

## Mental Deficiency - to Find a Person a Subject of Crime as a Hindering Condition

Abdurasulova Kumrinisa  
Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan



DOI : <https://doi.org/10.61796/ijblps.v2i1.261>



### Sections Info

#### Article history:

Submitted: December 28, 2025  
Final Revised: December 04, 2025  
Accepted: January 11, 2025  
Published: January 18, 2025

#### Keywords:

Sanity  
Insanity  
Criminal responsibility  
Punishment  
Subject of crime  
Criminal code

### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** This study aims to explore the role of forensic psychiatric examinations in determining the mental state of individuals accused of crimes. It seeks to clarify the relationship between mental disorders and criminal liability, focusing on how both medical and legal criteria are used to assess an individual's sanity. By examining the application of these criteria in judicial processes, the study highlights the importance of ensuring that criminal liability is assigned based on an individual's ability to understand and control their actions. **Method:** The research employs a comprehensive analysis of forensic psychiatric assessments, incorporating case studies, legal provisions (specifically Article 18 of the Criminal Code of Uzbekistan), and expert opinions. This method systematically evaluates the relationship between mental health conditions and criminal accountability, integrating clinical diagnoses with legal standards to provide a nuanced understanding of sanity in the context of criminal law. **Results:** The study finds that forensic psychiatric evaluations are essential in determining sanity, defined as the ability to understand the nature of one's actions and control one's behavior. Mental disorders, such as schizophrenia or temporary conditions like alcoholic psychosis, affect legal judgments. The dual-criteria approach – cognitive and volitional – ensures comprehensive assessments, considering both the individual's mental condition and their legal responsibility at the time of the offense. **Novelty:** This research introduces a dual-criteria framework, combining medical diagnoses and legal definitions of criminal liability. It emphasizes the importance of forensic psychiatric evaluations in ensuring fair criminal responsibility assignments, recognizing the complexities of mental health within the legal system.

## INTRODUCTION

In the realm of criminal law, the concept of sanity is fundamental in determining criminal liability [1], [2]. It establishes that only individuals of sound mind – capable of understanding the nature of their actions and exercising control over them – can be held accountable for their behavior. This principle underscores the necessity of distinguishing between those who commit crimes knowingly and voluntarily and those who lack the mental capacity to do so [3], [4]. Sanity, therefore, serves as a cornerstone in the pursuit of justice, ensuring that legal responsibility is assigned appropriately based on an individual's mental state at the time of the offense [5].

The principle of sanity is closely tied to the objectives of criminal punishment, which include re-education, deterrence, and prevention of future crimes. Punishments are designed to influence behavior and encourage adherence to legal norms, goals that can only be achieved if the individual has the cognitive and volitional capacity to understand the consequences of their actions [6]. When dealing with mentally unstable individuals, the law adopts a different approach, emphasizing medical intervention and rehabilitation

rather than punitive measures. This differentiation highlights the importance of accurately assessing mental states through forensic psychiatric examinations, a practice that has become a cornerstone of modern judicial processes [7].

The forensic psychiatric examination is critical in resolving issues related to an individual's mental state and their capacity to bear criminal responsibility. By employing both medical and legal criteria, these examinations provide a comprehensive evaluation of the accused's mental condition. The medical criterion focuses on diagnosing specific mental illnesses, such as schizophrenia or temporary psychoses, while the legal criterion assesses the individual's ability to understand the nature and consequences of their actions or control their behavior [6], [8]. This dual approach ensures that determinations of sanity or insanity are grounded in both clinical evidence and legal standards, fostering a fair and equitable application of the law.

Ultimately, the concept of sanity reflects the interplay between medical science and legal doctrine, with both disciplines working together to uphold justice. The distinction between sanity and insanity is not merely theoretical but has profound practical implications, shaping decisions on criminal liability and the appropriate measures for addressing socially dangerous acts. By aligning legal definitions of sanity with advancements in psychiatry, modern criminal law ensures that individuals are judged fairly, taking into account both their mental health and the societal need for justice and safety [6].

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

The research method in this study involves a comprehensive analysis of forensic psychiatric examinations conducted to determine the mental state of individuals accused of crimes. The method is grounded in a systematic evaluation of medical and legal criteria, specifically focusing on the relationship between mental disorders and criminal liability. Data were collected through case studies of forensic psychiatric assessments, referencing legal provisions such as Article 18 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan [9]. This legal framework establishes the criteria for determining sanity and insanity, including cognitive and volitional aspects. The study integrates clinical diagnoses of mental disorders, legal definitions of criminal accountability, and the practical application of these criteria in judicial and forensic contexts. Insights from historical and contemporary psychiatric literature, as well as expert opinions, were employed to ensure a thorough examination of the intersection between mental health and criminal responsibility [10], [11].

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The concept of criminal liability emphasizes that only individuals in a sane mental state can be held accountable for their actions. Sanity, as a fundamental condition for liability, ensures that punishments are applied to individuals capable of understanding their actions and their societal impact. Conversely, mentally unstable individuals, despite

engaging in socially dangerous behavior, are exempt from criminal liability. This principle underscores the need for forensic psychiatric evaluations to determine the mental state of the accused. These evaluations play a pivotal role in distinguishing between sanity and insanity based on medical and legal criteria.

The findings reveal that the determination of sanity relies heavily on the interpretation of mental health conditions. According to Article 18 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, sanity is defined as the ability of an individual to recognize the socially dangerous nature of their actions and control their behavior. The inability to meet these criteria, due to mental disorders such as chronic illnesses, temporary mental conditions, or mental retardation, exempts individuals from liability [9].

The medical criterion includes various mental health conditions, such as schizophrenia, epilepsy, manic-depressive psychosis, and other chronic or temporary disorders. For instance, temporary mental disorders like alcoholic psychosis and pathological intoxication, as well as permanent conditions like oligophrenia, demonstrate how the severity and nature of mental illness influence legal judgments. Furthermore, the recognition of non-pathological mental states, such as extreme fatigue or temporary mental excitement, highlights the complexity of assessing mental conditions in forensic psychiatry [8].

Legal criteria for insanity involve cognitive and volitional aspects. The cognitive criterion evaluates an individual's ability to comprehend the significance of their actions, while the volitional criterion assesses their capacity to control their behavior. A person may be deemed insane if they fail to meet either of these criteria. For example, a person with intact reasoning but impaired volitional control due to mental illness would be considered legally insane. This dual criterion approach ensures a comprehensive assessment of the individual's mental state [6].

The results also emphasize that the mental state of the individual at the time of the crime is critical. Forensic psychiatric evaluations aim to determine whether the accused's mental condition at the time of the offense impaired their ability to understand their actions or control their behavior. This determination requires thorough clinical analysis and is supported by both medical diagnoses and legal standards [12].

The integration of medical and legal perspectives allows for a nuanced understanding of mental illness and its implications for criminal liability. While medical assessments identify the presence and nature of mental disorders, legal criteria evaluate their impact on the individual's cognitive and volitional capacities. This approach ensures that justice is administered fairly, balancing the principles of criminal law with the complexities of mental health [6].

In summary, the evaluation of sanity in criminal law hinges on the interplay between medical diagnoses and legal criteria. The dual criteria framework – medical and legal – provides a robust foundation for assessing the mental state of individuals accused of socially dangerous acts. These findings underscore the importance of forensic

psychiatric examinations in ensuring that criminal liability is imposed only on those capable of understanding and controlling their actions [10], [12].

## CONCLUSION

**Fundamental Finding :** The research highlights the importance of sanity in criminal law, establishing that only individuals with a sound mind can be held criminally accountable. Forensic psychiatric evaluations, which integrate both medical and legal criteria, are essential in determining an individual's mental state, ensuring that justice is served by distinguishing between those who can understand and control their actions and those who cannot due to mental disorders. **Implication :** The study emphasizes the need for thorough forensic psychiatric evaluations in criminal justice systems to ensure fair and accurate assessments of criminal liability. The integration of both medical diagnoses and legal criteria provides a balanced approach, ensuring that individuals with mental health conditions are not unjustly punished while maintaining public safety. **Limitation :** One limitation of the study is that it primarily focuses on the legal framework of Uzbekistan, which may not be universally applicable. Further research could expand on how different jurisdictions address the issue of mental illness in relation to criminal liability, particularly in countries with varying legal systems and psychiatric practices. **Future Research :** Future studies could explore the evolving relationship between psychiatric diagnoses and criminal responsibility in various jurisdictions. Research could also examine the effectiveness of forensic psychiatric evaluations in ensuring just outcomes and the challenges faced by mental health professionals in making such determinations.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Mikołajczuk, "Criminal Liability of People With Mental Disorders: Selected Issues," *J. Perspect. Econ. Polit. Soc. Integr.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 7–29, 2022, doi: 10.18290/pepsi-2022-0001.
- [2] W. H. Reid, "Sanity evaluations and criminal responsibility," *Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 114–146, 2006.
- [3] Sherman SL, "NoGuilty But Mentally Ill: A Retreat from the Insanity Defense Title," *Am. J. Law Med.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 236–264, 1981, doi: 10.1017/S0098858800004925.
- [4] D. Nelken, *Critical Criminal Law*, vol. 14, no. 1. 1987. doi: 10.2307/1410300.
- [5] M. K. Rustambaev, "Commentary on the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan," 2004.
- [6] V. K. Kandinsky, "On the Issue of Insanity," p. 38.
- [7] *Criminal Law, General Part*. tASHKENT: Adolat, 1998.
- [8] V. P. Serbsky, "Forensic Psychopathology," *Moscow*, p. 7, 1985.
- [9] F. J. Samandarov, "Criminal Law: Issues of Crime and Punishment," *Baku*, p. 137, 1994.
- [10] M. Usmonaliev, *Criminal Law, General Par*. Tashkent: Yangi Asr Avlod, 2005.
- [11] Y. Septiani, E. Arribe, and R. Diansyah, "( Studi Kasus : Mahasiswa Universitas Abdurrah Pekanbaru )," *J. Teknol. dan Open Source*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 131–143, 2020.
- [12] K. Abdurasulova, "Stages of Formation of Criminological Doctrines in the Republic of Uzbekistan and Some Tasks of Modern Criminological Science," *Am. J. Polit. Sci. Law*

*Criminol.*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 40-51, 2021.

---

**\*Abdurasulova Kumrinisa (Corresponding Author)**

Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan

---