

DISTINCTION BETWEEN DISHONEST MISAPPROPRIATION OF PROPERTY AND CRIMINAL BREACH OF TRUST

A Critical Analysis of Entrustment and the Nature of Possession under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

¹Pavithra S.

¹LL.B. (Hons.)

¹SCSVMV University, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu, India

Lekshmi VS

Abstract : The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) recognises dishonest misappropriation of property and criminal breach of trust as distinct offences against property. Dishonest misappropriation is dealt with under Section 314, whereas criminal breach of trust is defined under Section 316. Although both offences involve dishonest appropriation or conversion of property, they differ in the manner in which possession is acquired and the legal relationship between the accused and the property. Entrustment is a fundamental ingredient of criminal breach of trust, while dishonest misappropriation does not necessarily require entrustment. This paper examines the statutory provisions, essential ingredients, and nature of possession associated with both offences. It also discusses relevant judicial decisions and practical examples to explain the legal distinction.

IndexTerms - Dishonest misappropriation, criminal breach of trust, entrustment, possession, dishonest conversion, Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

I. INTRODUCTION

Property-related offences form an important part of criminal law because they protect the ownership, possession, and lawful interests of individuals. Dishonest misappropriation of property and criminal breach of trust are significant because both involve dishonest dealing with property belonging to another person.

Under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, dishonest misappropriation of property is addressed under Section 314, while criminal breach of trust is defined under Section 316. The essential difference lies in the manner in which the accused obtains possession or control of the property.

In dishonest misappropriation, the accused dishonestly appropriates or converts movable property to personal use without necessarily having received it through entrustment. For example, a person who finds another person's wallet and later dishonestly keeps the money may commit dishonest misappropriation. In criminal breach of trust, property or dominion over it is entrusted to the accused for a particular purpose or under a legal obligation. If the accused dishonestly deals with the property contrary to that obligation, criminal breach of trust may arise.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study follows the doctrinal method of legal research. It examines the relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and judicial decisions relating to dishonest misappropriation, criminal breach of trust, entrustment, and possession. Earlier decisions interpreting corresponding provisions of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, are considered where relevant to explain the underlying legal principles.

III. DISHONEST MISAPPROPRIATION OF PROPERTY

A. Meaning and Definition

Dishonest misappropriation of property refers to the dishonest appropriation or conversion of movable property for one's own use. Section 314 of the BNS provides punishment for this offence. The essential feature is the dishonest intention to appropriate property for personal benefit or to cause wrongful loss to another person. The property may come into the accused's possession in circumstances that are not initially criminal; the offence arises when the accused subsequently decides to appropriate it dishonestly.

B. Essential Ingredients

The relevant ingredients include: (1) the property must be movable property; (2) the accused must dishonestly misappropriate or convert it to personal use; and (3) the dishonest appropriation or conversion must be established through the evidence and circumstances. Mere possession of another person's property does not automatically establish the offence.

C. Nature of Possession

Possession does not necessarily originate from a relationship of entrustment. The accused may find property, come across it accidentally, or obtain it under other circumstances. The crucial factor is the subsequent dishonest intention to appropriate it.

Example: A finds a mobile phone in a public place. After discovering the owner's identity, A deliberately sells the phone and keeps the money. Depending on the facts, A's conduct may constitute dishonest misappropriation.

D. Statutory Provision

Section 314 of the BNS deals with dishonest misappropriation of property and prescribes imprisonment of not less than six months, which may extend to two years, along with a fine.

IV. CRIMINAL BREACH OF TRUST

A. Meaning and Definition

Criminal breach of trust is defined under Section 316 of the BNS. It occurs when a person entrusted with property or dominion over it dishonestly misappropriates or converts it to personal use, or dishonestly uses or disposes of it in violation of a direction of law or a legal contract relating to the discharge of the trust.

Example: A gives INR 50,000 to B, an employee, with instructions to deposit it into the company's bank account. Instead, B uses the money for personal expenses. If the statutory ingredients are established, B may be liable for criminal breach of trust.

B. Essential Ingredients

The essential ingredients are: (1) entrustment of property or dominion over it; (2) dishonest intention; (3) dishonest misappropriation, conversion, use, or disposal of the property; and (4) conduct contrary to the relevant legal obligation as specified in Section 316. A mere failure to fulfil a contractual promise or return money does not automatically amount to criminal breach of trust.

C. Nature of Possession

Possession or control is obtained through entrustment. The accused receives property or authority over it for a specified purpose or subject to an obligation. The accused may initially possess the property lawfully; criminal liability may arise when the accused dishonestly appropriates it or deals with it contrary to the relevant obligation.

Example: A business owner entrusts goods to B for delivery to a customer. Instead of delivering them, B sells the goods and keeps the proceeds. If the ingredients are proved, this may amount to criminal breach of trust.

D. Statutory Provision

Section 316 defines criminal breach of trust and provides different punishments according to the circumstances and category of the person committing the offence. Section 316(2) deals with the general form, while other subsections address aggravated forms.

V. CONCEPT OF ENTRUSTMENT

A. Meaning of Entrustment

Entrustment means placing property or control over property in another person's possession for a particular purpose or subject to an obligation. Under Section 316, a person may be entrusted with property directly or may receive dominion over it. Dominion means authority or control over property, even where the person does not have unrestricted physical possession. Entrustment does not necessarily require a formal trust under the law of trusts.

B. Importance of Entrustment

Entrustment is a fundamental ingredient of criminal breach of trust. Without establishing entrustment or dominion over property arising from entrustment, the offence cannot be established merely because the accused dealt dishonestly with another person's property. The prosecution must establish both entrustment and the subsequent dishonest dealing.

For example, when an employer gives money to an employee for depositing it in a bank, the employee receives the money for a specified purpose. If the employee dishonestly uses it for personal purposes, the entrustment and subsequent misuse may establish criminal breach of trust. In contrast, a person who finds lost property and later dishonestly keeps it may be liable for dishonest misappropriation even though there was no entrustment.

C. Entrustment and Dominion Over Property

Entrustment may involve physical delivery of property or the transfer of authority to control it. A cashier may physically receive money belonging to an employer, while a person authorised to manage company funds may exercise dominion over property without physically holding it. Mere access or control is not automatically sufficient; the prosecution must establish that the relevant possession or dominion arose from entrustment.

D. Judicial Interpretation

In *State of Gujarat v. Jaswantlal Nathalal*, AIR 1968 SC 700, the Supreme Court considered the requirement of entrustment in criminal breach of trust. In *Velji Raghavji Patel v. State of Maharashtra*, AIR 1965 SC 1433, the Court considered the importance of proving entrustment or dominion over property. These decisions are relevant to the principle that the relationship between the accused and the property must be established.

VI. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO OFFENCES

Both offences involve dishonest dealing with property, but they differ in their essential ingredients, particularly entrustment and the manner in which possession is acquired.

Table 1: Distinction between dishonest misappropriation and criminal breach of trust

Basis	Dishonest Misappropriation	Criminal Breach of Trust
Provision	Section 314, BNS, 2023.	Section 316, BNS, 2023.

Basis	Dishonest Misappropriation	Criminal Breach of Trust
Meaning	Dishonest appropriation or conversion of movable property to personal use.	Dishonest dealing with entrusted property contrary to the relevant legal obligation.
Entrustment	Not an essential ingredient.	Entrustment or dominion arising from entrustment is essential.
Possession	May arise through finding, accidental acquisition, or other circumstances.	Possession or control is obtained through entrustment.
Initial possession	Need not arise from a trust-based relationship.	Arises from a relationship of entrustment.
Property	Section 314 concerns movable property.	Section 316 applies to property generally.
Example	A finds a lost wallet and dishonestly keeps the money.	A receives money for deposit into a bank but dishonestly uses it personally.
Main distinction	Dishonest appropriation without proving entrustment.	Dishonest dealing with property entrusted to the accused.

The principal distinction is that dishonest misappropriation does not require proof of entrustment, whereas criminal breach of trust requires proof that the accused was entrusted with property or dominion over it.

VII. DIFFERENCE IN THE NATURE OF POSSESSION

A. Possession in Dishonest Misappropriation

The accused may acquire possession without any specific obligation to hold the property for another person. The property may be found, received accidentally, or obtained in circumstances not involving entrustment. The offence focuses on the dishonest decision to appropriate or convert the property for personal use. Initial possession may be innocent, while subsequent conduct becomes criminal.

B. Possession in Criminal Breach of Trust

Possession or control is obtained through entrustment. The accused receives property or dominion over it with an obligation to deal with it in a particular manner. Criminal liability arises when the accused dishonestly misappropriates it or deals with it in violation of the applicable obligation.

C. Comparative Analysis

In dishonest misappropriation, the central question is whether the accused dishonestly appropriated or converted movable property to personal use. In criminal breach of trust, the inquiry begins with whether the property or dominion over it was entrusted to the accused, followed by proof of the dishonest dealing required by law. The legal origin of possession therefore helps distinguish the offences.

VIII. IMPORTANT JUDICIAL DECISIONS

A. *State of Gujarat v. Jaswantlal Nathalal*

Citation: AIR 1968 SC 700. This decision is relevant to the concept of entrustment and the need to examine whether property was entrusted to the accused and whether the subsequent conduct satisfies the legal requirements of the offence.

B. *Velji Raghavji Patel v. State of Maharashtra*

Citation: AIR 1965 SC 1433. The decision is relevant to the requirement of entrustment or dominion over property in criminal breach of trust and the distinction between mere control and control arising through entrustment.

C. *Jaikrishnadas Manohardas Desai v. State of Bombay*

Citation: AIR 1960 SC 889. The decision examined proof of criminal breach of trust. Entrustment, failure to account for property, and surrounding circumstances may support an inference of dishonest conversion where the evidence justifies it; failure to account does not automatically prove the offence in every case.

D. *Onkar Nath Mishra v. State (NCT of Delhi)*

Citation: (2008) 2 SCC 561. The Supreme Court discussed the essential components of criminal breach of trust, including an obligation relating to property over which the accused has dominion or control, followed by dishonest dealing contrary to that obligation.

Note: These decisions interpret corresponding provisions of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and may assist in understanding the corresponding BNS provisions, subject to the statutory text and applicable law.

IX. CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The distinction between dishonest misappropriation and criminal breach of trust is essential for the proper application of criminal law. Treating the offences as identical would ignore the special importance of entrustment in criminal breach of trust. The prosecution must establish the ingredients of the particular offence rather than relying only on the fact that another person's property has been retained or misused.

Physical possession alone does not determine criminal liability. The circumstances in which possession was obtained, the existence of an obligation, and the accused's subsequent conduct are all relevant. A failure to return money or fulfil a contractual promise does not automatically establish criminal breach of trust; the required entrustment and dishonest dealing must be proved.

Similarly, possession of lost property does not automatically establish dishonest misappropriation. The prosecution must establish the dishonest appropriation or conversion in accordance with the statute. Courts should therefore examine possession, entrustment, dishonest intention, and the purpose for which the property was received.

X. SUGGESTIONS

First, investigating authorities should establish how the accused acquired possession or control of the property. Second, in criminal breach of trust cases, evidence should specifically address the existence and nature of entrustment. Third, courts should distinguish dishonest appropriation from a mere failure to fulfil a contractual obligation. Fourth, the purpose for which property was delivered, the legal obligations governing its use, and the accused's subsequent conduct should be examined together.

XI. CONCLUSION

Dishonest misappropriation of property and criminal breach of trust are distinct offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. While both involve dishonest dealing with property, they differ primarily in the requirement of entrustment and the nature of possession.

Dishonest misappropriation under Section 314 does not require proof that the property was entrusted to the accused. Criminal breach of trust under Section 316 requires proof of entrustment or dominion over property resulting from entrustment, together with the dishonest conduct specified by the statute. A careful examination of how possession was acquired, the purpose for which property was received, and the accused's subsequent conduct is necessary to determine criminal liability.

XII. REFERENCES

- [1] Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Act No. 45 of 2023, Sections 314 and 316.
- [2] Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 403 and 405.
- [3] State of Gujarat v. Jaswantlal Nathalal, AIR 1968 SC 700.
- [4] Velji Raghavji Patel v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1965 SC 1433.
- [5] Jaikrishnadas Manohardas Desai v. State of Bombay, AIR 1960 SC 889.
- [6] Onkar Nath Mishra v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2008) 2 SCC 561.
- [7] India Code, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Copyright & License:



© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

