

MENTAL HEALTH AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SUDAN: A Case Study of Criminal Responsibility and Mental Illness Case Study: Sudan Government vs. Nafisa Dafaalla

Eman Yassir



This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0
International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Published on: 25 August 2026

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between mental health and the criminal justice system in Sudan through a qualitative case study of the 1961 Sudanese judicial decision involving Nafisa Dafaalla. The study explores how mental illness was interpreted within Sudanese legal proceedings and evaluates the adequacy of forensic psychiatric practices within the Sudanese justice system. Using doctrinal legal analysis and qualitative review of secondary sources, the research identifies systemic weaknesses including limited forensic psychiatric infrastructure, shortage of trained professionals, outdated diagnostic practices, and weak coordination between legal and healthcare institutions. Comparative analysis with English law and Islamic

jurisprudence demonstrates differing approaches to criminal responsibility and mental incapacity. The findings suggest that although Sudanese law recognizes partial insanity and diminished responsibility, implementation remains inconsistent due to institutional and structural limitations. The study recommends legal reform, investment in forensic psychiatric services, interdisciplinary training, and modernization of diagnostic procedures to improve fairness and human rights protections within Sudan's criminal justice system.

Keywords: mental health, criminal justice, Sudan, forensic psychology, insanity defense, criminal responsibility

* Introduction

Mental health remains one of the most neglected dimensions of

criminal justice systems in many developing countries, particularly in low-resource contexts such as Sudan. The relationship between psychological disorders and criminal responsibility presents significant legal and ethical challenges. Courts are often required to determine whether individuals suffering from mental illness possess the cognitive and behavioral capacity necessary for criminal accountability. Inadequate psychiatric assessment procedures may therefore result in unjust legal outcomes.

Sudan's mental health policy, revised in 2008, emphasized integration of mental healthcare into primary healthcare systems, protection of human rights, and professional training (World Health Organization [WHO], 2009). Despite these policy developments, implementation has remained weak due to limited institutional capacity, shortage of specialists, and insufficient forensic psychiatric services (Osman et al., 2019). Consequently, individuals with mental disorders who encounter the criminal justice system often face inconsistent treatment and inadequate psychological evaluation.

This paper examines the interaction between mental health and criminal responsibility in Sudan

through a case study analysis of the 1961 Nafisa Dafalla case, one of the earliest Sudanese judicial decisions involving partial insanity as a mitigating factor in criminal sentencing.

*** Literature Review**

Criminal responsibility traditionally depends upon the existence of intent, rational understanding, and voluntary conduct (Ashworth, 2013). Legal systems generally assume that individuals possess sufficient mental capacity to understand the consequences of their actions. However, severe psychological disorders may impair judgment, perception, impulse control, and decision-making capacity (Bartol & Bartol, 2019).

Forensic psychology plays a critical role in assessing defendants' mental conditions and assisting courts in determining criminal accountability. Psychological evaluations provide insight into competency, insanity defenses, diminished responsibility, and risk assessment (Melton et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the effectiveness of forensic psychology depends heavily on institutional support, qualified professionals, and standardized diagnostic procedures.

Case Study: Sudan Government vs.

Nafisa Dafaalla (1961)

The Nafisa Dafalla case involved a Sudanese woman charged with the killing of her husband following a period of severe emotional and psychological disturbance. During the legal proceedings, evidence was presented indicating that Nafisa suffered from melancholia, emotional instability, and symptoms associated with significant mental distress. Medical testimony suggested that although she was not completely deprived of reason, her mental condition substantially impaired her judgment and emotional control at the time of the offense.

According to Judicial Decisions of Sudan (Sudan Judiciary, 1961), the defense argued that Nafisa's psychological condition reduced her level of criminal responsibility. The court accepted that her mental state had significantly affected her behavior and concluded that full criminal liability would be inappropriate under the circumstances.

Under Section 50 of the Sudanese Penal Code, the court reduced the severity of punishment based on diminished responsibility and partial insanity (Sudan Judiciary, 1961). The judgment represented one of the earliest recognitions in

Sudanese legal history that mental illness could mitigate criminal responsibility even when the defendant retained partial awareness of the act.

*** Findings and Discussion**

The findings reveal several systemic barriers affecting the fair treatment of mentally ill individuals within Sudan's criminal justice system: -

- 1- Shortage of trained forensic psychiatrists and psychologists
- 2- Limited forensic psychiatric institutions
- 3- Weak collaboration between healthcare and legal sectors
- 4- Reliance on outdated diagnostic practices
- 5- Limited judicial awareness of mental illness complexities

Recommendations

- 6- Legal Reform: Sudan should modernize its mental health legislation to align with international human rights standards.
- 7- Development of Services: Specialized forensic psychiatric institutions should be established within correctional systems.
- 8- Training: Judges and healthcare professionals should receive specialized forensic psychology training.

9- Modern Tools: The system should adopt international frameworks like the DSM-5.

*** Conclusion**

The Sudanese criminal justice system faces enduring challenges in addressing mental health within legal processes. Meaningful reform requires interdisciplinary collaboration, modernization of psychiatric assessment procedures, and increased investment in forensic mental health infrastructure.

*** References**

- Ashworth, A. (2013). Principles of criminal law (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2019). Introduction to forensic psychology: Research and application (6th ed.). SAGE.
- Dols, M. W., & Immisch, D. E. (1992). Majnūn: The madman in medieval Islamic society. Oxford University Press.
- Osman, A. H. M., et al. (2019). Sudan's mental health service: Challenges and future horizons. BJPsych International.
- Sudan Judiciary. (1961). Judicial decisions of Sudan: Criminal responsibility and partial insanity in the Nafisa Dafalla case. Sudan Judiciary Archives.

World Health Organization. (2009). WHO-AIMS report on mental health system in Sudan. WHO Press.