



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

WHEN PIECES SPEAK VOLUMES— **STRENGTHENING THE USE OF** **CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN INDIA**

AUTHORED BY: HIR PATEL

Student

Unitedworld School of Law, Karnavati University

Abstract:

Circumstantial evidence often overlooked but crucial in legal proceedings, plays a significant role in establishing guilt or innocence when direct evidence is unavailable. This research paper titled "When Pieces Speak Volumes: Strengthening the Use of Circumstantial Evidence in India" explores the current approach to circumstantial evidence in Indian law and advocates for a more robust framework to utilize this form of evidence effectively.

The paper delves into the definition and characteristics of circumstantial evidence, highlighting its importance in constructing a compelling case. It discusses various legal principles and tests established by courts to evaluate circumstantial evidence, such as the "Panchsheel" principles and the requirements for establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Several landmark cases, including the Aarushi murder case and the Jessica Lal case, illustrate India's reliance on circumstantial evidence in securing convictions. However, the paper also acknowledges instances where courts have refrained from convicting based solely on circumstantial evidence, emphasizing the need for a complete chain of circumstances and thorough judicial scrutiny.

To strengthen the use of circumstantial evidence, the paper proposes practical solutions such as corroborating evidence from multiple sources, leveraging scientific methods, and educating jurors about the strengths and limitations of circumstantial evidence. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining a balance between justice and the rights of the accused, ensuring a fair trial process.

Overall, the paper contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of circumstantial evidence in Indian law and advocates for reforms that enhance the legal system's ability to achieve just

outcomes.

KEYWORDS: Circumstantial evidence, Panchsheel, Essentials of Circumstantial Evidence, Sole basis of conviction, Admissibility and Proof, Strengthening solutions.

INTRODUCTION

Have you ever watched a detective show where the culprit is caught based on a trail of clues, not an eyewitness? That's the power of circumstantial evidence. In the real world of law, just like in fiction, direct evidence (like an eyewitness) isn't always available. This is where circumstantial evidence steps in, piecing together the puzzle of a crime through seemingly unconnected facts. But how do you build a strong case from these fragments?

The Indian legal system heavily relies on the principle of "beyond reasonable doubt" for securing convictions. While direct evidence provides the most compelling proof, achieving this high standard often hinges on circumstantial evidence – a mosaic of seemingly unrelated facts that, when pieced together, point towards a conclusion.

This research paper, titled "When Pieces Speak Volumes: Strengthening the Use of Circumstantial Evidence in India," delves into the current approach towards circumstantial evidence in Indian legal proceedings. It argues for a more robust framework to utilize this vital form of evidence effectively, ensuring a just and efficient legal system.

SCOPE:

This paper will explore the various aspects of circumstantial evidence in India utilizing a multi-pronged approach, including doctrinal research (analyzing legal materials), comparative analysis (examining other jurisdictions), and policy analysis (evaluating potential reforms). The ultimate goal is to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of circumstantial evidence and propose meaningful reforms that enhance the Indian legal system's ability to achieve just outcomes.

LIMITATION:

This paper will primarily focus on the use of circumstantial evidence in criminal proceedings. While the principles might hold some relevance for civil cases, a deeper exploration of that aspect would require a separate study.

Research Questions:

1. How does the Indian legal system currently evaluate and weigh circumstantial evidence in reaching a verdict?
2. How do legal doctrines and judicial interpretations in India influence the admissibility and evaluation of circumstantial evidence?
3. What are the current challenges and limitations associated with the use of circumstantial evidence in Indian legal proceedings?
4. How can the Indian legal system be reformed to ensure a more balanced and effective use of circumstantial evidence in achieving justice?

Research Objectives:

- To critically analyse the current legal framework and judicial practices surrounding circumstantial evidence in India.
- To identify the factors that hinder the effective use of circumstantial evidence in securing convictions.
- To assess the impact of the current approach on the Indian justice system.
- To propose concrete recommendations for reforming the Indian legal system to enhance the reliability and weight given to circumstantial evidence.
- To contribute to a fairer and efficient justice system in India by promoting the effective use of all forms of evidence, including circumstantial evidence.

Research Methodology:

1. *Doctrinal Research:* This will involve a thorough analysis of relevant legal materials, including statutes, case law (landmark judgments from Supreme Court and High Courts), commentaries, and legal treatises on Indian Evidence Act and criminal procedure.
2. *Policy Analysis:* This will involve evaluating potential reforms to improve the use of circumstantial evidence, considering factors like achieving justice, maintaining fairness, and preventing wrongful convictions.

WHAT IS CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE?

Circumstantial evidence is evidence obtained through deduction rather than first-hand knowledge or information. It is also known as indirect or presumptive evidence and leads to a reasonable conclusion that such a thing exist. It refers to a series of facts other than those sought to be established. It is evidence acquired from events or circumstances around a fact at issue rather than

direct observation of the fact under consideration. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a truth or a set of facts which serves to determine if something is true or untrue.

Circumstantial evidence refers to facts other than those in issue that have been recognized by human experience to be so closely linked to the latter that the latter must be rationally inferred from them¹.

Circumstantial evidence should not be viewed as a single chain where the failure of one link causes the entire chain to collapse. Instead, it is comparable to a rope made up of multiple cords. While one cord alone may not be strong enough to support a weight, the combined strength of three cords could be sufficient. Similarly, in circumstantial evidence, individual circumstances may not individually lead to a reasonable conviction or more than a mere suspicion. However, when considered together as a whole, they can form a compelling conclusion of guilt, providing as much certainty as human affairs allow or demand².

Several prominent individuals have contributed significantly to understanding and defining the concept. A few of those have been discussed here:

- ✓ Peter Murphy describes circumstantial evidence as evidence that allows the desired conclusion to be inferred, but necessitates the fact-finding tribunal not only to acknowledge the presented evidence but also to draw conclusions from it³.
- ✓ Steve Uglow defines circumstantial evidence as evidence comprising circumstances that do not directly address the facts in question but can be used to infer those facts. Instances such as harbouring animosity towards the victim, being in the vicinity of the attack, or having the victim's blood on the accused's clothing collectively form a compelling yet inferential case⁴.
- ✓ Cross & Tapper define circumstantial evidence as any fact, also referred to as an 'evidential fact', 'factum probans', or 'fact relevant to the issue', from which the Judge or jury can infer the existence of a fact in question⁵.

¹ 17th Edition, Avatar Singh, Principles of The Law of Evidence, 34, Allahabad Central Law Publications 2009.

² R v. Exall & Ors., [1866] 176 ER 850 at 853.

³ 2nd Edition, Dr S R Myneni, The Law of Evidence, 20, Asia Law House.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

- ✓ Wills defined it as "evidence provided not through direct testimony from an eyewitness to the fact in question, but rather through other supporting facts that are relied upon and are incompatible with any conclusion other than the truth of the main fact⁶."

Circumstantial evidence can sometimes be as compelling as direct evidence. Although direct evidence is often considered as the strongest evidence, when direct evidence is lacking, the case is entirely or primarily reliant on circumstantial evidence. In such a scenario, the incident must be recreated in court utilising the surrounding circumstances, such as the cause or effects of the event. It is the attorneys' and the court's duty to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding the incident and draw conclusions to determine the accused's guilt or innocence.

The Supreme Court emphasized in the pivotal case of Hanumant Govind Nargundkar v. State of Madhya Pradesh⁷ that when dealing with circumstantial evidence, it's crucial to ensure that the circumstances pointing to guilt are thoroughly proven and that all established facts align exclusively with the accused's guilt.

While circumstantial evidence holds significant importance in both criminal and civil cases, it's often misinterpreted. Courts have clarified that circumstantial evidence shouldn't be conflated with hearsay or secondary evidence. Instead, it serves as a form of indirect evidence, complementing direct evidence in its application.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE:

1. It doesn't directly establish a fact but allows for logical deductions or inferences to be made. These inferences are drawn from a process of logical reasoning based on the evidence provided.
2. It can either be conclusive, leading to a single reasonable conclusion, or probative, supporting a particular conclusion without proving it definitively.
3. It's evaluated by considering the totality of circumstances surrounding a case, where all relevant evidence, both direct and circumstantial, is weighed together to ascertain guilt or innocence.
4. It serves to corroborate other evidence in a case, such as eyewitness accounts or physical proof.

⁶ SIR ALFRED WILLS, AN ESSAY ON THE PRINCIPLES OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, (Butterworth & Company 1902).

⁷ AIR 1952 SC 343.

5. Judges and juries are instructed to make only reasonable inferences from circumstantial evidence, grounded in logic and evidence rather than speculation.

EXAMPLES OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE ENCOMPASS VARIOUS FORMS:

1. Evidence indicating the defendant's motive.
2. Evidence establishing the defendant's opportunity, such as their presence at a specific location and time.
3. Forensic identification evidence, like bodily samples or fingerprints found at the crime scene matching those of the defendant.
4. Evidence of possessing incriminating objects, such as tools or items linked to drug supply.
5. Evidence of the defendant's silence during interviews or trial proceedings.
6. Evidence revealing the defendant's preparations to commit a specific act.
7. Evidence of the defendant's previous criminal behaviour or bad character, indicating a propensity to commit similar offenses.

These examples illustrate how circumstantial evidence can contribute to establishing guilt indirectly, without directly proving the offense.

THE PANCHSHEEL ESSENTIAL OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

As we know that circumstantial evidence holds immense power, but its use requires meticulous approach. There have been numerous instances where jurists as well as courts have laid down tests or essential principles which act as guidelines and have to be kept in mind while applying circumstantial evidence and its inference in any case.

In his book on "Circumstantial Evidence", Sir Alfred Wills succinctly outlines the key rules to consider:

1. The facts forming the basis of any legal inference must be clearly proven and indisputably linked to the main point in question.
2. The responsibility of proving any fact that implies legal liability rests on the party making the assertion.
3. In all instances, whether involving direct or circumstantial evidence, the highest quality evidence available must be presented.
4. To establish guilt, the incriminating fact must be inconsistent with the accused's innocence and incapable of being explained by any other reasonable explanation than their guilt.

5. If there exists any reasonable doubt regarding the guilt of the accused, they are entitled to acquittal.

In *Sharad Birdhichand Sarada v. State of Maharashtra*⁸, a three-Judge Bench established five key principles, known as the "Panchsheel," for cases based on circumstantial evidence:

1. The circumstances leading to the conclusion of guilt must be fully established.
2. The established facts should only align with the hypothesis of the accused's guilt, leaving no room for alternative explanations.
3. The circumstances should be definitive and conclusive in nature.
4. They must rule out every possible explanation except the one indicating the accused's guilt.
5. There should be a complete chain of evidence, leaving no reasonable doubt about the accused's innocence and indicating, with high probability, the accused's involvement in the act.

In *Padala Veera Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh*⁹, the Supreme Court outlined the following tests that must be met in cases relying on circumstantial evidence:

1. The circumstances leading to the inference of guilt must be firmly and convincingly established.
2. These circumstances should definitively and unmistakably indicate the accused's guilt.
3. Taken together, the circumstances should form a chain so comprehensive that it conclusively implicates the accused in the crime.
4. The circumstantial evidence must be thorough and incapable of supporting any explanation other than the guilt of the accused. It should not only align with the accused's guilt but also contradict any possibility of innocence.

In *Balwinder Singh v. State of Punjab*¹⁰, it was established that the circumstances leading to the inference of guilt must be fully proven and conclusively connect the accused with the crime. Each link in the chain of events must be established beyond reasonable doubt. The established circumstances should only support the hypothesis of the accused's guilt and completely contradict any possibility of innocence. When dealing with circumstantial evidence, the court must remain vigilant to prevent suspicion from replacing legal proof. Emotional considerations, no matter how compelling, should not sway the court in place of concrete evidence.

⁸ [1984] 4 SCC 116; AIR 1984 SCC 1622.

⁹ [1991] SC (Cri.) 407; AIR 1990 SC 79.

¹⁰ AIR 1996 SC 607; 1996 Cri. L. J. 883.

WITNESSES MIGHT LIE, BUT CIRCUMSTANCES CAN'T! — Can Circumstantial Evidence be the sole basis of Conviction?

According to Jeremy Bentham, in cases of circumstantial evidence, two key facts must be considered:

- i. the factum probandum, which is the main fact to be proven, and
- ii. the factum probans, which is the evidentiary fact from which the existence of the factum probandum is inferred¹¹.

Before convicting anyone based solely on circumstantial evidence, all courts, including the Supreme Court, are obligated to thoroughly consider every aspect of the chain of circumstances. If circumstantial evidence and the inferences derived from it can establish the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, then a conviction is possible. This standard goes beyond the presumption of innocence in criminal law, requiring that the evidence must demonstrate there is no reasonable or logical explanation for the crime other than the one being presented against the defendant. It should be so comprehensive that it leaves no reasonable doubt regarding the innocence of the accused¹².

There's a common misconception that circumstantial evidence is less credible or significant compared to direct evidence in court. However, numerous successful prosecutions have relied heavily on circumstantial evidence to construct a case. One advantage of circumstantial evidence is its inherent difficulty to fabricate. The judiciary has played a crucial role in convicting defendants based solely on circumstantial evidence.

In *Bodh Raj v. State of Jammu and Kashmir*¹³, the Supreme Court ruled that circumstantial evidence can serve as the sole basis for conviction, provided that certain prerequisites are fully met before conviction based on circumstantial evidence. These conditions are:

1. The circumstances supporting the conclusion of guilt must be thoroughly established. These circumstances "must" or "should" be established, not merely "may" be established.
2. The established facts should be consistent with the hypothesis of the accused's guilt.
3. The circumstances should be of conclusive nature & tendency.
4. They must exclude every possible hypothesis except the one being proved.

¹¹ Bentham J, *Rationale of Judicial Evidence* 1828, Vol 3, Garland, New York, 1973, Page 2-5, 248.

¹² *Dhananjay Chatterjee v. State Of West Bengal*, (1994) SCR (1) 37, 1994 SCC (2) 220, Para 7.

¹³ AIR 2002 SC 3164.

5. There must be a complete chain of evidence, leaving no reasonable doubt consistent with the accused's innocence and demonstrating that, in all human probability, the act was committed by the accused.

Legally established circumstances can serve as the foundation for conviction, but for more serious crimes, there should be heightened scrutiny of the evidence to prevent suspicion from replacing proof. Important considerations in erecting a case on circumstantial evidence include the "last seen" doctrine and the abnormal conduct of the indicted.

According to the "last seen" doctrine, if the evidence indicates that the victim and accused were last seen together, this alone is not sufficient for conviction; additional corroboration is required. However, this doctrine places the burden on the accused to prove their innocence. The conduct of the accused is crucial in establishing circumstantial evidence. Certain behaviour, such as absconding or providing false alibis, can undermine the presumption of innocence.

The highly remarkable yet contentious Aarushi murder case¹⁴ constructs a chain of evidence by directly aligning the facts with it. The "last seen" doctrine was employed to establish this chain of circumstantial evidence. The prosecution utilized it in relation to the observation that the two accused individuals and two victims were last seen in the house by their driver, after which no signs of entry or exit by any outsider were evident. Based on this fact and doctrine, additional strands of circumstantial evidence were formulated.

A notable example illustrating India's approach to circumstantial evidence is The Jessica Lal case¹⁵. In this case, witnesses turned hostile, leading to reliance on circumstantial evidence for conviction. Manu Sharma was sentenced to life imprisonment based on a chain of circumstantial evidence, including witness testimonies placing him at the crime scene and his abnormal conduct, such as absconding. Although the murder weapon was never recovered, evidence showed that the cartridges found at the crime scene matched those fired from the accused's gun. These strands of evidence formed a strong, unbreakable rope, demonstrating India's reliance on circumstantial evidence-based convictions.

In 1996, Priyadarshini Mattoo, a law student at Delhi University, was raped and murdered by

¹⁴ Nupur Talwar v. Central Bureau of Investigation and Ors., [2012] 11 SCC 465.

¹⁵ Sidhartha Vashisht alias Manu Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi), AIR 2010 SC 2352.

Santosh Kumar Singh, the son of a senior police official. Since there were no eyewitnesses to the crime, the prosecution relied solely on circumstantial evidence, presented through both oral and documentary evidence. Despite strong evidence against Singh, the trial court in Delhi acquitted him, citing mishandled and inadequate investigation by the police. However, upon review by higher courts, including the High Court and Supreme Court, the chain of circumstances presented in the case was deemed comprehensive and compelling. Despite some circumstances being questioned, both higher courts concluded that the evidence overwhelmingly pointed to Singh's guilt. They found the circumstantial evidence to be entirely inconsistent with Singh's innocence. Despite the firm evidence against him, Singh's sentence was commuted from death to life imprisonment by the Supreme Court. This decision was based partly on Singh's youth at the time of the crime and the fact that he had married after his acquittal. However, it was noted that this reduction in sentence was primarily due to sympathy, rather than any doubt about the validity of the circumstantial evidence against him¹⁶.

In the case of *Krishna Ghosh v. State of West Bengal*¹⁷, the accused individuals were convicted for offenses under Sections 498-A and 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The High Court upheld the conviction, and the accused appealed to the Supreme Court, arguing that the case relied solely on circumstantial evidence. The circumstances were as follows: the deceased woman died from injuries sustained in a physical assault at her matrimonial home, occurring within a year and four months of her marriage. The indicted had fled soon after the incident. The SC dismissed the appeal and affirmed the conviction. Justice Arijit Pasayat emphasized that while convictions can be based solely on circumstantial evidence, they must adhere to the legal standards for evaluating such evidence, established as far back as 1952.

The Supreme Court has also made several landmark decisions where it has chosen not to convict an accused based on circumstantial evidence.

In *KT Palanisamy v. State of Tamil Nadu*¹⁸, the accused was acquitted of murder based on the following reasons:

1. The deceased's body was not recovered.
2. No evidence confirmed the death.
3. It was not proven that the river had sufficient water or current to carry away a body.

¹⁶ State (through CBI) v. Santosh Kumar Singh, 133 [2006] DLT 393.

¹⁷ AIR 2009 SC 2819.

¹⁸ AIR 2008 SC 1095.

4. All prosecution witnesses were relatives of the deceased, raising doubts about their credibility.

Justice SB Sinha emphasized that in cases relying solely on circumstantial evidence, all links in the chain must be fully established for the offense to be proven.

In the case of *State of Manipur v. Okram Jitan Singh*¹⁹, it was determined that an accused cannot be convicted solely based on circumstantial evidence if there is a gap in the chain of events that fails to conclusively prove the circumstances against the accused.

To secure a conviction based on circumstantial evidence, the prosecution must demonstrate a sequence of circumstances that consistently indicate the guilt of the accused and are incompatible with their innocence²⁰.

ADMISSIBILITY & PROOF OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

ADMISSIBILITY:

Circumstantial evidence is well-defined as a relevant fact from which the court may infer the existence of a fact in question. Relevance is a criterion for admissibility, with all admissible evidence being relevant, though not all relevant evidence is admissible.

The behaviour of the accused plays a crucial role in substantiating circumstantial evidence. Unusual conduct, such as failure to provide an explanation, inability to disclose whereabouts during the offense, or offering implausible excuses, can undermine the presumption of innocence and contribute to proving guilt. It has been established that non-appearance as a witness could strongly discredit the truth of the case²¹.

Despite the need to meet standards of proof, criminal convictions often rely on circumstantial evidence. It is essential that circumstantial evidence corroborates other indirect evidence like DNA tests, fingerprints, witnesses, and handwriting analysis, directly or indirectly linking the accused to the crime and clarifying guilt or innocence beyond reasonable doubt. Circumstantial evidence must be conclusive in nature.

¹⁹ 2005 Cri. L. J. 1646.

²⁰ *State of Uttar Pradesh v. Desh Raj*, AIR 2006 SC 1712.

²¹ *Provincial Government Central Provinces and Berar v. Champalal*, [1946] Nag 504.

For circumstantial evidence to be admissible, there must be a chain of proof that establishes, beyond reasonable doubt, the guilt of the accused and proves that the act was committed by them. The evidence supporting conviction should be complete and incapable of explanation on any other theory than the accused's guilt, and it should not only be consistent with their guilt but also contradictory to their innocence.

PROOF:

In *G Parshwanath v State of Karnataka*²², it was emphasized that dealing with circumstantial evidence carries a risk of allowing conjecture or suspicion to replace solid proof. While strong suspicion alone cannot substitute for concrete evidence, the court must vigilantly ensure that conjectures and suspicions do not overshadow legal proof. It is noted that although human testimony may be flawed, circumstantial evidence remains reliable.

The court further outlined principles for handling circumstantial evidence. Firstly, the circumstances supporting guilt must be thoroughly established. Each individual fact must be proven independently. Secondly, while primary facts are judged based on evidence, the inference of guilt drawn from these facts must be considered separately.

In determining the sufficiency of circumstantial evidence for conviction, the court evaluates the cumulative effect of all proven facts, with each fact reinforcing the conclusion of guilt. Even if some facts alone may not be decisive, their combined effect should convincingly establish guilt. The established facts should only support the hypothesis of the accused's guilt and exclude any other plausible explanations. However, the prosecution is not required to disprove every hypothesis suggested by the accused, as long as a complete chain of evidence leads to the conclusion of guilt.

Four essential elements for proving guilt through circumstantial evidence are highlighted:

1. Full proof of the circumstances establishing guilt.
2. Consistency of all facts with the hypothesis of the accused's guilt.
3. Conclusiveness and tendency of the circumstances.
4. Exclusion of every hypothesis except the one proposed to be proved, with moral certainty²³.

²² AIR 2010 SC 2914; [2010] 8 SCC 593.

²³ State v. Shanker Prasad, AIR 1952 All 776.

The court has established that in cases lacking direct eyewitness testimony and relying solely on circumstantial evidence, the proof of motive and opportunity assumes significant importance. It is emphasized that the motive and conduct of the accused are not only relevant but also crucial in establishing guilt. The principle is firmly established that evidence from interested parties is not inherently unreliable²⁴.

STRENGTHENING CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE:

A FAIR TRIAL APPROACH

When considering the use of circumstantial evidence in Indian courts, it's essential to maintain a balance between ensuring justice and safeguarding the rights of the accused. Here are practical solutions to strengthen the use of circumstantial evidence while upholding the principles of a fair trial:

1. **Strengthening the Chain:** Corroborating evidence from various circumstantial sources enhances the credibility of the inference. When multiple independent facts align to suggest guilt, it reinforces the overall conclusion. Consistency among these elements further bolsters the case, as a consistent narrative strengthens the inference.
2. **Completeness of Circumstances:** The Supreme Court emphasizes the need for a complete chain of circumstances in circumstantial evidence cases. It should be irrefutable that, within all reasonable probability, the accused committed the crime, leaving no room for doubt. The circumstances should only point towards the guilt of the accused, without any plausible alternative explanations supporting innocence.
3. **Distinction from Hearsay:** Circumstantial evidence must be distinguished from hearsay or secondary evidence. It relies on observed facts and their logical connections, rather than statements made by others. It should be direct and primary, avoiding reliance on hearsay or secondary sources.
4. **Utilizing Scientific Evidence:** Leveraging scientific and forensic methods, such as DNA analysis and fingerprint matching, can provide strong circumstantial evidence. Courts should encourage the use of reliable scientific techniques to establish connections between the accused and the crime scene.
5. **Judicial Scrutiny:** Judges should meticulously scrutinize circumstantial evidence, critically assessing each link in the chain for reliability. They should refrain from making

²⁴ Hari Obula Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh, AIR 1981 SC 82 (87-88).

presumptions or filling gaps in the evidence with conjecture, ensuring a thorough and cautious evaluation.

6. **Presumption of Innocence:** While circumstantial evidence holds weight, the presumption of innocence must prevail until guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden of proof rests with the prosecution, and the accused need not prove their innocence solely based on circumstantial evidence.
7. **Educating Jurors:** It's essential to educate jurors and legal professionals about the strengths and limitations of circumstantial evidence. Promoting awareness of its role in criminal trials encourages jurors to evaluate evidence objectively, considering both direct and circumstantial elements.

Although circumstantial evidence holds potential significance, it requires careful handling to uphold justice and safeguard the rights of the accused.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, circumstantial evidence plays a crucial role in the Indian legal system, often serving as the backbone of convictions when direct evidence is lacking. This research paper has explored the various facets of circumstantial evidence, from its definition and characteristics to its admissibility and proof requirements. Through an examination of landmark cases and legal principles, it's evident that circumstantial evidence, when presented meticulously and conclusively, can lead to just outcomes in criminal proceedings.

However, the strength of circumstantial evidence lies in the completeness of the chain of circumstances and the absence of any reasonable doubt regarding the accused's guilt. Upholding the principles of fairness and due process is essential in utilizing circumstantial evidence effectively. This necessitates a balanced approach that emphasizes the importance of corroborating evidence, scientific methods, and judicial scrutiny.

Furthermore, while circumstantial evidence can be compelling, it must be distinguished from hearsay and secondary evidence, and judges must remain vigilant to prevent conjecture or speculation from overshadowing concrete proof. Preserving the presumption of innocence until guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt is paramount, ensuring that the burden of proof rests squarely on the prosecution.

Educating jurors and legal professionals about the nuances of circumstantial evidence is essential for promoting a thorough and objective evaluation of evidence in criminal trials. By fostering awareness of its strengths and limitations, the legal system can ensure that circumstantial evidence is utilized responsibly and ethically.

In essence, while circumstantial evidence may not provide the definitive clarity of direct evidence, it remains a vital tool in piecing together the puzzle of a crime. Through a comprehensive understanding of its principles and requirements, coupled with rigorous adherence to legal standards, circumstantial evidence can continue to contribute to the pursuit of justice in Indian courts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

STATUTE:

1. The Indian Evidence Act, 1872

BOOKS:

1. Dr S.R. Myneni, The Law of Evidence, 2nd Edition, Asia Law House.
2. Vepa P. Sarathi, Law of Evidence, 7th Edition, Eastern Book Company.
3. Chief Justice M Monir, Textbook on the Law of Evidence, 12th Edition, Lexis Nexis.
4. Dr Avtar Singh, Principles of The Law of Evidence, 24th Edition, Central Law Publications.

ONLINE SOURCES:

1. [BRIEF ANALYSIS OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE \(ijlra.com\)](http://ijlra.com)
2. [CREDIBILITY-OF-CIRCUMSTANTIAL-EVIDENCE.pdf \(ijlr.in\)](http://ijlr.in)
3. [255.-Agniva-Mandal.pdf \(jlrjs.com\)](http://jlrjs.com)
4. [aj2.pdf \(tndalu.ac.in\)](http://tndalu.ac.in)
5. <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-3537-circumstantial-evidence-beyond-reasonable-doubt.html>
6. <https://www.lawyersclubindia.com/articles/circumstantial-evidence-its-role-and-importance-through-case-laws-13806.asp>
7. <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9256-circumstantial-evidence-its-elements-and-application.html>

8. <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-14333-understanding-circumstantial-evidence-meaning-examples-and-importance.html>
9. [What is meant by Circumstantial Evidence in Law? - PlanetofLaw](#)
10. [Admissibility of Circumstantial Evidence - BareLaw](#)
11. [Case Comment on S.P. Mittal v. Union Of India \(thelawbrigade.com\)](#)
12. <https://lexlife.in/2020/03/12/circumstantial-evidence/>

