# IPC Section 182: False information, with intent to cause public servant to use his lawful power to the injury of another person.

## IPC Section 182: False Information with Intent to Cause Public Servant to Use Lawful Power to the Injury of Another Person  
  
Section 182 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) addresses the malicious act of providing false information to a public servant, with the deliberate intention of causing the public servant to misuse their lawful authority to harm another person. This provision safeguards against the misuse of public power instigated by false accusations or misleading information. It acknowledges the potential for harm when individuals exploit the authority of public servants for personal vendettas or malicious purposes.  
  
\*\*The Text of Section 182:\*\*  
  
"Whoever gives to any public servant any information which he knows or believes to be false, intending thereby to cause, or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby cause, such public servant—  
  
(a) to do or omit anything which such public servant ought not to do or omit if the true state of facts respecting which such information is given were known by him, or  
  
(b) to use the lawful power of such public servant to the injury or annoyance of any person,  
  
shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both."  
  
\*\*Key Elements of the Offense:\*\*  
  
1. \*\*Providing False Information:\*\* The individual must provide information to a public servant, which they know or believe to be false. This information can be communicated in any form, including oral statements, written complaints, or other modes of communication. The falsity of the information is a crucial component, distinguishing it from genuine mistakes or misunderstandings.  
  
2. \*\*Knowledge or Belief of Falsity:\*\* The person providing the information must either know that it is false or genuinely believe it to be untrue. This highlights the intentional nature of the offense. It requires a deliberate act of misleading the public servant, as opposed to providing incorrect information unknowingly.  
  
3. \*\*Intent to Cause Public Servant to Act Improperly:\*\* The individual must intend to induce the public servant to act or omit to act in a way that would be inappropriate if the true facts were known. This intent demonstrates a manipulative motive behind providing the false information. The aim is to misuse the public servant's authority for personal gain or to harm another person.  
  
4. \*\*Two Potential Consequences (a & b):\*\* Section 182 outlines two possible outcomes arising from the false information:  
  
 \*\*(a) Inducing Improper Action or Omission:\*\* The false information might lead the public servant to take an action they should not have taken or refrain from taking an action they should have taken, had they known the truth. For example, a false complaint might lead a police officer to arrest an innocent person or fail to investigate a genuine crime.  
  
 \*\*(b) Misuse of Lawful Power:\*\* The false information might cause the public servant to use their lawful power in a way that harms or annoys another person. This encompasses situations where the public servant acts within the scope of their legal authority, but the action is motivated by the false information and results in injury or annoyance to someone else. For instance, a false report might lead to a tax audit of a rival business, even though there are no genuine grounds for suspicion.  
  
5. \*\*Public Servant:\*\* The recipient of the false information must be a public servant. This includes a wide range of government officials, police officers, judicial officers, and others vested with public authority. The definition of "public servant" is elaborated upon in Section 21 of the IPC.  
  
  
\*\*Punishment:\*\*  
  
Section 182 prescribes a punishment of imprisonment of either description (simple or rigorous) for a term which may extend to six months, or with a fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both. The relatively lower penalty compared to other offenses related to false statements reflects that the harm caused might not always be as severe as in cases of perjury or fabricating evidence. However, it still recognizes the potential for significant damage when public servants are misled into misusing their authority.  
  
\*\*Distinction from Other Related Offenses:\*\*  
  
\* \*\*Section 177 (Furnishing False Information):\*\* Section 177 deals with furnishing false information to a public servant, but it lacks the specific element of intending to cause the public servant to misuse their power. It covers a broader range of situations where false information is provided, regardless of the intention behind it.  
\* \*\*Section 181 (False Statement on Oath):\*\* Section 181 focuses on false statements made under oath or affirmation, whereas Section 182 does not require the formality of an oath. Section 181 also doesn't necessarily involve the intent to cause a public servant to act improperly.  
\* \*\*Section 191 (Giving False Evidence):\*\* Section 191, pertaining to perjury, relates specifically to giving false evidence in a judicial proceeding. Section 182 has a wider scope, encompassing false information given to any public servant in any context.  
  
  
\*\*Importance of Section 182:\*\*  
  
Section 182 protects against the malicious exploitation of public authority. It deters individuals from using false information as a weapon to harass, intimidate, or harm others through the misuse of governmental power. It upholds the integrity of public administration by ensuring that public servants' actions are based on truthful information rather than malicious fabrications. By penalizing those who make false accusations or provide misleading information, it fosters an environment where citizens can trust that public servants will act fairly and impartially based on accurate information. This section plays a crucial role in maintaining the balance between the effective exercise of public power and the protection of individual rights from malicious interference.