

## Securing Witnesses is Crucial

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- 33 of the 49 witnesses examined by the prosecution recently in the Sohrabuddin Sheikh encounter have turned hostile.

\n

- In several sensational cases, prosecution has failed after witnesses turned hostile either due to either intimidation or allurement by the accused.

\n

\n\n

### What were some highprofile cases of witness backtracking?

\n\n

\n

- In 2016, the Supreme Court had noted that witnesses turning hostile was become a common phenomenon.

\n

- A hostile witness is understood to be one who does not tell the truth at the request of the party on whose request he/she has been called to testify.

\n

- Over the last few years, an unusually large number of witnesses have turned hostile, including in cases relating to alleged Hindu rightwing extremism.

\n

- **Hindutva Intimidation** - Shorabuddin's case, saw multiple people have changed their statements in complete contradiction to their initial stand.

\n

- Similarly, in the - 2007 Mecca Masjid case, Ajmer Dargah and Samjhauta Express blasts cases, as many as 40 witnesses turned hostile.

\n

- Notably, this led to the acquittal of the prime accused, 'Swami Aseemanand'.

\n

- The 'best bakery case', which was part of the plethora of the post Godhra Gujarat Riots cases is another classical example.

\n

- Witnesses had initially claimed that armed mobs shouting anti-Muslim slogans were involved in arson for multiple hours but retracted later.

- \n
- Significantly, the apex court had slapped a 1 year prison term on one of the witnesses who retracted for lying, and also ordered a retrial for 21 others.
- \n
- **Other cases** - Actor Salman Khan had secured his acquittal in the 2002 hit-and-run case due to multiple witnesses changing their initial statements.
- \n
- Criminal-turned-politician Abhay Singh, was acquitted in the 1998 murder of Lucknow jail superintendent after all 36 witnesses turned hostile.
- \n
- Convictions in the 1999 Jessica Lal murder case and the BMW hit-and-run case in New Delhi were possible mainly due to witnesses turning hostile.
- \n

\n\n

### **How are witnesses treated in India?**

\n\n

- \n
- Criminal cases are built upon the edifice of evidence that is admissible in law, for which witnesses are of paramount importance.
- \n
- Yet, witnesses in India are treated shabbily with poor facilities, their allowances are delayed, and they also often face courtroom intimidation.
- \n
- Lengthy trials frustrate them, and the threat of bodily harm looms large - all of which contributes to a witness turning hostile.
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- **Remedial options** - If a witness who was to prove is crucial has turned hostile, the concerned party may call other witnesses to counter the lie.
- \n
- Else, the party may impeach the credit of the witness with the permission of the court by proving inconsistencies in his testimony.
- \n
- Also, the witness may be cross-examined, and confronted with leading questions within the court room.
- \n

\n\n

- \n
- **Legality** - In criminal trials, initial testimony of a witness who turned hostile

is not altogether rejected and the judge decides its reliability based on facts.

\n

- Hence, if a witness chooses to withdraw support, that would not result in the prosecution's case being thrown out completely.

\n

\n\n

### **How has the Indian State progressed in this domain?**

\n\n

\n

- Various commissions had stressed the need for witness protection since independence and multiple judicial pronouncements have also been made.

\n

- Based on the recommendations of the Justice V S Malimath Committee Report (2003) and the 178<sup>th</sup> Law Commission (2001), The Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 2003 was proposed.

\n

- The Bill made it mandatory for police to record statements of witnesses before a judicial magistrate, although other protections granted were minimal.

\n

- The centre has expressed its inability to legislate on this domain as law and order is a state subject, but the Supreme Court has been convinced.

\n

- Sighting the example NIA Act, 2008, which also falls in the state domain, the Supreme Court has expressed its displeasure at the centre's attitude.

\n

\n\n

**Source: Indian Express**

\n

