolitionist countries such as Australia, Germany, and Norway etc. view capital punishment as incompatible with human rights, emphasizing rehabilitation over retribution. This divergence demonstrates that while some legal systems prioritize deterrence and public safety, others champion reformation and the inviolability of human life.

Despite these differences, a unifying theme emerges all traditions religious and legal uphold the right to life as a fundamental and sacred principle. Even those supporting capital punishment do so under strict conditions, limiting it to cases where a person's actions have grievously violated another's right to life and dignity. Retentionists maintain that the death penalty, when lawfully imposed, vindicates the victim's suffering and reinforces moral order. Abolitionists emphasize the rehabilitation and reformation of the offenders and reject capital punishment. Still, the method of execution remains a critical concern, as justice must not lead to exploitation. Thus, the global discourse on capital punishment continues to draw the fine line between justice, morality, and humanity, seeking balance between the sanctity of life and the lawful authority of the state.

### **Recommendations**

From the study above, the researchers suggest the following recommendations:

Capital punishment must be awarded in heinous crimes threatening to the public order only.

Trials must be fair, particularly in cases of offences of capital punishment, so that no one



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imaging Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

is sentenced to death without justified reasons.

The process of executing capital punishment shall not be inhuman.

The said result-oriented conclusion and recommendations may possibly be helpful in particularly in upholding the rule of law and justice.

### References

Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries. World Coalition Against the Death Penalty. [https://worldcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/FactsFigures2024\\_EN\\_Final.pdf](https://worldcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/FactsFigures2024_EN_Final.pdf)

Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries. (2025). Death Penalty Information Centre. <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/policy-issues/policy/international/abolitionist-and-retentionist-countries>

Ahimsa. (2009).  
BBC.

[https://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/jainism/living/ahimsa\\_1.shtml](https://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/jainism/living/ahimsa_1.shtml) Al-An'am. (6:151). Holy Quran. <https://quran.com/al-anam/151>

Al-Ma'idah. (5:45). Holy Quran. <https://quran.com/al-maidah/45> Al-Ma'idah. (5: 32). Holy Quran. <https://quran.com/al-maidah/32>

Chart of signatures and ratifications of Treaty 114. (2025). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list?module=signatures-by-treaty&treatyid=114>

China sentences former agricultural minister to death with reprieve. (2025). Hong Kong Free Press. <https://hongkongfp.com/2025/09/29/china-sentences-former-agricultural-minister-to-death-with-reprieve/>

Countries That Have Abolished the Death Penalty Since 1976. (2025). Death Penalty Information Centre <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/policy-issues/policy/international/countries-that-have-abolished-the-death-penalty-since-1976>

Courts Of Quarter Session—County Courts. (1838). <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1838-03-01/debates/7bf93fef-d144-4a12-a9f3-d81a8774c5ac/CourtsOfQuarterSession%C3%A2%E2%82%AC%E2%80%9DCoourt%20yCourts>

The Death Penalty in Jewish Tradition. (2025). My Jewish Learning. <https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/the-death-penalty-in-jewish-tradition/>

Death sentences and executions 2022. (2023). <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/6548/2023/en/>

Deuteronomy. (13:5). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Deuteronomy/13/Deuteronomy-13-5.html>

Deuteronomy. (22:24). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Deuteronomy/22/Deuteronomy-22-24.html>

Dohrmann, N. B. (2009). Capital Punishment: Judaism. *Eyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, 954-957.

Dragne, L. (2013). The right to life—a fundamental human right. *DEZBATERI*



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

SOCIAL ECONOMICE, 2(2), 65-70.

Exodus. (20:13).

Bible.

[https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus%2020%3A13&version=NI\\_V](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus%2020%3A13&version=NI_V)

Exodus. (21:12). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Exodus/21/Exodus-21-12.html> Exodus. (21:16). Bible.

<https://www.bibleref.com/Exodus/21/Exodus-21-16.html> Exodus. (22:19). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Exodus/22/Exodus-22-19.html>

First abolition of death penalty. Guinness World Records.

<https://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/first-abolition-of-death-penalty>

Frédéric, F. N. (2019). The christian argument against the death penalty. FIACAT.

<https://www.fiacat.org/en/about-us/a-christian-movement/2763-the-christian-argument-against-the-death-penalty>

Hinduism and capital punishment. (2009).

BBC.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/hinduism/hinduethics/capitalpunishment.shtml#findoutmore>

Article 1, Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, (1991). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/second-optional-protocol-international-covenant-civil-and>

Johnson, B. (2016). The Execution Sites of London. Historic UK. <https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryMagazine/DestinationsUK/ExecutionSitesinLondon/>

Justice Department Charges Light Rail Attacker with Federal Crime.

(2025). <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-charges-light-rail-attacker-federal-crime>

Leviticus. (20:10). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Leviticus/20/Leviticus-20-10.html>

Leviticus. (20:13). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Leviticus/20/Leviticus-20-13.html> Leviticus. (24:17).

Bible.

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus%2024%3A17&version=NIV>

Lightning, T. W. T. (2015). THE SIKHISM BELIEF ON CAPITAL

PUNISHMENT. Prezi.

<https://prezi.com/rsbn0-wieeux/the-sikhism-belief-on-capital-punishment/>

Mahajan, D. V. D. (1987). Jurisprudence and Legal Theory. Eastern Book Company, Lucknow.

American Convention on Human Rights on the Abolition of the Death Penalty, (1990). <https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/mandate/Basics/american-convention-abolish-death-penalty.pdf>

Parveen, G., Ms. Bushra, Z., & Ms, K. (2023). DEATH PENALTY IN

PAKISTAN: LEGAL

AND HUMAN RIGHTS PERSPECTIVES. International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences, 2(4), 1591-1597.



## Vol. 3 No. 10.1-International Conference on Re-imagining Justice (October, 2025)- Special Issue

<https://ijciss.org/index.php/ijciss/article/view/1646>

Rajendra Prasad v State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR

916 (SC 1979).

Romans. (5:8). Bible. <https://www.bibleref.com/Romans/5/Romans-5-8.html>

Romans. (6:23). Bible.

<https://www.bibleref.com/Romans/6/Romans-6-23.html>

Sir Samuel Romilly and the Abolition of Capital Punishment. (1931). *Social Service Review*, 5(2), 276-296. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30009703>

Trump calls for death penalty for man accused of fatal stabbing on N.C. train. (2025).

The Washington Post.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2025/09/10/trump-death-penalty-charlotte-killing/>

Article 3, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, (1948). <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

Wahidullah v. State, Cr.LJ 1706 (2021).

Waliyyullah, S. (1986). *Hujatullāh al-Bāligah*, Deoband (Vol. vol. 2).

What does Buddhism say about the death penalty? (2024). Bitezie.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zxfyxf/revision/4>

Wilkins, W. J. (1882). *Hindu Mythology, Vedic and Purānic*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink; Bombay: Thacker; London: W. Thacker.

Yog, V. (10: 4-5). *Bhagavad Gita*. <https://www.holy-bhagavad-gita.org/chapter/10/verse/4-5/>

Zargar, N. A. (2022). CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN ISLAM. *the land*, 9(5), 33.

Zhou, Z. (2012). *The death penalty in China: Reforms and its future* [Waseda University].