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## IPC Section 111: Liability of Abettor When One Act Abetted and Different Act Done  
  
Section 111 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) addresses a specific scenario related to abetment where the person abetted commits a different offense than the one the abettor intended, but that different offense is part of a broader transaction that the abettor did intend. This provision deals with situations where the abettor's intent encompasses a broader set of actions, and the person abetted commits an offense within that broader scope, even if it's not the precise offense the abettor had in mind.  
  
\*\*The Provision of Section 111:\*\*  
  
Section 111 states:  
  
"When an act is abetted and a different act is done, the abettor is liable for the act done, in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had directly abetted it:  
Provided the act done was a probable consequence of the abetment, and was committed under the influence of the instigation, or with the aid or in pursuance of the conspiracy, which constituted the abetment."  
  
  
\*\*Explanation and Breakdown:\*\*  
  
This section clarifies that when an abettor instigates, aids, or conspires with another person to commit a specific act, and that person commits a \*different\* act, the abettor can still be held liable for the act actually committed, provided it meets certain conditions. The key difference between Section 111 and Section 110 (which also deals with a different act being done) is that in Section 111, the different act done must be a probable consequence of the abetment \*and\* must be committed under the influence of the abetment. This means the abetment must have played a direct role in causing the different act to be committed.  
  
\*\*Illustrative Examples:\*\*  
  
\* \*\*Scenario 1 (Probable Consequence, Under the Influence of Abetment):\*\* A instigates B to steal valuable jewels from C's house. While attempting to steal the jewels, B is confronted by C. B, in a panic, assaults C to escape. While A abetted theft, the assault was a probable consequence of the abetment, and it was committed under the influence of the instigation to commit theft. Therefore, A can be held liable for the assault under Section 111.  
  
\* \*\*Scenario 2 (Probable Consequence, Not Under the Influence of Abetment):\*\* A instigates B to steal mangoes from C's orchard. While in the orchard, B encounters D, an old enemy, and murders D. While murder might be a probable consequence of entering the orchard illegally, it was not committed under the influence of the abetment to steal mangoes. The murder stemmed from a separate, unrelated motive. Therefore, Section 111 would not apply to hold A liable for the murder.  
  
\* \*\*Scenario 3 (Not a Probable Consequence):\*\* A encourages B to play a prank on C by putting a harmless fake snake in C's bed. B, however, decides to place a real, venomous snake in C's bed, resulting in C's death. The act done (causing death by snakebite) is not a probable consequence of the abetment to play a harmless prank. Therefore, Section 111 would not apply to hold A liable for C's death.  
  
  
\*\*Key Elements of Section 111:\*\*  
  
1. \*\*Abetment of an Act:\*\* There must be an initial act of abetment, which can involve instigation, conspiracy, or intentional aiding.  
  
2. \*\*Commission of a Different Act:\*\* The person abetted must commit a different act than the one originally abetted.  
  
3. \*\*Probable Consequence:\*\* The different act committed must be a probable consequence of the abetment. This means a reasonable person could foresee the possibility of the different act occurring as a result of the abetment.  
  
4. \*\*Under the Influence of Abetment:\*\* The different act must be committed under the influence of the instigation, aid, or conspiracy that constituted the abetment. This means there must be a direct causal link between the abetment and the commission of the different act.  
  
5. \*\*Liability as if Directly Abetted:\*\* If these conditions are met, the abettor is liable for the different act as if they had directly abetted it.  
  
  
\*\*Distinction from Section 110:\*\*  
  
While both Section 110 and Section 111 deal with situations where a different act is done than the one abetted, there is a key distinction: Section 110 applies when the different act is a probable consequence of the abetment. Section 111 requires the additional element that the different act must be committed \*under the influence\* of the abetment. This narrower scope emphasizes the direct causal link between the abetment and the commission of the different act.  
  
  
\*\*Purpose and Significance of Section 111:\*\*  
  
Section 111 is important because it:  
  
\* \*\*Addresses Variations within a Transaction:\*\* It recognizes that criminal transactions can evolve and deviate from the initial plan, holding abettors accountable for foreseeable variations that occur under the influence of their abetment.  
  
\* \*\*Reinforces Accountability:\*\* It prevents abettors from escaping liability by claiming they didn't specifically intend the precise act that was ultimately committed, as long as the act falls within the probable and influenced consequences of their abetment.  
  
\* \*\*Promotes Justice:\*\* It ensures that the punishment is appropriate for the harm caused, holding abettors responsible for the full extent of the criminal transaction they set in motion.  
  
  
  
\*\*Conclusion:\*\*  
  
Section 111 of the IPC is a crucial provision that clarifies the liability of abettors in situations where the person abetted commits a different act than the one initially intended. By focusing on the probable consequences and the influence of the abetment, the section provides a nuanced and just framework for attributing responsibility in complex scenarios. It reinforces the principle of accountability, ensuring that abettors are held responsible for the full extent of the criminal activity that flows from their actions.