### **DECLARATION**

I, SUPARNA DEKA, of LL.M. 4th Semesterhereby declare that the Dissertation entitled "CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL TRIAL" is submitted to Department of Law, Tezpur University, for the Course Code-LW0522 It is a write up to understand the reliability and credibility of circumstantial evidence in criminal trial. The study on this topic to fulfil the course outcome is done by me during the 4th Semester under the guidance and supervision of Mr. Debajit Kumar Sarmah, Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Tezpur University. I further declare that it has not been submitted either in part or in full for the award of any other degree or diploma or other similar title of any candidate of any university.

Date:

**SIGNATURE** 



Tezpur-784028, Assam, India

## CERTIFICATE OF THE SUPERVISOR

This is to certify that the Dissertation entitled 'CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL TRIAL' submitted to the Department of Law, Tezpur University in partial fulfilment for the award of the degree of Master of Laws, is a record of project work carried out by Ms Suparna Deka (Roll No- LAM21010) under my supervision during the period from January 2023 to June 2023. All support received by her from various sources have been duly acknowledged. No part of this Dissertation has been submitted elsewhere for the award of any other degree or diploma.

Date:	Supervisor
Place:	

DR. PRIYARANJAN KUMAR, LL.M
Associate Professor & Head of the department
DEPARTMENT OF LAW
TEZPUR UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATE OF THE HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT

This is to certify that Suparna Deka, student of 4<sup>th</sup> semester, LLM under Tezpur University has prepared this Dissertation entitled "CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL TRIAL" under the guidance of Mr. Debajit Kumar Sarmah, Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Tezpur University. She has fulfilled all the requirements under the Tezpur University Regulation.

Τ	'n	is	D	issertation ma	y kindl	y be	presented	for t	he necessary	y evaluation.
					,					

Place:

Date:

DR.PRIYA RAJAN KUMAR

Associate Professor& Head of the Department

Department of Law

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

At the very outset it's my pleasant duty to acknowledge Mr. Debajit Kumar Sarmah, Assistant Professor, Department of law, Tezpur University, for giving me the opportunity to domy Dissertation entitled "CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL TRIAL" and also for his valuable and important suggestions from time to time. His supervision and guidance have helped immensely in completing my research work. In the myths of various preoccupation, Sir enthusiastically devoted much of his valuable time and energy and guided me patiently in the preparation and accomplishment of this Dissertation. Such a helpful approach from my guide was encouraging. I therefore express my heartfelt thanks to my guide for his persistent inspiration and untiring supervision in preparation of this dissertation.

I extend my thankfulness to the Head of Department, other faculty members of Department of Law, Tezpur University, for their valuable suggestions.

I also offer for my thankfulness to the whole staff of our Central Library, Tezpur University.

I am indebted to the various authors of the books and articles I consulted and referred to in the preparation of this Dissertation.

Last but not the least I would like to extend my thankfulness to my family for their encouragement and my friends who directly or indirectly helped me to complete this project.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY:	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:	2
1.3 LITERATURE REVIEW:	4
1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:	7
1.5RESEARCH QUESTIONS:	7
1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:	7
1.7CHAPTERIZATION:	8
CHAPTER II	9
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: TRIAL AND EVIDENCE	9
2.1 Evolution of Indian Criminal Justice System:	9
2.2 Types of Criminal Justice System:	13
2.2.1 Adversarial System:	13
2.2.2Inquisitorial System:	14
2.3 Criminal Trial:	14
2.4 Stages of Criminal Trial:	16
2.5 Evidence in Criminal Trial:	19
CHAPTER III	20
EVIDENCE IN INDIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	20
3.1Historical Overview of Law of Evidence in India:	20
3.1.1 Early Hindu Period	21
3.1.2 Mughal Period	22
3.1.3 British Period:	23
3.2Meaning of Evidence:	25
3.3Types of evidence:	28
CHAPTER IV	33
CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE	33
4.1 Definition:	33
4.2 Which one is favourable, direct, or circumstantial evidence?	35
4.3 Circumstantial and hearsay evidence	36
4.4 Relevancy of Circumstantial Evidence:	36
4.5 Proving solely based on circumstantial evidence:	38

4.6We	akness of defence:	.41
4.7 Go	lden Principles of Circumstantial Evidence:	.42
4.8Wa	nt of explanation:	.43
4.9Las	st seen theory:	.43
4.10	Chain of events:	.44
4.11	The chain of events must always be laid down with precision:	.45
4.12	Proof of Corpus Delicti:	.46
4.13 T	est of Reliability:	. 47
4.14	Conviction solely based on circumstantial evidence:	.49
4.15 J	udicial Analysis:	.51
4.15.1	Anant Chintaman Lagu v. State of Bombay	.51
4.15.2	Khasbaba Maruti Sholke v. State of Bombay	.54
4.15.3	Shankarlal Gyarasilal Dixit v. State of Maharashtra	.55
4.14.4	Laxman Naik v. State of Orissa	.58
4.15.5	Babudas v. State of M.P.	. 60
4.15.6	Rumi Bora Dutta v. State of Assam	.61
4.15.7	Madhu v. State of Karnataka	. 63
4.15.8	Anjan Kumar Sharma v. State of Assam	. 64
4.15.9	Reena Hazarika v. State of Assam	.66
4.15.1	0 Ravinder Singh v. State of Punjab	. 68
4.16	Newspaper Headings:	. 70
CHAP	TER V	.71
	ON ON CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE COLLECTED FROM SONITPUR DISTRICT	
	T	
	at amounts to circumstantial evidence in your opinion?	
	w often do you have to rely on circumstantial evidence during the criminal trial?	. /2
	at do you think are the reasons for the absence of direct evidences because of which astantial evidence comes into play?	.73
5.4Wh	at do you think is the relevance of circumstantial evidence in criminal trial?	.74
5.5Wh	at are the major challenges of conviction relying solely on circumstantial evidence?	. 75
	nat standards of procedure are followed so far as the admissibility of circumstantial evidence concerned?	
FINDI	NGS	.77
6.1 Na	ture of circumstantial evidence:	.77
6.2 Ho	ow far the judiciary has provided meaning and scope to circumstantial evidence?	.77
6.3 Ho	w far success of a trial depends on circumstantial evidence?	.78
СНАР	TER VII	.79

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	79
7.1 CONCLUSION:	79
7.2 SUGGESTIONS:	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

### LIST OF CASES

Anant Chaintaman Lagu v. State of Bombay, (1960) 2 SCR 460: AIR 1960 SC 500: 1960 Cri Lj 682

Anjan Kumar Sharma v. State of Assam, (2017) 14 SCC 359: (2017) 4 SCC (Cri) 867: 2017 SCC OnLine SC 622

Babudas v. State of M.P, (2003) 9 SCC 86: 2003 SCC (Cri) 1749: 2003 SCC OnLine SC 593

Bachan Singh v. State of Rajasthan, (1979) 3 SCC 727: 1979 SCC (Cri) 830.

Banwarilal v. State, AIR 1956 All 385; 1956 Cri LJ 841.

C. Chenga Reddy v. State of A.P., (1996) 10 SCC 193.

Deonandan v. State of Bihar, AIR 1955 SC 801.

Dimple Gupta v. Rajiv Gupta, AIR 2008 SC 239.

DPP v. Kilbourne (1973) AC 729, at p. 758 (HL).

Govarayya vs. Emperor, AIR 1930 Nag. 242.

Gulab Chand v. Kudi Lal, AIR 1959 SC 290.

Gurunam Tanti v. State of Assam, (Gauh) 1983 Cri LJ 289 to 292.

Hanumant Govind Nargundkar v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1952 SC 343

Hardeep v. State of Haryana, 2002 Cri Lj 3939 at 3942 SC.

Harishchandra LadakuThange v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 2007 SC 2957

Jackson v. State, 29 Tex. App. 458, 16 S.W. 247

Khasbaba Maruti Sholke v. State of Bombay, (1973) 2 SCC 449: 1973 SCC (Cri) 863

Kusuma Ankama Rao v. State of A.P., AIR 2008 SC 2819.

Lakhsmi and Ors. V. Uttar Pradesh, (2002) 7 SCC 198: AIR 2002 SC 3119.

Laxman Naik v. State of Orissa, (1994) 3 SCC 381: 1994 SCC (Cri) 655.

Liyakat v. State of Uttaranchal, AIR 2008 SC 1537.

Madhu v. State of Karnataka. (2014) 12 SCC 419: (2014) 6 SCC (Cri) 765: 2013 SCC OnLine SC 1048.

Makbul Ahmed Mallik v. Abdul Rahman Akhand and Ors., AIR 1952 Cal 494.

Mani Kumar Thapa v. Sikkim, AIR 2002 SC 2920: (2002) 7 SCC 157.

Mula Devi v. Uttar Pradesh, AIR 2009 SC 655: (2008) 14 SCC 511.

Palanisamy v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2003) 3 SCC 100.

Prithipal Singh v. Punjab, (2012) 1 SCC 10: (2011) 12 SCALE 411(2).

Rama Nand &Ors. V. Himachal Pradesh, AIR 1981 SC 738.

Ramjee Rai &Ors. V. Bihar, 2006 (8) SCALE 440: (2006) 13 SCC 229

Ravinder Singh v. State of Punjab, (2022) 7 SCC 581: (2022) 3 SCC (Cri) 211: 2022 SCC OnLine SC 541.

Reena Hazarika v. State of Assam, (2019) 13 SCC 289: (2019) 4 SCC (Cri) 546: 2018 SCC OnLine SC 2281.

Reg. v. Hodge, (1838) 2 Lewin 227.

Rumi Bora Dutta v. State of Assam, (2013) 7 SCC 417: (2013) 3 SCC (Cri) 544: 2013 SCC OnLine SC 483.

Sarbir Singh v. Punjab, 1993 Supp (3) SCC 41.

ShankarlalGyarasilal Dixit v. State of Maharashtra, (1981) 2 SCC 35: 1981 SCC (Cri) 315.

Sharad Birdichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1984 SC 1622.

State of Rajasthan v. Raja Ram, 2003 (8) SCC 180.

State of U.P. v. Satish, AIR (3) SCC 114.

Swamy Shraddhananda v. State of Karnataka, AIR 2007 SC 2531.

Vijay Kumar Arora vs. State (Government of NCT of Delhi), (2010) 2 SCC 353: AIR 2010 SC 2914.

Wakkar&Anr. V. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2011 (2) SCALE 198: (2011) 3 SCC 306.