A STUDY ON THE VALIDITY OF DIRECT EVIDENCE GIVEN BY A WITNESS

Gospelan Paul.V, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science, (SIMATS), Saveetha University[1]
Sanket Mohapatra, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science, (SIMATS), Saveetha University [2]

ABSTRACT

The research paper deals on the validity of direct evidence given in court by a witness. The paper consists of direct evidence such as eyewitness and oral admissions which come under direct evidence. The paper consists of judicial Interpretation and international perspective of evidence as well. According to Section 3 of The Indian Evidence Act, 1872 evidence methods and incorporates both oral and composed evidence. Narrative evidence incorporates all reports including electronic records produce for the assessment of court. The evidence is any self evident actuality that involved with the claim offers to demonstrate or negate on a specific issue in a specific case. It very well may be said as the arrangement of rules and standards or a course of action of standards and standards that is used to make sense of which surenesses may be surrendered, and to what degree a judge or jury may consider those substances, as a check of a particular issue in a claim.It alludes to the evidence straightforwardly about the genuine point in the issue. It is the affirmation of the spectator as to key assurance to be illustrated. The verification of a person who says that he saw the commission of the exhibit that contains certified bad behavior. The first archive is additionally incorporated into the roundabout evidence. Direct evidence is commonly clear and persuading. It is essentially the theoretical confirmation when the reality of the situation is exhibited by direct assertion or certainties. Direct evidence likewise implies that the individual has heard, seen, saw, structure feeling and after that uncovered the realities. Oral evidence When the confirmation is limited to verbally expressed words or by signals or movement then it is named as oral evidence.

Keywords: Witness, Evidence, Court, Civil and Criminal

[1] BA.LLB(Hons.) Saveetha School of Law, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences (SIMATS), Saveetha University, Chennai-77, Tamilnadu, India.
[2] BA.LLB(Hons.) Saveetha School of Law, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences (SIMATS), Saveetha University, Chennai-77, Tamilnadu, India.

INTRODUCTION:

Witness is a significant constituent of the organization of equity. By giving evidence connecting to the charge of the offense the witness plays out a important obligation of helping the court to find reality. This is the motivation behind why before giving evidence he/she either makes a vow for the sake of God or makes a grave confirmation that he/she will talk reality, every bit of relevant information and only reality. The witness has no hazard in the choice of neither the criminal court as he is neither denounced nor the person in question. The witness plays out a significant open obligation of helping the court in settling on the blame or generally of the charged for the situation. He forfeits his time and goes out of the way to make a trip right to the court to give evidence. The witness plays out a significant open obligation of helping the court in choosing the blame or generally of the charged for the situation. He forfeits his time and sets aside the time to venture out right to the court to give evidence. The witness ought to thusly be treated with extraordinary regard and thought as a visitor of respect. Tragically, all these are seen not to occur in the courts. In law a witness is somebody who intentionally gives tribute evidence, either oral or composed, of what the person in question thinks about the issue under the steady gaze of the Court and semi legal Tribunals, Commissions and other Forum. In India, the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, oversees the principles of evidence and witnesses' assessment and questioning in the Court of law. The aim of the research paper is to know requisite of evidence by witness

OBJECTIVES:

- To know the subjects involved in direct evidence
- To know the role of witness in direct evidence
- To know the validation of direct evidence
- To know applicability of direct evidence
- To know legislations involved

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Witness is a key player in the quest for the equity conveyance framework through ages and as indicated by one of the well-known legal advisers and rationalist Bentham. It is the need of key equity that there ought to be truth and fair-mindedness as the core of equity. With this comes the job of an eye-witness who affirms the commission or oversight of a demonstration prompting an offense. Whatever statements of eye-witness are recorded, they are viewed as

right as they are recorded on pledge. The job of an eye-witness is of central significance in the equity conveyance framework. An witness assumes a significant job in the equity conveyance framework, yet commonly they lead to illegitimate feelings because of which a guiltless get sentenced for a wrongdoing he hasn't submitted. Area 118 of the Indian Evidence Act expresses that each individual ought to be able to affirm under the watchful eye of the Court of law except if excluded because of legitimate handicap. E.g., an insane person individual cannot affirm as a witness. Another arrangement of the Indian Evidence Act that fortifies the status of an eye-witness is area 134. This segment sets out the arrangement that there is no specific number of witness fixed by law which can be required to demonstrate any reality. Indeed, even one witness can be sufficient to demonstrate a reality under the steady gaze of the official courtroom. The Supreme Court has held that even though there can be conviction even based on the sole witness. The job of a witness under Indian law is noteworthy for the preliminary procedure and to keep up the reasonableness of the equity conveyance framework. Essentially, the job of eye-witness becomes possibly the most important factor during the underlying preliminary methodology where the foundation of the whole case is worked under the watchful eye of an official courtroom. Every one of the statementsof witnesses are recorded as evidence as per segment 164 of Cr.P.C. The statementsare recorded on pledge pursued by the three-level system of Examination in boss, questioning and reevaluation of eye-witnesses. The eye-witness declarations are influenced by a few factors that decrease their precision. The distinguishing evidence by eye-witness is significantly influenced by elements such as: Being under very unpleasant conditions at the location of a wrongdoing or during the procedure of ID. Dread or worry because of the nearness of weapons at the wrongdoing scene. Utilization of veil, wig or any camouflage by the wrongdoer. Any sort of racial difference between the witness and suspect. Short survey time by the witness during the commission of a wrongdoing or recognizable evidence procedure. Absence of recognition of witness. There are certain measures that must be taken so as to fundamentally diminish the likelihood of unfair feelings while utilizing witness declarations. It has been prescribed that when a Test Identification Parade is led, where there are different suspects, just one think be incorporated into the lineup at once. Counting various presumes builds the likelihood of a respondent having been chosen based on mystery. The people separated from the speculates who are incorporated into the ID march ought to be chosen in such a way, that they are of a similar age range, race and by and large fit the portrayal of the culprit. The guidelines that are offered to the onlookers ought to incorporate an explanation that the culprit mama not be available in the lineup and such directions have appeared to fundamentally diminish misidentifications. Oral evidence is a

significantly less good vehicle of verification than narrative evidence. In any case, equity can never be managed in the most significant cases without falling back on it. In every single enlightened arrangement of statute there is an assumption against prevarication. The right rule is to pass judgment on the oral evidence with reference to the direct of the gatherings, and the assumptions and probabilities genuinely emerging in the case. Another test is to see whether the evidence is reliable with the normal experience of humankind, with the standard course of nature and of human lead, and with surely understood standards of human activity. "FALUS IN UNO FALSUS OMNIBUS", The maxim implies false in one specific, false taking all things together. This rule is to some degree perilous saying. There is constantly an edge of weaving to a story, anyway valid in the fundamental thus where the deception in only a weaving, that would not be sufficient to ruin the entire of the witness's evidence; where , then again the misrepresentation identifies with a significant or material point that is sufficient to dishonor the witness. Oral evidence ought to be drawn closer with alert. The court must move the evidence, separate the grain from the waste and acknowledge what it sees as evident and reject the rest. The validity of the witness ought to be settled on the accompanying significant focuses: Regardless of whether the witness have the methods for increasing right data, Regardless of whether they have any enthusiasm for disguising reality, Regardless of whether they concur in their declaration. In spite of the fact that a possibility witness isn't really being a bogus witness, it famously careless to depend upon such evidence. The genuine tests for tolerating or dismissing evidence are; the means by which steady is simply the story, how can it stands of interrogation and how far does it fit it with the remainder of the evidence and conditions of the case. Non-thought of oral evidence by the lower redrafting court, it is a non-recognition of the obligatory arrangement of Order 41, Rule 31 which acquires the sessions sickness in the judgment. The judgment in such a cases stands vitiated and isn't authoritative on the high court in the second appeal. When a young lady expresses that a specific individual used to behave as her dad, she says so from his own insight and it isn't gossip. Individual who can make affirmations:-Gathering to the procedure (Section 18) Operator approved by such gathering (Section 18) Gathering suing or sued in a delegate character (Section 18) an Individual who has any exclusive or monetary intrigue (Section 18) People from whom the gatherings to the suit have determined their enthusiasm for the topic of the suit. (Section18) An individual whose position is in issue or is significant. (Section 19) People explicitly alluded by the gathering to suit. (Section 20) An oral understanding is as similarly substantial, as kept in touch with one. The legitimateness of an oral understanding can't be addressed, on the off chance that it falls under the ambit of the necessities expressed in section 10 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.

This was substantiated by the Delhi High Court, on account of Nanak Builders and Investors Pvt. Ltd. versus Vinod Kumar Alag AIR 1991 Delhi 315, whereby the Court held that even an oral understanding can be a substantial and enforceable agreement. Subsequently, in the strict sense, it isn't fundamental that an agreement must be recorded as a hard copy, except if determined by law or the gatherings themselves mull over the decrease of terms of consent to composing. The equivalent was repeated by the Supreme Court on account of Alka Bose versus Parmatma Devi and Ors [CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 6197 OF 2000], whereby the Court held that even a deal understanding can be oral and have a similar restricting worth and enforceability, as a composed understanding. The understanding ought to be pair with the fundamentals recorded in segment 10 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and along these lines, will have the equivalent power of evidentiary worth, as a kept in touch with one. Validity of Oral Agreement as Evidence: According to the Act of 1872, a substantial oral understanding is of worth and can be authorized in the courtroom. Be that as it may, it is constantly hard to demonstrate the presence or the definite terms of the understanding, if there should be an occurrence of contest. Moreover, Section 48 of the Registration Act, 1908, states that all non-testamentary archives appropriately enlisted under this Act, and identifying with any property, regardless of whether mobile or relentless, will produce results against any request, understanding or announcement identifying with such property, except if where the understanding or presentation has been joined or pursued by conveyance of ownership. Likewise, Section 92 of the Indian Evidence Act expresses that when the conditions of any such agreement, award or other mien of property, or any issue legally necessary to be decreased to the type of an archive, have been demonstrated by the last area, no evidence of any oral understanding or proclamation will be conceded, as between the gatherings to any such instrument or their agents in enthusiasm, to repudiate, shifting, adding to, or subtracting from, its terms. Be that as it may, its stipulation makes an exemption to that if there is any different oral understanding as to any issue where the archive is quiet and the terms are conflicting, at that point the oral understanding might be demonstrated legitimate. Furthermore, stipulation further makes a special case that if there is any different oral understanding which comprises a condition point of reference to the connecting of any commitment under any such agreement, at that point additionally oral understanding might be demonstrated.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION:

Vikas Kumar Roorkiwal v. State of Uttarakhand & Ors[3]*:*

As held on account of Vikas Kumar Roorkiwal v. State of Uttarakhand and Ors., Supreme Court has inspected the job of witnesss in the criminal equity framework. The court set out its perception that the witnesss assume an indispensable job in the criminal equity framework. In a similar case, the Supreme Court likewise held the taking authoritative measures for the insurance of witnesses can add to leading a reasonable preliminary.

Madhu Madhuranath V. State of Karnataka[4]*:*

On account of Madhu Madhuranath V. State of Karnataka, a witness has been characterized as an individual who can give evidence by oral or composed affidavits given in the court or something else. By and large, an witness is viewed as free except if acting under pressure, misrepresentation or false means.

E.C.T. Farming Society Case[5]*:*

Supreme Court observed: It is very much settled that the impact of an witness relies on the conditions where it was made. An Oral Evidence to be utilized as a confirmation must be clear, explicit and unambiguous and in the possess expressions of the individual making it and must be demonstrated to be so. It's anything but an obstruction drawn by anyone which ought to be taken as an affirmation. An admission to be deserving of being gotten in evidence, considered and depended upon, it ought to right off the bat be the obvious and exact proclamation of that very individual in his own works. It must be demonstrated to be the oral evidence of the individual who made it

In Union of India v. Moksh Builders[6]*:*

In Union of India v. Moksh Builders, Court expressed that an affirmation is substantive evidence of the reality conceded and when appropriately demonstrated is significant independent of the reality whether the individual making such confirmation made it in witness-box or not and whether he was defied with those statementsor not in the event that he created

[3] No. 182 of 2006 and FIR No.169 of 200
[4] CRIMINAL APPEAL NOs.1357-1358 of 2011
[5] AIR 1974 SC 1121
[6] AIR 1977 SC 408

an impression as opposed to his affirmations. The court referred to an announcement from WIGMORE ON EVIDENCE such that a confirmation need not be in opposition to the producer's advantage. Along these lines it isn't important before conceding the evidence of a confirmation that it ought to be brought to the notice of the gathering who made it.

REFERENCE:

The cases imply that the evidence is in need of validity and the evidence which is given in direct form as to have the concession required by the court. The court may take the judgment in either eyewitness or in oral orientation of the witness it is in need of discretionary decision of the court to give justice to the parties.

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE:

What makes direct evidence appears to be uncommon is that by naming the realities of result, it creates certainty that we now have a review window through which we can look precisely upon the past. In the event that we have before us an onlooker who knows directly what happened who saw the gleaming pool, Be that as it may, direct evidence no more gives us simple, essential, or immediate access to reality with regards to the past than does circumstantial evidence. For there is no truth there are no facts that is basically about the past. Reality toward which all evidence focuses is never just about the past yet is in every case additionally particularly about what's to come. When the fact finder finds facts, when the fact finder picks among the contending accounts (Cunningham-Hill and Elder) of the preliminary and the comparing translations of the evidence. Every preliminary choice, made out of blended translations of law and certainties, is such an admixture of past and future, of portrayal and expectation, of conviction about how the world was and yearning for how the world ought to be. What's more, every preliminary choice along these lines contributes material from which that world may be made.

CONCLUSION:

Legitimate arrangement of laws of evidence is imperative to meet the reasonable and unbiased organization of equity in light of the fact that the evidence has its impact in fulfilling the court about the presence or non-presence of the right. It is the evidence under the watchful eye of the court on which the court will stand its decision. So evidence is the mode to demonstrate the presence of right. Evidence is significant in legal, semi legal and managerial reason. It comes to in a reasonable and judicious choice in certain purpose of question, and a choice with no

evidence or with ill-advised evidence methods assertion and premature delivery of equity. By and large Evidence assumes its dynamic job in the preliminary stage. At the point when the witness precede the court, and they will give direct evidence by method for assessment in boss and their believability or veracity will be tried by method for questioning. So incredible information of the law of evidence is as indispensable to an effective legal counselor as the learning of auxiliary designing is to the designer or the study of route is to the chief of a ship. It is a typical involvement in an official courtroom that a decent case has fizzled due to an absence of satisfactory and vital information of evidence with respect to legal advisor depended with the direct of the case. How much worth ought to be forced upon evidence relies upon the kind of case or nature of the case or suit, Proposition being supported. An evidentiary estimation of evidence is an undertaking of courts, giving some evidence more accentuation than others. From one extraordinary, where no worth is appended to confirm, and the evidence is stricken or barred from preliminary, to the opposite finish of the evidentiary range, it is fundamentally how much something is value. In the general plan of things, just best evidence is qualified for more an incentive than others. Another view on the estimation of evidence would be whether the evidence is immediate or fortuitous. Be that as it may, Evidence is the best way to decide a case at last and furthermore decide if the case is valid or not. Evidence ought to be cheeked cautiously since evidence can bring the decision whether a specific thing is valid or not.