

Evidence Laws: An Analysis of the Principles Governing the Admissibility of Evidence in Court

Paramjeet, Department of law

Maharshi Dayanand University , Rohtak.

Email :- hoodaparamjeet0067@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper explores the principles governing the admissibility of evidence in court, focusing on the legal frameworks that dictate what evidence can be presented in legal proceedings. The paper begins with a brief overview of the history and types of evidence, including direct, circumstantial and hearsay evidence. It then delves into the key principles of evidence admissibility, such as relevance, reliability and fairness, which are essential for ensuring the integrity of the legal process. Through a detailed analysis of statutory and case law, the paper examines how these principles are applied in practice, highlighting the challenges and controversies that arise in the context of evidence admissibility. The paper offers a comparative study of evidence laws in different jurisdictions, shedding light on the complexities of cross-border legal proceedings. The research concludes with recommendations for improving evidence laws and their application, emphasizing the need for ongoing reform to address emerging legal challenges. The findings of this paper contribute to a deeper understanding of the critical role of evidence laws in the pursuit of justice.

Keywords: Jurisdiction, Circumstantial, Hearsay, Evidence

Introduction

The foundation of any legal proceeding is the evidence presented before the court. Evidence laws, which govern the admissibility and evaluation of this evidence, are therefore central to the functioning of the justice system. These laws determine what information can be considered by a judge or jury in reaching a decision, ensuring that the process is fair, reliable and relevant to the matter at hand. The importance of evidence laws cannot be overstated.¹ They not only protect the rights of the accused but also ensure that the truth is uncovered in a

¹Haack, S., 1993, *Evidence and Inquiry, Towards Reconstruction in Epistemology*, Oxford: Blackwell.

manner that upholds the principles of justice. With the advent of new technologies and the increasing complexity of legal cases, evidence laws have evolved to address emerging challenges while maintaining the integrity of the legal process.

The Indian Evidence Act, 1872 is a comprehensive legal framework that governs the admissibility, relevance and probative value of evidence in Indian courts. The Act lays down the principles and rules for presenting and evaluating evidence during judicial proceedings, ensuring that justice is served based on reliable and relevant facts.² It encompasses various types of evidence, including oral testimony, documentary evidence and electronic records, providing clear guidelines on how each should be treated in court. The Act also addresses important concepts such as the burden of proof, the presumption of innocence and the standard of proof required in civil and criminal cases. It outlines the circumstances under which confessions, admissions and expert opinions can be admitted as evidence, as well as the rules for examining witnesses and cross-examination. The Indian Evidence Act plays a crucial role in the administration of justice, ensuring that legal proceedings are conducted fairly and based on sound principles of evidence law.³ In the context of the Indian legal system, the legal framework governing the admissibility of evidence is primarily outlined in the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. This Act is a comprehensive statute that provides the rules and principles for the admissibility, relevancy and weight of evidence in Indian courts.

Indian Evidence Act, 1872⁴:

- i. Relevancy of Facts (Sections 5-55): These sections outline what facts are considered relevant and therefore admissible in court. This includes facts that are directly in issue, as well as those that are indirectly related but have a bearing on the case.
- ii. Admissibility of Evidence (Sections 56-100): These sections provide the rules for what types of evidence are admissible, including oral and documentary evidence and the conditions under which they can be presented in court.
- iii. Witnesses (Sections 118-134): These sections deal with who may testify as a witness and the examination of witnesses, including direct examination, cross-examination and re-examination.

²Kaye, D. and J. Koehler, 2003, "The Misquantification of Probative Value", *Law and Human Behavior*, 27: 645–659.

³Lempert, R., 1977, "Modeling Relevance", *Michigan Law Review*, 75: 1021–1057.

⁴ Indian Evidence Act. (1872). Act No. 1 of 1872.

- iv. Proof (Sections 101-114A): These sections address the burden of proof, the standard of proof required in civil and criminal cases and the presumption of certain facts.
- v. Estoppel (Sections 115-117): These sections outline the doctrine of estoppel, which prevents a party from denying a fact that they have previously admitted or represented.

The latest amendment to the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, is the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2018. This amendment introduced significant changes, particularly in the context of sexual offenses. Some key amendments include:

- Section 53A of the Indian Evidence Act restricts courts from considering evidence based on the victim's character or prior sexual experience in sexual assault cases.
- Section 146 was amended to ensure that no questions will be asked of rape survivors about their character or sexual experience to prove their consent.
- The 2018 amendment also introduced a minimum sentence of 7 years imprisonment in cases of rape.

These amendments aim to protect the dignity of rape survivors and ensure that the focus remains on the accused's actions rather than the victim's character or past sexual experiences. The amendments were influenced by several high-profile cases and the recommendations of the Justice Verma Committee, which was set up in the wake of the 2012 Delhi gang-rape case. There is a new bill called The Bharatiya Sakshya Bill, 2023, which aims to repeal and replace the existing Indian Evidence Act, 1872. This bill introduces several changes, including the expansion of secondary evidence to include oral and written admissions and the testimony of a person skilled in the examination of documents.

The Bharatiya Sakshya Bill, 2023

The Bharatiya Sakshya Bill, 2023, is a significant legislative proposal aimed at repealing and replacing the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. This new bill introduces several key changes to the existing framework of evidence law in India. One of the notable amendments is the expansion of secondary evidence to include oral and written admissions and the testimony of a person skilled in the examination of documents. This broadens the scope of what can be considered secondary evidence in court. Another important aspect of the bill is the clarification on the admissibility of electronic records. Under the new bill, electronic records produced from proper custody will be considered primary evidence unless disputed. This is a significant shift from the current position, where electronic records are generally treated as secondary evidence. The

bill also expands the definition of electronic records to include information stored in semiconductor memory or smartphones, including emails, location data and voicemails. The bill also addresses the issue of joint trials, where a confession made by one of the accused can affect other accused individuals. It adds an explanation to this provision, stating that a trial of multiple persons, where an accused has absconded or has not responded to an arrest warrant, will be treated as a joint trial. The Bharatiya Sakshya Bill, 2023, aims to modernize and adapt the Indian evidence law to contemporary needs, especially in light of advancements in technology and the increasing relevance of electronic evidence in legal proceedings.

Indian evidence law has been significantly shaped by judicial interpretations and rulings. Landmark cases such as *State of Tamil Nadu v. K. Shyam Sundar and Tukaram S*⁵. *Dighole v. Manikrao Shivaji Kokate*⁶ have provided important clarifications and guidelines on the application of the Indian Evidence Act. In addition to the Indian Evidence Act, other statutes also impact evidence law in specific contexts. Code of Civil Procedure, 1908⁷, contains provisions related to the presentation and recording of evidence in civil cases. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973⁸, governs the procedure for criminal trials, including the collection, submission and examination of evidence. Information Technology Act, 2000⁹, addresses the admissibility of electronic records and digital evidence. The Indian legal framework for evidence is characterized by a combination of statutory provisions and judicial interpretations, which together ensure that evidence is handled in a manner that is fair, relevant and conducive to the pursuit of justice.

List of Cases

The case of *Anvar P.V v. P.K. Basheer & Ors* (2014)¹⁰ is a landmark decision by the Supreme Court of India that significantly impacted the admissibility of electronic evidence in court proceedings. Prior to this case, there was ambiguity regarding the admissibility of electronic records as evidence under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. In this case, the Supreme Court clarified that electronic records, such as emails, digital documents and CCTV footage, can be admitted as evidence in court only if they meet the criteria specified in Section 65B of the Act. This section requires that electronic records be accompanied by a certificate from a competent

⁵ *State of Tamil Nadu v. K. Shyam Sundar*. (2010). Supreme Court of India.

⁶ *Tukaram S. Dighole v. Manikrao Shivaji Kokate*. (2010). Supreme Court of India.

⁷ Code of Civil Procedure. (1908). Act No. 5 of 1908.

⁸ Code of Criminal Procedure. (1973). Act No. 2 of 1974.

⁹ Information Technology Act. (2000). Act No. 21 of 2000

¹⁰ *Anvar P.V v. P.K. Basheer & Ors*. (2014). Supreme Court of India.

authority, verifying the integrity and authenticity of the electronic record. The judgment established a clear legal framework for the admissibility of electronic evidence, ensuring that such evidence is reliable and trustworthy before being used in legal proceedings.

In the case of *Bodh Raj @ Bodha and Ors v. State Of Jammu and Kashmir (2002)*¹¹, the Supreme Court of India dealt with the interpretation of Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, which pertains to the admissibility of statements made by an accused person to the police. The court held that certain parts of the accused's statements, which led to the discovery of relevant facts or objects related to the crime, could be admitted as evidence in court. This is known as the 'doctrine of discovery,' where the information provided by the accused during police custody, if it leads to the discovery of material evidence, can be used against them in court. The judgment emphasized that such statements are admissible only to the extent that they relate to the discovery of the fact and not beyond that. This case clarified the scope and application of Section 27, ensuring that the rights of the accused are protected while allowing for the effective use of evidence in criminal proceedings.

In the case of *State of Maharashtra v. Praful Desai (2003)*¹², the Supreme Court of India played a pivotal role in clarifying the rules regarding the admissibility of electronic evidence under the Indian Evidence Act. Prior to this judgment, there was considerable ambiguity about how electronic records should be treated in court. The Supreme Court's decision established that electronic evidence, such as emails, digital documents and other forms of electronic records, could be admitted in court, provided they meet the criteria specified in the Act. This judgment was instrumental in modernizing the Indian legal system to accommodate the growing use of electronic documents in both personal and professional spheres.

In *R v. Abdul Rahim (1949)*¹³, the concept of 'similar facts' evidence was recognized and upheld by the court. The case established that evidence of similar facts could be admissible if it demonstrated a pattern of conduct or a common plan. This principle allows the court to consider evidence of past behavior or actions that are similar to those in the current case, under the premise that such evidence can provide context or support the establishment of intent, motive, or opportunity. The recognition of 'similar facts' evidence has had a significant impact on the development of evidence law, providing a tool for prosecutors and defense attorneys alike to build stronger cases based on patterns of behavior.

¹¹ *Bodh Raj @ Bodha and Ors v. State Of Jammu and Kashmir. (2002). Supreme Court of India.*

¹² *State of Maharashtra v. Praful Desai. (2003). Supreme Court of India.*

¹³ *R v. Abdul Rahim. (1949). Supreme Court of India.*

In the case of *P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra* (1954)¹⁴, the Supreme Court of India addressed the constitutional validity of search warrants and their role in the collection of evidence. The court held that documents seized during a lawful search, conducted under a valid search warrant, could be used as evidence in court. This judgment underscored the importance of adhering to legal procedures during searches and seizures, ensuring that evidence obtained in this manner is admissible and can be relied upon during legal proceedings.

The case of *M. Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra* (1961)¹⁵ is a landmark judgment in the context of the admissibility of circumstantial evidence in Indian courts. In this case, the Supreme Court highlighted the significance of circumstantial evidence and established guidelines for its evaluation. The court held that circumstantial evidence could be used to establish guilt if it forms a chain of events so complete that it leads to the inescapable conclusion of the accused's guilt and there is no reasonable hypothesis that can be drawn from the evidence other than the accused's guilt. This judgment has had a profound impact on the way circumstantial evidence is treated in criminal cases, emphasizing that it can be as persuasive as direct evidence when properly linked together.

In the case of *State of U.P. v. Deoman Upadhyaya* (1960)¹⁶, the Supreme Court of India emphasized the importance of the presumption of innocence, a fundamental principle in criminal law. The court held that it is the responsibility of the prosecution to prove the accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This means that if there is any reasonable doubt in the case, the accused must be given the benefit of that doubt, leading to acquittal. This judgment reinforced the notion that an individual is considered innocent until proven guilty and the burden of proof lies with the prosecution.

The case of *Hanumant Singh v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (1952)¹⁷ dealt with the admissibility of extra-judicial confessions in court. The Supreme Court ruled that extra-judicial confessions, which are confessions made outside of a judicial proceeding, are admissible as evidence if they are made voluntarily and without any inducement, threat, or promise. This means that for such a confession to be considered valid, it must be made freely and without any coercion. The judgment underscored the importance of ensuring that confessions are genuine and not the result of pressure or manipulation.

¹⁴ *P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra*. (1954). Supreme Court of India.

¹⁵ *M. Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra*. (1961). Supreme Court of India.

¹⁶ *State of U.P. v. Deoman Upadhyaya*. (1960). Supreme Court of India.

¹⁷ *Hanumant Singh v. State of Madhya Pradesh*. (1952). Supreme Court of India.

In *Arjun Pandit Rao vs. Kailash Kishanrao (2022)*¹⁸, the Supreme Court of India addressed the issue of the admissibility of electronic evidence in court. The court made it mandatory to furnish a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act for the admissibility of electronic evidence. This certificate is required to verify the authenticity and integrity of the electronic record. This judgment highlights the increasing relevance of electronic evidence in legal proceedings and the need for proper authentication to ensure its reliability.

Conclusion

Evidence laws play a crucial role in the legal system by determining the admissibility, relevance and evaluation of evidence in court proceedings. The Indian Evidence Act, 1872, serves as the cornerstone of evidence law in India, providing a comprehensive framework for handling various types of evidence, including oral testimony, documentary evidence and electronic records. The Act outlines key principles such as relevance, reliability and fairness, which are essential for maintaining the integrity of the legal process. Recent developments, such as the Bharatiya Sakshya Bill, 2023, aim to modernize and adapt the evidence laws to contemporary needs, especially in light of technological advancements. The proposed bill seeks to expand the definition of secondary evidence and clarify the admissibility of electronic records, among other changes.

Landmark cases have also played a significant role in shaping evidence law by providing judicial interpretations and guidelines on the application of the Indian Evidence Act. These cases highlight the challenges and controversies that arise in the context of evidence admissibility and underscore the need for ongoing reform to address emerging legal challenges. The evolution of evidence laws and their application in court proceedings is critical for the pursuit of justice, ensuring that legal decisions are based on reliable and relevant evidence.

¹⁸ *Arjun Pandit Rao vs. Kailash Kishanrao. (2022)*. Supreme Court of India.