

ANALYSIS OF MOVIE: SECTION - 375

By:-

Boddu Harshith Sai

3rd Year BBA LLB (H)

BENNETT UNIVERSITY

E-Mail:- harshithsaiboddu@gmail.com



Sceenshot taken from Koimoi.com

INTRODUCTION

This complex subject of laws intended to safeguard women and how those very same laws are being abused by women for personal gain is addressed in the bold and timely film Section 375. Both sides of the tale are presented by the narrative's use of point-of-view changes. From the opening scenes the audience witnesses a relation between the Law and Justice. Tarun Saluja (Akshaye Khanna) asserts during a law school event that **"justice is abstract, law is an**

actuality." It stands out in a film that generally appears to take its legal study seriously that Saluja (Akshaye Khanna) is presented as Senior Advocate, High Court—which one is not mentioned. He strongly believes in the rule of law, the right of everyone—including accused rapists—to the assistance of counsel, and the distinction between justice and the law. His younger sister Hiral Gandhi (Richa Chadha), who can't stand this last aspect, departed his chamber because of it.

ABOUT THE FILM

Famous film director Rohan Khurana (Rahul Bhat) is detained and found guilty by the Sessions Court after Anjali Dangle, a costume designer, accuses him of rape. As Rohan's helper, Anjali is sent to his home to gain his approval on certain costumes. When Anjali gets to his house, Rohan and the maid are already there. Rohan sends the maid to the market when Anjali arrives so that they can be alone in the house. Soon after, we witness how Rohan is pushing her and "forcing" her against her will. In the next scene Anjali is observed by her neighbour, stepping out of an auto rickshaw while her face is covered in a scarf. However, the neighbour notices Anjali's behavior as being strange right away. Her brother is the first person to discover her when they arrive at her residence, and they then proceed to call the police.

Following the filing of the complaint, the police, in accordance with standard procedure, sends Anjali for a full body examination. Major bruises are discovered all over her face and in between her thighs during the examination. In addition, the scrapings taken from under her nails contain traces of Rohan's DNA. When Rohan is examined, it is discovered that his back is covered in nail scratches and that his DNA matches the DNA found on and inside Anjali's body. When all of the evidence is presented to the Sessions Court, the Judge immediately sentences Rohan to ten years in prison. After the Sessions Court issues this order, Rohan's wife seeks the assistance of Tarun Saluja (Akshaye Khanna), a well-known criminal lawyer. When the Sessions Court order is challenged in the High Court, Anjali is represented by Hiral Gandhi (Richa Chadha), a utopian lawyer and champion of women's rights who is fighting her first major case. Surprisingly, Hiral was once Tarun's trainee.

Tarun attempts to expose the flaws in Anjali's claims under the watchful eyes of judges Justice Madgaonkar (Kishore Kadam) and Justice Indrani (Kruttika Desai). Throughout the course of the

case, Tarun presents concrete evidence and refutes Anjali's claims. Hiral, on the other hand, defends her client with emotion rather than logic. She comes across as a lawyer who is zoned out and occasionally raises an 'objection'. Rohan confesses during the hearing, and the details included in the confession were:

- Anjali and Rohan had an extramarital affair, and Rohan had promised her a major film project.
- As a result of the relationship's end, Rohan refused to give Anjali the project, and Anjali tried to blame Rohan for the rape.

However, everything that happened between the two of them was completely consensual. And Tarun is successful to demonstrate that Anjali's own brother was partially responsible for the bruises that were discovered on her body. And despite the fact that it is a crucial piece of evidence, the court entirely ignores it.

WHAT THE FILM GOT RIGHT

From the legal point of view the court maintains the Order of the Sessions Court due to the murky nature of the case and evidence, public pressure, and a lack of conclusive evidence of Anjali's spitefulness. Anjali then admits to Hiral outside the courtroom that Rohan's confession was accurate and that some of her bruises were caused by her own brother and some by herself. Hiral is stunned by this and feels bad about her. The title of the film 'Section 375' is derived from the same section of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 that contains the definition of rape. In this movie the accused Rohan is charged with the following offences mentioned under the Indian Penal Code, 1860:

- Section 376: Penalty for rape
- Section 342: Penalty for wrongful confinement
- Section 354B: Penalty for assault or use of criminal force on a woman with intent to disrobe and
- Section 506: Penalty for criminal intimidation.

And I feel that the film never feels dragged and delivers the messages it intends to deliver early on. It touches on its main premise of informing the audience about Section 375. As it is commonly assumed that **"no rape occurs without the consent of a woman,"** the film emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between "will" and "consent," the two main requirements when it comes to sex.

WHAT WENT WRONG IN THE FILM

If the acts committed were not consensual, all of these sections are legally applicable. However, the film depicts two opposing viewpoints on the same situation, one more plausible than the other. Tarun appears throughout the film as the devil's advocate, supporting a criminal and being despised for it. He examines and presents facts in an unconventional manner. He is constantly questioning the case's veracity, even having his practicing license suspended at one point. According to my understanding of Section-375 movie it had raised many questions on my understanding on the MeToo movement. The film raised a lot of questions about the #MeToo Movement making it extremely timely. Even though the film received positive reviews from critics. However, it did not perform well at the box office and failed to get the acclaim from the audience and it had received mixed reviews, but it definitely sparked a debate. During the #MeToo Movement, many allegations were made, some of which were true and some of which were false, similar to the movie. Women were seen on social media speaking out about various incidents that happened to them years ago, and this was seen not only in Bollywood but also in the entertainment and corporate sectors.

By the understanding of this movie I have felt that women make false allegations for a variety of reasons, including vengeance, previous grudges, workplace animosity, attempting to obtain money through compensation, and so on. The more heartbreaking part is that there are no laws protecting men from false allegations made by women. Feminism is a relevant and important movement in today's world, especially in a patriarchal country like India, but it should not be exploited or confused with pseudo feminism and misandry. The judges in the film admit that the case has two different theories, either of which could be correct, but because the law was created for and in favor of the victim, it must be followed regardless of which theory is correct.

SOCIO LEGAL IMPACTS OF THE MOVIE

After the analysis of this movie I can say that this movie was gripping take on the aspects Law vs. Justice and it shows not only woman always become victim of the offences like rape and other sexual offences and even men can become an victim in the cases where if the women are likely to take revenge and have their personal vengeance on a particular person and making the false allegations on them and the sad part is that even though the man is not at wrong the society treats him like a criminal and they will be on a opinion to get him punished by not even seeing the issue from his side of the story. And for these types of the offences there are no laws protecting the victims herein this case it is Rohan.

I believe that the present societal mentality of the people is deeply ingrained in Section 375; the hash tag #hangtherapist is trending online, and #MeToo is frequently mentioned. And it is precisely this that raises the question of why director Ajay Bahl chose to focus his camera on the idea of a false case at a time when women are finally finding the strength to come up about the sexual harassment and assault they have endured for so long.

CONCLUSION

The film is cynical about the distinction between law and justice; the law is concrete, but justice is abstract. Tarun establishes in the film's opening line, "Justice is abstract, but law is a fact," and there are numerous similar lines throughout the film. Tarun asserts his right to be heard. "Imagine a world without the constitutional right to self-defense," he says early in the film. This would be a horrible world. Tarun, predictably, blames social media for demonizing his client prematurely and permanently. In doing so, he ignores the fact that the man had already been convicted under the law, so whatever outrage ensued was legally sanctioned. It is clear from the film's plot that the director is more interested in depicting the plight of the accused but does not always make the best effort.

In the guise of being a subtle reminder of how no man accused of rape can ever "walk free," even if acquitted by the legal system, the film sends a very toxic and dangerous message. At the end of the movie when Hiral meets Tarun and admits to him that she does not believe that justice was served, Tarun replies **"we're not in the business of justice; we're in the business of law"**. This only goes to show that justice is a nebulous concept, and law is merely a means to an end. In this case, the tool does not exist, preventing justice from being served.

The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher.