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Social and Legal Context

• A national discussion regarding streamlining and fast-tracking the legal response to facilitate justice, in the wake of several incidents of rape that garnered national attention.

• The focus is primarily on conducting effective rape trials and delivering retributive justice.

• There is a necessity to use evidence to inform locally relevant legal and judicial response strategies.

• Section 363; Section 364(2)(g): Penal Code, 1883
Why the Rape Trial?:

Situating the Present Study

• The rape trial encapsulates:
  – the link between language and the law
  – the dynamics of power in the courtroom
  – politics of gender.

• In Sri Lanka, prior research and commentary on rape as reflected in judgements but no analysis from the perspective of language use.

• Findings have implications for policy changes, highlighting judicial approaches to the offence, and identifying strengths and weakness of such approaches.
Scope and Focus of Study

• Examines judicial pronouncements by the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal of Sri Lanka
  – published in the Sri Lanka Law Reports
  – during 1995-2013
  – through a Critical Discourse Analysis approach.

• Excludes statutory rape and war-time rape.

• Focus is on whether the Courts are guided by ‘extra-legal’ i.e. external socio-cultural factors when adjudicating cases of rape, and if so, its impact.
## Methodology: Primary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Range of Pages</th>
<th>No. of Words</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name of Case</th>
<th>Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32-40</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>1 SLR 32</td>
<td>Savinda v. Republic of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>1 SLR 23</td>
<td>Ajith v. Attorney General</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144-50</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>1 SLR 144</td>
<td>Chaminda v. Republic of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>1 SLR 18</td>
<td>Saman Kumara v. Republic of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>288-312</td>
<td>9141</td>
<td>1 SLR 288</td>
<td>Ajith Fernando alias Konda Ajith and Others v. Attorney General</td>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>413-416</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1 SLR 413</td>
<td>Nishantha Janaka v. Attorney General</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>307-315</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>1 SLR 307</td>
<td>Inoka Gallage v. Kamal Addararachchi and Another</td>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>161-171</td>
<td>3413</td>
<td>2 SLR 161</td>
<td>Rajapakshe v. The State</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>245-276</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>2 SLR 245</td>
<td>Keerthi Bandara v. Attorney General</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>393-420</td>
<td>9625</td>
<td>3 SLR 393</td>
<td>Kamal Addararachchi v. The State</td>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 56765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sri Lanka Law Reports (SLRs)
Methodology:

Linguistic Model

- Examines linguistic features present in the description of the victim of rape, her actions, and the significance of such features through a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Approach

Why CDA?

- CDA reveals ideological assumptions and power dynamics that shape the creation of a text.

Three Dimensional Model (Fairclough, 1992):

i. As a text
ii. As a discursive practice
iii. As a social practice
Credibility of the Complainant

'A woman with whose consent the act of sexual intercourse was performed can later claim that it was done against her will or without her consent. This can be due to failure on the part of the man to fulfil what had been promised at the time or before the act of intercourse and/or she consented to an act which she is now ashamed of."

Ajith v. Attorney General

Causal semantic relations (and epistemic modality) draws a link between retraction of consent and failure to fulfil promises or shame.

Also indicates that retraction could be for multiple reasons.
Findings in Brief

Delineation of an expected code of conduct by a genuine victim of rape:

- Prompt complaint, aggressive resistance, crying out for help.

Repercussions of non-conformity to code:

- Shift of the blame and responsibility for the rape onto the victim (victim blaming).

Consequences for Justice and Fairness:

- Reinforces stereotypes and vests them with the authority of the law.
- Violates principles of fairness, objectivity and impartiality and further violates the rights of the victim of rape.
Prompt Complaint by Victim

Court imposes what is ‘natural’ without any empirical evidence to support it.

‘No one can expect her to divulge the incident to Chaminda (husband’s co-worker) **but it was natural for her to send a message to her husband.** Following day she went to the Grama Sevaka’s (village headman) house **but she did not complain about the incident**… She went and slept with her sister on the following day **but she did not tell her about the incident**…

Her subsequent conduct raises a reasonable doubt whether there was consent to the sexual intercourse. **In fact** her subsequent conduct indicates that sexual intercourse was performed with her consent’.
Presence of Physical Injuries

‘Absence of such tell-tale marks is a circumstance that was strongly supportive of the sexual act having taken place with her consent...there being no injuries either on the prosecutrix or on the accused-appellant there appears to be no independent corroboration relating the act of sexual intercourse having been committed on the prosecutrix against her will or without her consent’

[Kamal Addararachchi v. The State]
‘Human conduct’ is such that, when there is danger it is natural for a human being to cry for help whether there were people around or not... Common sense will tell us that the prosecutrix did not shout or cry as she was a willing party to the sexual conduct...

If the accused-appellant attempted to ravish her for the second time, prosecutrix would have yelled and cried for help’

[Kamal Addararachchi v. The State].

Presupposition and generalisation: What is ‘natural’ about ‘human conduct’ is presumed and considered ‘common sense’ thereby imbuing the statement with a hue of universality.

‘would’ – modal marker

The epistemic modality of the marker expresses a prediction.

The marker is instrument in constructing an expected behaviour of a victim.
‘If her intention was...to go to Katunayake why didn't she get off from the passenger door?...if...she was not permitted to get off the bus... why couldn't she jump over the iron fence when the passengers were getting off at Pettah? She could have easily done this since...her seat was behind the driver's seat... she could have easily got the help of the passengers to jump over the fence... Was it natural for this woman to remain in the bus with two men (the driver and the conductor) when she had the opportunity of getting off...? I think not. This shows that she was willing to enjoy the company of the appellant’

‘By this time she should know that something serious was going to happen to her. Then why didn't she jump over the iron fence...?’

Repercussions of Non-Conformity

[Savinda v. Republic of Sri Lanka].
Impact of the delineation of ‘expected behaviour’

- Does not account for
  - realities and complexities surrounding rape and the rape trial.
  - behavioural responses can differ from one person to another.
- Presupposes that the Prosecutrix would have behaved otherwise if complaint was truthful; constructs certain behavioural responses as ‘innate’.
- However, such ‘innate’ responses:
  - Are not supported by empirical evidence;
  - Fail to account for psychological trauma;
  - Fail to consider stigma, societal pressures and negative association of a crime which, though committed by a male, is often attached to the raped female.
Overall Implications of Findings

- Rape Victim assigned a gendered subject position.
- Gender-based stereotypes and social norms are invoked in judicial decisions as a discursive practice.
- Affects apportioning of blame and responsibility for rape.
- Court is seen disciplining females for violation of the ‘normal conduct’ of Sri Lankan women i.e. policing and controlling female behaviour.
- Reinforces stereotypes and vests them with the authority of the law.
- Violates principles of fairness, objectivity and impartiality and further violates the rights of the victim of rape.