

**A Comparative Study Between Section 84 Of The Malaysian Penal Code  
And The M'Naughten Rules**

By

Nur Aishah Binti Mohd Salim	(2009458702)
Nor Asyikin Bt Nor Azhar	(2009483024)
Nur Afifah Bt Abd Hamid	(2009619504)
Najib Bin Abdu Salam	(2009636922)
Khairuddin Bin Noordin	(2009482316)

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Bachelor in Legal Studies (Hons)

**Universiti Teknologi MARA  
Faculty of Law**

December 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	1
Abstract	2

### CHAPTER ONE: RESEARCH PROPOSAL

1.1	Title	3
1.2	Introduction	3 - 4
1.3	Problem Statement	5 - 6
1.4	Objective of Study	7
1.5	Literature Review	8 - 10
1.6	Methodology	11
1.7	Scope and Limitation	12
1.8	Significance of the Study	13
1.9	Provisional Plan of Research	14 - 15

### CHAPTER TWO: THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECTION 84 OF THE PENAL CODE MALAYSIA – THE DEFENCE OF UNSOUNDNESS OF MIND

2.1	Actus Reus and Mens Rea in Crime	16 - 17
2.2	When Actus Reus and Mens Rea Did Not Coincide	17 - 21
2.3	Defence of Unsoundness of Mind – S84 of Penal Code	21 - 22
2.4	Development of the Law	23 - 25
2.5	Ingredient of Section 84	25
	2.5.1 At the Time of Doing It	25 - 28
	2.5.2 By Reason of Unsoundness of Mind	28 - 29
	2.5.2.1 Insane Delusion	29 - 31
	2.5.2.2 Irresistible Impulse	31 - 32
	2.5.2.3 Automatism	32
	2.5.2.3.1 Insane Automatism	32 - 33
	2.5.2.3.2 Non-Insane Automatism	33 - 34
	2.5.2.4 Mental Deficiency	34 - 35
	2.5.3 Incapable of Knowing	35 - 36
	2.5.4 Nature of the Act	37
	2.5.5 Either Wrong or Contrary to Law	37 - 39
2.6	Acquittal on Ground of Unsoundness of Mind	39
2.7	Conclusion	40

### CHAPTER THREE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF M'NAUGHTEN RULES

3.1	Development of the Rules	41 - 43
3.2	The M'Naughten Rules	44
	3.2.1 M'Naughten Case (1843) 10 C & F 200	44
	3.2.2 The Question	45 - 47
	3.2.3 Elements of M'Naughten Rules	48
	3.2.3.1 Disease of Mind	48 - 50
	3.2.3.2 Defect of Reason	50 - 51
	3.2.3.3 Nature and Quality of Defendant's Act	51 - 52

3.2.3.4	Knowledge That the Act is Wrong	52
3.2.3.4.1	Know	52 - 53
3.2.3.4.2	Wrong	53 - 54
3.2.3.5	Insane Delusion	54 - 55
3.2.3.6	Irresistible Impulse	55 - 57
3.2.3.7	Burden of Proof	57
3.3	Diminished Responsibility	58
3.3.1	The Nature of the Defence	59 - 62
3.3.2	Evidence	62
3.4	Conclusion	63 - 64

#### **CHAPTER FOUR: COMPARISON BETWEEN SECTION 84 OF PENAL CODE AND M'NAUGHTEN RULES**

4.1	Definition and Terminology	65 - 70
4.2	Procedures and Qualification	70 - 73
4.2.1	Insanity at the Trial	73 - 77
4.3	Conclusion	78

#### **CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

5.1	Recommendations	79 - 80
5.2	Conclusion	81 - 84
	References	85 - 89
	Appendices	

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

In doing a research, surely it will involve lots of effort to finish it. It will not only drain energy and ideas from the researchers alone but also those who direct and indirectly contributed to complete this research.

Our team with all our heart would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor who helped us a lot in completing this research paper, Puan Mimi Sintia Haji Mohd Bajury. We would like to thank her for lending us her precious time, ideas, knowledge and experiences to settle our confusion and questions in order to compile a complete research paper.

In this opportunity, we would like to express our gratitude Professor Dr. Ahmad Hatim bin Sulaiman in sharing his ideas and knowledge at time we needed answers to questions arose in completing this research.

We also would like to express our gratitude to our lecturers, family and friends for their support, effort and ideas that we used as supporting ladder for us to be able to reach the completion of this research paper.

## **ABSTRACT**

This research is to differentiate between Section 84 of Malaysia Penal Code and the M'Naughten Rules of insanity. This research will look into the words used by both law, whether they were vague or not. This research also looks into the different implementation of the rules, whether the other is stricter than the other vice versa. In the last chapter, recommendation to the findings of this research will be laid down.