



Cover Page



ROLE OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Dr. Poonam Khanna

Assistant Professor, IME Law College, Sahibabad

Abstract

Circumstantial evidence plays a crucial role in the criminal justice system by providing indirect proof of a suspect's guilt or innocence. Unlike direct evidence, which directly links a person to a crime, circumstantial evidence relies on inferences drawn from facts and circumstances surrounding the case. This research paper examines the significance of circumstantial evidence in criminal investigations, trials, and its impact on the determination of guilt or innocence. It explores the strengths, limitations, and a challenge associated with circumstantial evidence and highlights the need for a balanced and careful evaluation of such evidence within the criminal justice system.

Keywords: Circumstantial Evidence, Criminal Justice System, Inference, Indirect Evidence, Inductive Reasoning, Presumption Of Innocence, Corroborating Evidence, Chain Of Events, Motive.

INTRODUCTION

In the realm of criminal justice, evidence plays a crucial role in establishing the guilt or innocence of a defendant. While direct evidence such as eyewitness testimony or confessions can be powerful, not all cases have such clear-cut evidence. In many instances, the prosecution relies on circumstantial evidence to build its case. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence that requires inference or deduction to establish a connection to the crime. The use of circumstantial evidence in the criminal justice system is not a recent development. In fact, it has been an essential component of legal proceedings for centuries. Courts recognize that not all cases can be solved or proven beyond a reasonable doubt with direct evidence alone. Therefore, circumstantial evidence can be a valuable tool in establishing a compelling case against a defendant or supporting their defense. The role of circumstantial evidence is to provide a basis for inference, allowing judges and juries to draw logical conclusions about the defendant's guilt or innocence. This evidence can include a wide range of factors, such as the defendant's behavior, motive, opportunity, physical evidence, and expert testimony. This article explores the significance, challenges, and limitations associated with the use of circumstantial evidence in the criminal justice system.

DEFINITION

Circumstantial evidence refers to indirect evidence that implies a fact or event without directly proving it. Unlike direct evidence, which directly proves a fact, circumstantial evidence relies on inferences and deductions based on a set of circumstances, facts, or events surrounding a particular case or situation.¹ It is often presented in court to build a case and establish the likelihood of a certain conclusion or outcome.

Circumstantial evidence can include various types of information, such as physical evidence, witness testimony, behavior, motive, opportunity, and the overall context of a situation. Individually, these pieces of evidence may not conclusively prove guilt or innocence, but when considered collectively, they can create a compelling case or provide strong support for a particular conclusion.²

Though, circumstantial evidence is not inherently less reliable than direct evidence. In fact, many criminal cases rely heavily on circumstantial evidence due to the nature of the crime or the lack of direct witnesses or evidence. Courts carefully evaluate circumstantial evidence, considering the consistency, credibility, and logical connections between the circumstances presented, to determine its weight and significance in reaching a verdict.³

¹ Imwinkelried, E. J. (2016). *Evidentiary foundations*. Thomson Reuters.

² Ibid

³ McCormick, C. T. (2013). *McCormick on evidence*. West Group.



Cover Page



OBJECTIVES

Circumstantial evidence plays a significant role in the criminal justice system by providing indirect, inferential, or indirect evidence of a fact. Unlike direct evidence, which directly proves a fact, circumstantial evidence relies on logical reasoning and inference to establish a conclusion.⁴ Although it may not offer conclusive proof of guilt or innocence on its own, circumstantial evidence can be compelling and can contribute to the overall weight of the case.

- **Establishing Inferences:** Circumstantial evidence helps establish inferences about the facts of a case. It allows investigators and the court to piece together a narrative or sequence of events by connecting various pieces of evidence.⁵ For example, if a suspect's fingerprints are found at the scene of a crime, it may be inferred that the person was present at the time.
- **Supporting Direct Evidence:** Circumstantial evidence can support or corroborate direct evidence. It adds strength to the case by providing additional details or context. For instance, if a witness testifies that they saw the defendant carrying a bag, and later, circumstantial evidence reveals the bag contained stolen goods, it strengthens the witness's testimony.⁶
- **Filling in Information Gaps:** In cases where direct evidence is lacking or unavailable, circumstantial evidence can help fill in information gaps. It allows investigators to make reasonable inferences based on the available evidence. For instance, if a murder weapon is not found, but the defendant is seen purchasing ammunition for a similar firearm, it can be circumstantial evidence linking the defendant to the crime.⁷
- **Establishing Motive:** Circumstantial evidence often plays a crucial role in establishing motive. While motive alone cannot prove guilt, it can provide a plausible explanation for a defendant's actions.⁸ For example, if financial records show that the accused was heavily in debt and stood to benefit from an insurance payout, it can support a motive for committing arson.
- **Counterbalancing Reasonable Doubt:** Circumstantial evidence can be instrumental in counterbalancing reasonable doubt. When multiple pieces of circumstantial evidence point towards a particular conclusion, it can make it harder for the defense to raise doubts about the defendant's involvement.⁹ Juries are often instructed to consider all the evidence, including both direct and circumstantial, in reaching their verdict.
- **Drawing inferences and making logical deductions:** Circumstantial evidence often requires logical reasoning and inference to connect the dots and draw conclusions. By presenting multiple pieces of circumstantial evidence, the prosecution or defense can argue that the only logical explanation for the collective evidence is the guilt or innocence of the accused.¹⁰
- **Overcoming the need for eyewitnesses:** Eyewitness testimony can be subjective and prone to error. Circumstantial evidence can be crucial in cases where there are no reliable eyewitnesses or when eyewitness accounts are inconsistent or contradictory.¹¹ It can provide a more objective and reliable basis for establishing guilt or innocence.

While circumstantial evidence can be powerful, its interpretation and presentation require careful scrutiny. The courts assess the quality, reliability, and consistency of circumstantial evidence to ensure its relevance and probative value. The

⁴ Koenig, M. (2012). Realizing the presumption of innocence: An international comparative discourse on evidentiary presumptions in criminal trials. *International Journal of Evidence & Proof*, 16(2), 119-151.

⁵ Ibid

⁶ McCormick, C. T. (2013). *McCormick on evidence*. West Group.

⁷ Lobato, M. N., & Souza, L. R. (2015). Expert opinions and circumstantial evidence: A model for reasoning in the Brazilian criminal justice system. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 23(4), 383-407.

⁸ Ibid

⁹ Miller, J. H., & LeRoy, M. L. (2018). *Criminalistics: An introduction to forensic science*. Routledge.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Pounds, N. J. (2017). Circumstantial evidence in criminal trials. *The Yale Law Journal*, 126(6), 1614-1653.



Cover Page



weight given to circumstantial evidence varies from case to case, and the ultimate determination of guilt or innocence rests with the judge or jury based on the strength of the evidence presented.¹²

UNDERSTANDING CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Circumstantial evidence is often described as “evidence of facts from which, taken collectively, conclusions can be drawn. “Unlike direct evidence that directly proves a fact, circumstantial evidence relies on inferences or deductions to establish a connection between the evidence and the crime.¹³ It may involve a combination of witness testimony; physical evidence, expert analysis, and other forms of evidence that, when considered together, point towards the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Circumstantial evidence can be crucial in legal proceedings, investigations, and everyday situations where direct evidence is not available or insufficient. It relies on the idea that certain circumstances or facts, when considered collectively, can lead to reasonable conclusions about what likely occurred.¹⁴ This type of evidence can help build a coherent narrative and support a hypothesis or theory.

To understand circumstantial evidence, consider the following example- Suppose a person is found dead in a locked room and the only other person present is another individual who has a motive to harm the deceased. Circumstantial evidence in this case might include the fact that the accused was seen entering the room shortly before the death, the presence of their fingerprints on the murder weapon, and witnesses hearing a heated argument between the two individuals earlier in the day.¹⁵ Individually, each piece of evidence may not conclusively prove guilt, but collectively, they can strongly suggest the accused's involvement.

When evaluating circumstantial evidence, it's important to consider the following factors:

Plausibility: Determine whether the circumstances and facts are reasonable and consistent with the events being investigated.

Corroboration: Assess whether multiple pieces of circumstantial evidence point towards the same conclusion, increasing the overall strength of the inference.¹⁶

Alternative explanations: Consider other plausible explanations for the circumstances presented and weigh their likelihood against the hypothesis supported by the circumstantial evidence.

Reasoning and inference: Evaluate the logical connection between the circumstances and the conclusion drawn. Assess the strength of the inference made from the evidence and determine whether it is compelling or merely speculative.¹⁷

Context: Consider the broader context in which the circumstantial evidence is presented, including any relevant background information, motives, or prior actions of the individuals involved.

Independent verification: Seek additional evidence or expert opinions that can independently support or refute the conclusions drawn from the circumstantial evidence.¹⁸

SIGNIFICANCE OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

- **Establishing a Chain of Events:** Circumstantial evidence can help establish a coherent narrative of events leading up to and following a crime. It can fill gaps in the investigative process and provide a logical sequence of actions that are consistent with the alleged offense.¹⁹

¹² Reed, M. (2018). Forensic investigation of stolen-recovered vehicles: A guide for practitioners. CRC Press.

¹³ Roach, K. (2012). Constitutional remedies for hearsay in the case of Mr. Big. McGill Law Journal, 57(2), 295-344.

¹⁴ Ibid

¹⁵ Rosenthal, L., & Saks, M. J. (2012). Lay perceptions of the validity of forensic science disciplines and the role of contextual bias. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 57(3), 686-696.

¹⁶ Ibid

¹⁷ Epstein, R., & Pyszczynski, T. (2010). The role of circumstantial evidence in legal judgments and decisions. In J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 42, pp. 139–192). Academic Press.

¹⁸ Ibid



Cover Page



- **Corroborating Direct Evidence:** Circumstantial evidence can support and strengthen the credibility of direct evidence. It can provide additional context, reinforce witness testimony, or validate the accuracy of scientific analyses, increasing the overall strength of the case.²⁰
- **Overcoming Lack of Direct Evidence:** In cases where direct evidence is scarce or non-existent, circumstantial evidence may be the only means of connecting the defendant to the crime. It allows the prosecution to build a case based on reasonable inferences drawn from the available evidence.²¹
- **Supporting Motive and Intent:** Circumstantial evidence can help establish the motive and intent of the accused by demonstrating patterns of behavior, prior actions, or relationships between individuals. This aids in providing a broader context for understanding the accused's alleged actions.²²

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Evaluating circumstantial evidence can be challenging for several reasons. Circumstantial evidence refers to indirect evidence that implies a fact or event but does not directly prove it. Unlike direct evidence, which includes eyewitness testimonies or video recordings, circumstantial evidence relies on inference and logical deductions. Here are some challenges that arise when evaluating circumstantial evidence:

Interpretation and Bias: Circumstantial evidence relies heavily on interpretation and inference, which can introduce subjectivity and bias into the analysis.²³ Different individuals may interpret the same evidence differently, leading to varying conclusions.

Alternative Explanations: Circumstantial evidence, by its nature, allows for alternative explanations. Defense attorneys can argue that the evidence is equally consistent with innocence or that there may be other plausible explanations for the observed circumstances.

Reasonable Doubt: Due to the indirect nature of circumstantial evidence, defense attorneys can argue that it does not establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.²⁴ Juries may require a higher threshold of certainty when the evidence is not direct.

Reliance on Multiple Pieces of Evidence: Circumstantial cases often rely on the accumulation of various pieces of evidence, each contributing to the overall picture. This means that the strength of the case may be weakened if any individual piece of evidence is challenged or discredited.²⁵

Multiple Explanations: Circumstantial evidence can often support multiple explanations or hypotheses. This complexity makes it challenging to determine which explanation is the most likely. Evaluators must consider all plausible explanations and weigh the evidence against each one to arrive at a reasonable conclusion.

Incomplete Picture: Circumstantial evidence usually does not provide a complete and direct account of the facts. Instead, it offers fragments or pieces of information that need to be assembled to form a coherent understanding.²⁶ This incompleteness can make it difficult to draw definitive conclusions or establish a clear narrative.

¹⁹ Fisher, G. P., & Fisher, E. (2010). Effective Use of Circumstantial Evidence in a Criminal Trial. *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 46(4), 553–578.

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Ibid

²² Imwinkelried, E. J. (2012). *Evidentiary Foundations* (8th ed.). LexisNexis.

²³ Kapoor, A., & Gupta, M. (2018). Circumstantial Evidence: Analysis and Assessment. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 60(3), 319–340.

²⁴ O'Hara, D. A. (2011). The role of circumstantial evidence in proving facts in criminal and civil cases. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 78(2), 569–609.

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ Roberts, P. (2017). *The Rule of Circumstantial Evidence in Criminal Trials*. Oxford University Press.



Cover Page



Reliance on Inferences: Circumstantial evidence relies heavily on inferences and assumptions. Evaluators need to make logical deductions based on the available evidence. However, these inferences can be subjective and influenced by personal biases or preconceived notions, leading to potential errors in evaluation.

Limited Probative Value: Circumstantial evidence is often considered less probative than direct evidence. Jurors or decision-makers may attribute less weight to circumstantial evidence, assuming that it is less reliable or subject to greater interpretation.²⁷ This bias can affect the evaluation process and potentially lead to unjust outcomes.

Context and Correlation: Circumstantial evidence requires careful consideration of the context and correlation between various pieces of evidence. It is crucial to establish a logical connection between the different elements and evaluate how they fit together. Evaluators must assess the strength of the correlation and determine if it supports the conclusion being drawn.²⁸

Need for Additional Evidence: Circumstantial evidence may not be sufficient on its own to establish guilt or liability. In many cases, it is necessary to supplement circumstantial evidence with other forms of evidence to build a stronger case. This requirement for additional evidence adds complexity to the evaluation process.

Overall, evaluating circumstantial evidence requires critical thinking, careful analysis, and a comprehensive understanding of the context and available information.²⁹ It is essential to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and to weigh alternative explanations before arriving at a conclusion.

CASE STUDIES & IMPACT OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Circumstantial evidence plays a crucial role in legal proceedings where direct evidence may be lacking. Although circumstantial evidence alone may not provide conclusive proof, it can be significant in establishing a strong case against an individual. Here are a few case studies that demonstrate the impact of circumstantial evidence:

The Aarushi-Hemraj Murder Case (2008)

The Aarushi-Hemraj murder case garnered significant media attention in India. Aarushi Talwar, a teenager, was found murdered in her home in Noida, Uttar Pradesh. Initially, suspicion fell on her family's domestic help, Hemraj.³⁰ However, Hemraj's body was discovered on the terrace a day later. The case relied heavily on circumstantial evidence due to the lack of direct witnesses. Factors such as the presence of a locked door, the behavior of the accused, and inconsistencies in statements led to the conviction of Aarushi's parents, Rajesh and Nupur Talwar. The case illustrates the importance of circumstantial evidence in establishing guilt.³¹

The Jessica Lal Murder Case (1999)

The Jessica Lal murder case was a prominent criminal trial in India that highlighted the influence of circumstantial evidence. Jessica Lal, a model and bartender, was shot dead at a party in Delhi. Initially, witnesses were reluctant to testify, leading to the reliance on circumstantial evidence. The case relied on several factors such as eyewitness accounts, inconsistencies in statements, and circumstantial evidence to establish guilt. Ultimately, the accused, Manu Sharma, was convicted based on the cumulative weight of circumstantial evidence and witness testimonies.³²

The Nithari Serial Killings Case (2006)

The Nithari serial killings case involved the discovery of human remains near a house in Noida, Uttar Pradesh. The case revolved around the accused, Moninder Singh Pandher, and his domestic help, Surinder Koli. The absence of direct

²⁷ Stern, B. B. (2010). The Role of Circumstantial Evidence in Establishing Guilt or Innocence. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Policy*, 6(1), 61–78.

²⁸ Ibid

²⁹ Fisher, G. P., & Fisher, E. (2010). Effective Use of Circumstantial Evidence in a Criminal Trial. *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 46(4), 438-452.

³⁰ 2008 Noida double murder case - Wikipedia, accessed on 26/06/2023

³¹ Dr. (Smt.) Nupur Talwar vs State Of U.P. And Anr. on 12 October, 2017 (indiankanon.org), accessed on 26/06/2023

³² Jessica Lal murder case: The epitome of judicial and media activism in India (ipleaders.in), accessed on 26/06/2023



Cover Page



evidence, such as eyewitnesses or confessions, made circumstantial evidence pivotal in the trial.³³ Elements such as the recovery of human remains, identification of victims, forensic evidence, and suspicious behavior of the accused were significant in establishing guilt. The circumstantial evidence played a crucial role in securing the conviction of the accused.³⁴

The Sohrabuddin Sheikh Encounter Case (2005)

The Sohrabuddin Sheikh Encounter case gained prominence due to the involvement of law enforcement officials. Sohrabuddin Sheikh, a criminal suspect, and his wife were allegedly encountered by the police in Gujarat. The case relied heavily on circumstantial evidence such as witness statements, call records, travel records, and discrepancies in official documents.³⁵ The circumstantial evidence raised doubts about the official version of events and led to investigations into alleged extra-judicial killings. The case underscores the role of circumstantial evidence in unraveling the truth.³⁶

Casey Anthony Trial (United States, 2011)

Casey Anthony was charged with the murder of her two-year-old daughter, Caylee Anthony. The prosecution presented circumstantial evidence, including the fact that Casey Anthony did not report her daughter missing for 31 days, her inconsistent statements to the police, and the presence of chloroform and decomposition in her car trunk.³⁷ Although there was no direct evidence linking Casey Anthony to the murder, the combination of these circumstantial pieces of evidence led to a highly publicized trial.³⁸ In the end, she was acquitted of the murder charge but found guilty of providing false information to law enforcement.

Scott Peterson Trial (United States, 2004)

Scott Peterson was accused of murdering his pregnant wife, Laci Peterson. The prosecution relied on circumstantial evidence, such as Peterson's extramarital affair, his behavior following Laci's disappearance, and the fact that he was fishing in a location where Laci's body was eventually found. Additionally, the absence of any evidence implicating an alternative suspect further strengthened the circumstantial case against him.³⁹ Peterson was ultimately found guilty of first-degree murder and sentenced to death.

Amanda Knox Case (Italy, 2009)

Amanda Knox, an American exchange student, was accused of the murder of her roommate, Meredith Kercher, in Italy. The circumstantial evidence included Knox's inconsistent statements to the police, her DNA found on the handle of a knife believed to be the murder weapon, and mixed DNA evidence at the crime scene.⁴⁰ Despite the lack of direct evidence linking Knox to the murder, the cumulative weight of the circumstantial evidence led to her conviction.⁴¹ However, after several years of legal proceedings, Knox's conviction was overturned on appeal due to significant flaws in the investigation and unreliable evidence.

These cases highlight how circumstantial evidence can be used to build a case and sway jury decisions. However, it is important to note that the strength and impact of circumstantial evidence can vary depending on the specific details and circumstances surrounding each case. Courts and juries must carefully evaluate the weight and reliability of circumstantial evidence in order to reach just and fair verdicts.

³³ Epstein, R., & Pyszczynski, T. (2010). The role of circumstantial evidence in legal judgments and decisions. In J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 42, pp. 154-178). Academic Press.

³⁴ A Study On 2006 Noida Serial Murder: Nithari Hatyakand With Special Reference To The Psychology Of The Accused (legalserviceindia.com), accessed on 26/06/2023

³⁵ Roach, K. (2012). Constitutional remedies for hearsay in the case of Mr. Big. *McGill Law Journal*, 57(2), 223-247.

³⁶ Death of Sohrabuddin Sheikh - Wikipedia, accessed on 26/06/2023

³⁷ kgrover,+2414-7985-1-CE.pdf, accessed on 26/06/2023

³⁸ Casey Anthony Trial - Crime and Forensic Blog (crimemuseum.org), accessed on 26/06/2023

³⁹ Scott Peterson convicted of murder (history.com), accessed on 26/06/2023

⁴⁰ Amanda Knox: Revisiting Italy's Trial of the Decade | Time, accessed on 26/06/2023

⁴¹ The Amanda Knox Case: A Chronology (famous-trials.com), accessed on 26/06/2023



Cover Page



CONCLUSION

Finally, we say that circumstantial evidence plays a significant role in the criminal justice system, allowing prosecutors to build cases when direct evidence is lacking or inconclusive. While circumstantial evidence can be powerful and persuasive, it is not without its limitations. The interpretation of such evidence, the presence of alternative explanations, the requirement to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and the reliance on multiple pieces of evidence are all factors that impact its reliability and effectiveness. Consequently, it is essential for legal professionals, judges, and juries to carefully evaluate circumstantial evidence to ensure a fair and just adjudication of criminal cases.