IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Jurisprudence Of Forensic Science In India: Analyzing The Parameters Comparatively With Refrence To Forensic Evidence

Mr. Gautam Negi, Mr. Rishav Dogra,

LLM Research Scholar, Assistant Professor,

University Institute of Law, Sant Baba Bhag Singh University, Jalandhar , Punjab

Abstract

In contemporary criminal investigations, forensic science has emerged as a crucial component, providing scientific precision, impartiality, and dependability in legal proceedings. This study examines the acceptance of forensic evidence in Indian courts, drawing comparisons with international benchmarks in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and Australia. Despite the widespread use of forensic science in Indian courtrooms, its efficacy is often compromised by the lack of a uniform admissibility framework, inadequate forensic infrastructure, and judicial inconsistencies. A comparative evaluation of global forensic legislation underscores India's requirement for structured forensic reforms. Nations such as the U.S. employ scientific admissibility criteria (Daubert Test), while the U.K. enforces rigorous forensic regulation through autonomous oversight. Germany prioritizes judicial forensic education to ensure scientific accuracy in court rulings, and Australia maintains a nationally certified forensic framework. In contrast, India lacks a National Forensic Science Regulator, standardized forensic protocols, and formal judicial forensic training, resulting in delayed forensic reporting, expert prejudice, and discrepancies in forensic interpretation. This research proposes critical reforms to enhance India's forensic laws, including the creation of a National Forensic Science Regulator, adoption of a scientific admissibility test, standardization of forensic procedures, and expansion of judicial forensic training initiatives. Additionally, progress in AI-driven forensic analysis, digital forensics, and block chain technology offers new avenues for improving forensic accuracy and evidence security. The study concludes that while forensic science in India is progressing, legal modernization, scientific validation, and regulatory supervision are vital for ensuring forensic reliability in courts. Bolstering forensic laws will improve the credibility of forensic evidence, reduce wrongful convictions, and uphold the principles of justice with greater scientific rigor.

Index Terms - Forensic science, Digital & AI Revolution, criminal justice, DNA evidences, Narco-Analysis & Polygraph Tests, Fingerprint & Ballistics Evidence, admissibility of forensic evidence, Digital Forensics and Cyber Evidence.

I. INTRODUCTION

"It is better that ten guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer." – William Blackstone (1769)[1]

Forensic science has evolved into a vital instrument in today's criminal justice system. Scientific methods are used in order to establish the facts, identify suspects and to ensure that the judicial decisions are based upon objective evidence rather than assumptions. Forensic techniques such as DNA analysis, fingerprint matching, toxicology, ballistics and digital forensics are used to enhance the accuracy of criminal investigations. Notwithstanding its critical function, the admissibility of forensic evidence in courts remains a contentious

[1] William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England (1769).

issue, as legal frameworks vary across jurisdictions. Although nations like the United States and the United Kingdom have well-established forensic science regulations and admissibility criteria, India continues to rely on outdated legal provisions, leading to inconsistencies in the acceptance and evaluation of forensic evidence in judicial proceedings.[2]

The dependence on forensic evidence in legal proceedings has played a crucial role in both securing convictions and facilitating exonerations. For instance in 1892, Argentina saw the first documented conviction based on fingerprint evidence. when forensic science successfully linked a suspect to the scene of the crime, proving the potential of scientific methods in criminal justice.[3] Similarly, in India, forensic DNA analysis had a significant impact in securing convictions in high-profile cases such as Nirbhaya gang rape case (2012), demonstrating the evidentiary strength of forensic science.[4] However, forensic techniques have also led to wrongful convictions when not subjected to rigorous scrutiny. The Brandon Mayfield case (2004) in the United States, where an incorrect fingerprint match led to the wrongful arrest of an innocent man, underscores the risks associated with unverified forensic evidence.[5]These instances underscore the necessity of establishing rigorous legal criteria to guarantee that forensic evidence is credible, scientifically sound, and acceptable in legal proceedings.

Notwithstanding its increasing prevalence, forensic science remains subject to legal and scientific scrutiny regarding its universal acceptance. Countries adopt different evidentiary standards to assess forensic reliability. The 1993 decision of Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals established the Daubert Standard, which establishes rules for determining whether scientific evidence is admissible in the United States. It requires forensic evidence to be scientifically tested, peer-reviewed, and have a known error rate.[6] The United Kingdom, on the other hand, has introduced the Forensic Science Regulator Act (2021) to make sure that forensic techniques meet strict scientific and legal standards before being presented in court.[7] However, India does not have a standardized forensic evidence admissibility framework, and its courts rely on Section 39(1) of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam,2023, which states that opinions of experts are admissible but does not provide any clear scientific criteria for forensic validation.[8] This inconsistency in the legal framework has resulted in varying judicial decisions, with forensic evidence occasionally being admitted without thorough examination, while at other times, it is dismissed due to doubts regarding its reliability.

In India, narco-analysis, polygraph examinations, and brain mapping have been among the most contentious forensic methods. The Supreme Court, in *Selvi and ors v. State of Karnataka and anr (2010)*, decided that conducting such tests without the consent of the accused violated Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution, which protects individuals from self-incrimination.[9] This Decision not only shows the importance of protecting individual rights, it has also revealed the uncertainties in the legal rules about the use of forensic evidence in court. Since these techniques are still used in some exceptional cases, they raise ethical and scientific issues.

The lack of forensic science regulation in India presents several challenges. First, many forensic laboratories in India remain unaccredited, leading to questions regarding the credibility of forensic reports.[10] Unlike the United Kingdom, which has an independent Forensic Science Regulator, India lacks a centralized oversight body to ensure the standardization of forensic procedures.[11] Second, forensic expert testimony in India is often treated as opinion-based rather than science-based, reducing its impact in trials. Third, the chain of custody—which ensures the proper handling and storage of forensic evidence—is frequently compromised, leading to the risk of evidence tampering and contamination.[12] These challenges highlight the urgent need for comprehensive forensic reforms in India.

In light of these complications, the goal of this research article is to analyze Indian forensic evidence's admissibility and contrast it with global forensic science norms. It seeks to investigate the difficulties Indian courts have when assessing forensic evidence and suggest legislative changes that might improve the nation's laws governing forensic science. The following research questions will be specifically addressed in this paper:

---

[2] Gaurav & Dr. Ranjana, Admissibility of Forensic Evidence in Investigations: A Comparative Analysis, International Law Journal, 2023.
[3] Francisca Rojas case, Argentina (1892).
[4] *State v. Ram Singh & Ors* (2013) SC, Nirbhaya case judgment.
[5] Brandon Mayfield case, FBI wrongful fingerprint match (2004).
[6] *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
[7] Forensic Science Regulator Act, UK, 2021.
[8] Section 39(1) of BHARATIYA SAKSHYA ADHINIYAM, 2023.
[9] Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263.
[10] Ridita Dey, Admissibility and Evidentiary Value of Scientific Evidence, Journal of Indian Law Review, 2022.
[11] Forensic Science Regulator Act, UK, 2021.
[12] Evidentiary Value of Forensic Reports and Legal Implications, 2023.

1. What are the existing legal frameworks governing forensic evidence admissibility in India and internationally?
2. What are the major challenges in forensic evidence acceptance within Indian courts?
3. How can forensic evidence laws in India be reformed to align with international best practices?

This study will identify gaps in India's forensic legal framework and make policy recommendations to ensure the reliability and scientific validity of forensic evidence in Indian courts by conducting a comparative analysis of forensic admissibility laws in India, the US, the UK, and the EU.

A. Meaning of Forensic Science

Forensic science is a varied profession that uses scientific ideas to help in the investigation of both criminal and civil cases. The term "forensic" stems from the Latin word forensis, meaning "of or before the forum", referring to its historical role in Roman courts, where legal disputes were presented before the public.[13] With the passage of time, forensic science has become one of the most crucial resources for law enforcement, the judiciary, and legal professionals, helping in crime investigations and the delivery of justice.

B. Definitions of Forensic Science

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) defines Forensic Science as:
"The application of scientific methodologies and techniques to investigate crimes, analyze evidence, and provide expert testimony in courts of law."[14]

Similarly, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) describes forensic science as:
"A discipline that applies scientific knowledge and methodologies to matters of law, ensuring accuracy, reliability, and impartiality in the justice system."[15]

In India Forensic Science is recognised under Section 39(1) in Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 which states:
"When the Court has to form an opinion upon a point of foreign law or of science or art, or any other field, or as to identity of handwriting or finger impressions, the opinions upon that point of persons specially skilled in such foreign law, science or art, or any other field, or in questions as to identity of handwriting or finger impressions are relevant facts and such persons are called experts."[16]
Although this section acknowledges the importance of forensic expertise in court cases, it does not provide precise legal standards for assessing the scientific validity of forensic evidence, which leads to inconsistent admissibility.

II. Historical Development of Forensic Science in criminal justice

From ancient investigative methods to contemporary DNA analysis, digital forensics, and artificial intelligence in crime detection, forensic science has undergone substantial change over the ages. As science and technology have advanced, the field has expanded as well, influencing how criminal cases are looked into, evidence is evaluated, and justice is carried out.

A. The Origins of Forensic Science

The initial documented application of forensic science can be traced to ancient China in 1248, where a Chinese judge and physician, Song Ci, documented forensic techniques in his book The Washing Away of Wrongs (Xi Yuan Ji Lu).[17] His work explained how to differentiate between several causes of death, including murderous strangulation and accidental death. This was one of the first comprehensive forensic examinations in history.
In ancient Rome and Greece, forensic techniques were rudimentary but emphasized medical examinations in legal cases. The Roman orator Cicero (106–43 BCE) frequently relied on logical reasoning and medical evidence in court proceedings, establishing the early connection between science and law.[18]

[13] K. Inman & N. Rudin, Principles and Practice of Criminalistics: The Profession of Forensic Science, CRC Press, 2001.
[14] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Guidelines on Forensic Best Practices, 2022.
[15] American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS), Forensic Science Standards & Practices, 2021
[16] Section 39(1) in Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023
[17] Song Ci, The Washing Away of Wrongs, China, 1248.
[18] Cicero, De Officiis, 44 BCE

B. The Formation of Modern Forensic Science (17th–19th Century)

As scientific understanding progressed, the field of forensic science evolved to be more organized and widely used in criminal cases. Key advancements consist of:

1670s – Anton van Leeuwenhoek developed the first microscope, enabling the detailed study of blood, hair, and fibers, which later became essential forensic evidence.[19]

1814 – Mathieu Orfila, the "Father of Toxicology," published his studies on the effects of poisons, helping criminal investigations detect poison-related deaths.[20]

1835 – Henry Goddard pioneered ballistics analysis, using bullet comparison to link a suspect's firearm to a crime scene.[21]

1892 – Francis Galton published the first comprehensive study on fingerprint analysis, proving that fingerprints are unique and permanent, making them valuable for criminal identification.[22]

C. 20th Century: The Rise of Scientific Policing

The twentieth century saw significant advances in forensic science, as police agencies around the world began using scientific procedures into criminal investigations. The key milestones include:

1901 – *Karl Landsteiner* discovered blood groups (A, B, AB, and O), allowing for blood analysis in forensic cases.[23]

1910 – *Edmond Locard*, often called the "Sherlock Holmes of Forensics," established the first forensic laboratory in Lyon, France. He formulated Locard's Exchange Principle, which states: *"Every contact leaves a trace."* This principle remains a fundamental rule in forensic investigations today.[24]

1923 – The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) established the first crime lab in the United States, setting a model for forensic facilities worldwide.[25]

1984 – *Sir Alec Jeffreys* developed DNA fingerprinting, revolutionizing forensic identification and exonerating wrongly convicted individuals.[26]

D. 21st Century: The Digital & AI Revolution in Forensic Science

The twenty-first century has transformed forensic science through technological advancements that improve the precision and speed of forensic investigations. Notable advancements include:

DNA Databases – Governments worldwide have established national DNA databases to compare crime scene samples with known offenders. For example, the United Kingdom's National DNA Database (NDNAD) has helped solve thousands of cases.[27]

Digital Forensics – Law enforcement agencies now use advanced cyber forensics to analyze hacked data, encrypted devices, and online crimes.[28]

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Crime Analysis – AI-driven forensic tools can now identify patterns in forensic data, assist in facial recognition, and enhance criminal profiling.[29]

III. Importance of Forensic Science in Criminal Justice

One of the most substantial achievements of forensic science is its ability to avoid unfair convictions and reinforce court decisions. In India, cases like the Nirbhaya gang rape (2012)[30] and the Arushi Talwar murder (2008)[31] revealed how DNA evidence and forensic analysis influenced court decisions. However, forensic science has faced hurdles, as seen by the 2006 Nithari serial killings[32], in which forensic evidence was mishandled, resulting in delays and credibility concerns. This emphasizes the need for improved forensic infrastructure and standardized processes in India.

Despite its benefits, forensic science in India is still evolving, with many forensic facilities lacking accreditation and courts struggling to judge forensic dependability. The National Crime Records

[19] Anton van Leeuwenhoek, Microscopic Discoveries, 1670.
[20] Mathieu Orfila, General System of Toxicology, France, 1814.
[21] Henry Goddard, Ballistics and Firearms Analysis, UK, 1835
[22] Francis Galton, Finger Prints, Macmillan, 1892.
[23] Karl Landsteiner, Blood Groups and Their Forensic Applications, Nobel Prize Research, 1901.
[24] Edmond Locard, Locard's Exchange Principle and Crime Scene Investigation, Lyon, 1910.
[25] Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), History of Crime Labs, 1923.
[26] Sir Alec Jeffreys, DNA Fingerprinting: A Breakthrough in Forensic Science, 1984.
[27] UK Home Office, National DNA Database Annual Report, 2022.
[28] Interpol, Advancements in Digital Forensics, 2021.
[29] FBI, Artificial Intelligence in Crime Scene Investigation, 2023.
[30] State v. Ram Singh & Ors (2013) SC.
[31] (2010) 9 Scc 355
[32] Moninder Singh Pandher v. CBI (2009) 14 SCC771

Bureau(NCRB) has emphasized the need for advanced forensic capabilities, given the rising number of cybercrimes, financial frauds, and violent offenses requiring scientific investigation.[33] Additionally, the Malimath Committee Report (2003) suggested that India should adopt stricter forensic admissibility standards, similar to international practices, to improve judicial outcomes.[34]

IV. Legal Framework for Admissibility of Forensic Evidence in India

The admissibility of forensic evidence in India is governed by a number of statutes, judicial decisions, and procedural guidelines. While forensic science has become an important tool in criminal investigations, Indian law does not provide a uniform framework for determining the reliability and admissibility of forensic evidence. Instead, courts rely on broad evidentiary principles established by the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 as well as case law and expert testimony.

A. Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023

The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 provides the primary legal basis for forensic evidence:

Section 39(1) – Recognizes expert opinions (including forensic analysts) as admissible evidence but lacks scientific credibility criteria.[35]

Section 40 – Allows courts to accept or reject forensic reports based on corroborative evidence.[36]

Section 72 – Permits courts to compare handwriting and fingerprints, often without forensic expertise, leading to inconsistent rulings.[37]

B. BHARATIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA, 2023

The BNSS sets procedural guidelines for collecting, preserving, and presenting forensic evidence:

Section 51 – Allows medical examinations of accused persons, enabling DNA and toxicology testing.[38]

Section 329 – Forensic reports from official government institutions (such as CFSLs – Central Forensic Science Laboratories) are admissible as evidence without requiring the expert's presence in court, unless challenged.[39]

Section 184 – Mandates immediate forensic medical examination in rape cases to ensure evidence integrity.[40]

C. Judicial Precedents on Forensic Evidence

Indian courts have played a vital role in determining the admissibility of forensic evidence through major decisions:

i) DNA Evidence

Kishanbhai v. State of Gujarat (2014) – The Supreme Court ruled that DNA evidence is reliable but must be corroborated with other evidence.[41]

Mukesh & Anr v. State (Nirbhaya Case, 2013) – DNA analysis was decisive in securing convictions, setting a precedent for forensic reliability in rape cases.[42]

ii) Narco-Analysis & Polygraph Tests

Selvi v. State of Karnataka (2010) – The Supreme Court ruled that narco-analysis, polygraphs, and brain mapping violate Article 20(3) (Right against Self-Incrimination) unless conducted with consent.[43]

C. Fingerprint & Ballistics Evidence

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978) – The court held that forensic techniques must meet procedural fairness standards.[44]

D. Challenges in Forensic Evidence Admissibility in India

Despite existing legal safeguards, forensic evidence in India has various obstacles.

No Standardized Forensic Admissibility Criteria - Unlike the Daubert Standard in the United States, Indian courts do not have a scientific dependability test for forensic procedures.

Inadequate Forensic Infrastructure - Many forensic laboratories lack necessary accreditation, compromising the quality and credibility of evidence.

---

[33] National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Crime in India Report, 2022.
[34] Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2003.
[35] Section 39(1) of Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023
[36] Section 40 of Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023
[37] Section 72 of Bhartiya Shakshya Adhiniyam, 2023
[38] Section 51 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023
[39] Section 329 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023
[40] Section 184 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023
[41] Kishanbhai v. State of Gujarat (2014) 5 SCC 108
[42] (2017) 6 Scc 1.
[43] (2010) 7 Scc 263.
[44] (1978) 1 Scc 248.

Judicial Discretion and Inconsistent Verdicts - Courts differ in their acceptance of forensic reports, which frequently results in inconsistent rulings.

Chain of Custody Concerns - Improper evidence management raises the danger of tampering or contamination, jeopardizing its trustworthiness.

E. Need for Reforms

Improve the admissibility of forensic evidence in India:

Establish Scientific Admissibility Standards: Use standards comparable to the Daubert Standard (US) or the Forensic Science Regulator Act (UK) to assure the scientific dependability of forensic evidence.

Strengthen Forensic Infrastructure: Improve accreditation and upgrade forensic laboratories to provide high-quality evidence analysis

Judicial Training in Forensic Science: Give judges specialized training to reduce subjective assessments and ensure informed decision-making.

V. Comparative Analysis: Forensic Evidence Admissibility – India vs. Global Standards

Forensic evidence is an important component of worldwide criminal justice systems, although admission criteria vary greatly between jurisdictions. Nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Australia have established well-defined scientific and legal standards for determining the trustworthiness of forensic evidence. In contrast, India lacks a defined framework and instead relies on general evidential principles outlined in the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023. This section provides a comparative examination of forensic evidence admissibility in various nations, outlining best practices that India might implement to strengthen its legal system.

A. Forensic Evidence Admissibility in the United States

The United States has a well-established framework for forensic evidence admissibility, which ensures that investigative methods meet scientific reliability standards before being introduced in court. The Daubert and Frye standards are the two primary legal tests used to assess the admissibility of forensic evidence, and they provide a structured approach to evaluating its scientific validity.

- **The Frye Standard (1923): General Acceptance Rule**

The Frye Rule was developed in the case of **Frye v. United States (1923)**, in which the court determined that: "Scientific techniques and principles must be generally accepted by the relevant scientific community before being admitted as evidence in court."[45]

From this, we can infer that forensic methods such as DNA fingerprinting, toxicology, and ballistics analysis should be endorsed by forensic scientists or medical experts to be used as trial evidence. However, this test has faced criticism for being outdated, as it does not account for new or advanced forensic techniques that have yet to gain worldwide acceptance.

- **The Daubert Standard (1993): Scientific Reliability Test**

The Daubert Standard, established in Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993)[46], has supplanted Frye in federal courts and several states across the United States. The Daubert judgment established judges as the "gatekeepers" of forensic evidence, requiring them to evaluate:

i. Whether the forensic method has been scientifically tested.
ii. Whether it has been peer-reviewed and published in a scientific journal.
iii. Whether it has a known and acceptable error rate.
iv. Whether it is widely accepted by the forensic science community.

This test is applicable to DNA analysis, forensic toxicology, bite-mark comparison, fingerprint analysis, and digital forensics. It plays a crucial role in preventing the use of unreliable forensic methods in trials, ensuring that judicial decisions are guided by scientifically validated principles.

- **U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence (Rule 702 & 703)**

In addition to Daubert, the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) regulate the admission of forensic evidence in the United States.

Rule 702: Requires forensic experts to be qualified based on education, training, and experience.[47]

[45] Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (1923).
[46] *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
[47] U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 702, 2023.

Rule 703: Allows forensic experts to base their opinions on data not directly presented in court, provided it is scientifically valid.[48]
These rules require that only certified forensic specialists testify in court, which increases the credibility of forensic reports.

- **Impact of Daubert on U.S. Courts**

The Daubert ruling led to the exclusion of unreliable forensic techniques, such as: **Hair Comparison Analysis** – Once widely used, but later found to have high error rates. **Bite Mark Evidence** – Discredited as subjective and scientifically unproven. **Arson Investigation Techniques** – Older methods relied on flawed fire patterns and burn marks, leading to wrongful convictions.[49]
Daubert enhanced forensic standards, requiring that only scientifically verified forensic methodologies be used in criminal cases.

- **Challenges in U.S. Forensic Evidence Admissibility**

Despite Daubert's high requirements, issues persist in the United States: Forensic laboratory backlogs cause trial delays. Forensic biases, in which specialists occasionally support the prosecution. There is a lack of national uniformity, since certain states in the United States continue to follow Frye rather than Daubert.

- **Insights for India**

India currently lacks a defined framework for determining the scientific validity of forensic evidence. Unlike the United States, where forensic methodologies must undergo rigorous validation testing before being allowed to court, India depends on judicial discretion under Section 39(1) of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, which does not require a scientific reliability evaluation.
To improve forensic admissibility, India can embrace essential concepts from the US approach, including:

i. Establishing specific forensic admissibility rules, which ensure that only scientifically tested and validated forensic methodologies are utilized in court.
ii. Implementing required training programs for judges and legal professionals to assist them in critically evaluating forensic evidence.
iii. Preventing the use of untested forensic procedures by implementing a forensic review system akin to the Daubert Standard, which requires courts to analyze the credibility of forensic testimony before admitting it as evidence.

By implementing these changes, India can improve the credibility of forensic science in its legal system, resulting in more accurate and equitable court judgments.

B. Forensic Evidence Admissibility in the United Kingdom

The United Kingdom (UK) has a well-regulated system for forensic evidence admissibility that prioritizes scientific reliability, laboratory accreditation, and expert accountability. Unlike the judge-led forensic assessment system in the United States, the UK imposes parliamentary control through the Forensic Science Regulator Act (2021) and follows rigorous procedural requirements for forensic specialists.

- **The Forensic Science Regulator Act, 2021**

The Forensic Science Regulator Act (FSRA) of 2021 was passed to increase forensic quality control and prohibit the use of untrustworthy forensic evidence. The key provisions include: Forensic laboratories must be accredited to fulfill scientific standards. Forensic specialists are regulated to follow ethical and scientific norms. Legal accountability for forensic practitioners, with sanctions for noncompliance.

This regulation guarantees that forensic evidence presented in UK courts is scientifically sound and handled properly, lowering the possibility of evidence contamination, mistakes, or expert prejudice.

- **Criminal Procedure Rules (CPR) and Expert Testimony**

The Criminal Procedure Rules (CPR) of 2005 govern forensic evidence admission in the United Kingdom. Part 19 of the CPR requires forensic specialists to:

[48] U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 703, 2023.
[49] National Academy of Sciences, Forensic Science in Criminal Justice, 2009.

A. Provide evidence honestly while noting any limits.[50]
B. Explain the mistake rates and uncertainty in their forensic results.
C. Disclose any conflicts of interest or any biases in their reporting.

This method improves openness and eliminates misleading forensic testimony by requiring forensic specialists to act as impartial consultants to the court rather than representing either the prosecution or the defense.

- **Landmark Forensic Cases in the UK**

A lot of cases have influenced forensic admissibility in the UK. Some of them are:
R v. T (2010) – The court ruled that forensic experts must not overstate the certainty of their conclusions and must provide a scientific basis for their opinions.[51]
R v. Adams (1996) – DNA evidence was challenged due to statistical misinterpretation, leading to reforms in how DNA probability calculations are presented in court.[52]
R v. Dallagher (2002) – The case highlighted the unreliability of ear-print evidence, leading to its rejection in forensic practice.[53]

These instances highlight the UK's dedication to scientific precision, which prevents forensic mistakes from impacting court judgments.

- **.Digital Forensics and Cyber Evidence in the UK**

The United Kingdom has stringent standards regarding digital forensic evidence, notably in situations involving cybercrime, financial fraud, and digital data recovery. The Computer Misuse Act of 1990 and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA), 2000, outline:

Legal processes to avoid tampering with digital evidence.
Encryption and privacy measures to ensure data integrity.
Judicial monitoring for cases involving social media, email forensics, and cyber surveillance.[54]
These regulations guarantee that digital forensic evidence is obtained legally and utilized responsibly in court processes.

- **Insights for India**

India could enhance its forensic evidence admissibility system by implementing essential components from the UK model:
A. Create a national forensic science regulator to supervise quality and accreditation.
B. Hold forensic experts accountable by requiring them to reveal mistake rates and limits.
C. Improving digital forensic legislation to ensure ethical treatment of cyber evidence.
D. Providing judges with forensic training for proper report assessment.

C. Forensic Evidence Admissibility in Germany

Germany has one of the most scientifically rigorous and legally organized forensic evidence regimes. Unlike India's dependence on judicial discretion or the United Kingdom's regulatory monitoring approach, Germany has a dual-review system, requiring forensic results to undergo scientific validation and independent expert evaluation before being allowed to court.

- **The Dual-Review System for Forensic Evidence**

Under Germany's forensic admissibility system, all forensic evidence must be assessed by: Accredited forensic laboratories must adhere to stringent scientific norms.[55] Independent forensic panels cross-check forensic results before submission to court.[56]

This two-layer validation approach reduces mistakes, expert prejudice, and forensic misinterpretations while assuring that only scientifically validated evidence is offered in trials.

[50] Criminal Procedure Rules, Part 19, UK, 2005.
[51] R v. T (2010) EWCA Crim 2439.
[52] R v. Adams (1996) EWCA Crim 10.
[53] R v. Dallagher (2002) EWCA Crim 1903.
[54] Computer Misuse Act, UK, 1990; Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA), 2000.
[55] German Federal Police (BKA), Forensic Science Standards in Germany, 2021.
[56] German Forensic Science Association, Independent Forensic Review Guidelines, 2022.

- **The Role of the German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO)**

Germany's Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung - StPO) oversees the admission of forensic evidence through the following provisions:

Section 244 – Judicial Duty to Investigate

Courts must actively verify forensic findings instead of relying solely on expert testimony.[57]

Section 245 – Right to Challenge Expert Reports

Defense attorneys can cross-examine forensic experts and request a second expert review if forensic conclusions appear flawed.[58]

Section 261 – Free Evaluation of Evidence

Judges must assess forensic evidence holistically, considering scientific validity and procedural fairness before accepting it in court.[59]

These laws guarantee that forensic evidence is properly and legally reviewed, therefore preventing forensic reports from being misused or manipulated

- **Landmark Cases Shaping Forensic Evidence in Germany**

Many cases have influenced forensic admissibility in the UK. Some of them are:

The Jörg Kachelmann Case (2011) – A well-known TV presenter was accused of sexual assault, but forensic inconsistencies in DNA evidence led to his acquittal. The case reinforced the need for strict forensic cross-verification.[60]

The NSU Trial (2018) – In a case involving neo-Nazi terrorism, forensic evidence, including ballistics and digital forensics, was crucial. The court ensured forensic findings were reviewed by multiple independent experts before admission.[61]

The Krause Case (2020) – A murder conviction was overturned when a second forensic review found flaws in blood spatter analysis, proving Germany's commitment to re-examining forensic errors.[62]

These instances demonstrate Germany's emphasis on forensic precision and several expert reviews to prevent false convictions.

- **Insights for India**

India can improve its forensic evidence framework by adopting key elements from Germany:

i. Implementing a dual-review forensic system, ensuring forensic reports undergo cross-verification before being presented in court.
ii. Introducing mandatory forensic training for judges, helping them critically analyze forensic reports.
iii. Strengthening defendants' rights to challenge forensic findings, preventing wrongful convictions.
iv. Establishing forensic peer review panels, reducing errors and bias in forensic testimony.

D. Forensic Evidence Admissibility in Australia

Australia has a highly organized forensic regulatory system that ensures scientific dependability, expert accountability, and rigorous forensic laboratory accreditation. Unlike India's discretionary forensic system, Australia has national forensic science guidelines and applies the Expert Evidence Act (1995) to determine whether forensic testimony is admissible in court.

- **National Forensic Science Standards in Australia**

In Australia, the following laws control forensic evidence:

The National Institute of Forensic Science (NIFS) :-Oversees forensic accreditation, research, and quality control.[63]

[57] Section 244, German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO), 2020.
[58] Section 245, German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO), 2020.
[59] Section 261, German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO), 2020.
[60] Jörg Kachelmann Case, Higher Regional Court of Mannheim, 2011.
[61] NSU Trial Verdict, Federal Court of Justice, 2018.
[62] Krause Case, Federal Constitutional Court, 2020.
[63] National Institute of Forensic Science (Australia), Forensic Science and Legal Standards, 2021.

The Expert Evidence Act (1995):- Requires that forensic expert testimony be based on scientific research, peer-reviewed studies, and recognized techniques.[64]

The Model Criminal Code on Evidence (2005):- Establishes strong forensic evidence handling rules to ensure chain of custody integrity.[65]

These regulations guarantee that forensic procedures fulfill scientific reliability standards before they are employed in criminal cases.

- **Digital Forensics & Cyber Evidence Regulations**

Australia has strict digital forensic laws, governed by:

The Cybercrime Act (2001) – Regulates digital forensic investigations for cybercrime, financial fraud, and data breaches.[66]

The Privacy Act (1988) – Ensures forensic DNA and biometric evidence is stored securely, preventing privacy violations.[67]

The Telecommunications Interception Act (1997) – Establishes forensic procedures for intercepting digital communications as evidence.[68]

- **Landmark Cases Shaping Forensic Evidence in Australia**

R v. Tang (2006) – The court ruled that forensic experts must disclose statistical probabilities and error rates when presenting DNA evidence.[69]

R v. Gilham (2012) – A conviction based on forensic fire investigation was overturned when the forensic methods used were found to be scientifically unreliable.[70]

R v. Jama (2008) – A wrongful conviction based on flawed DNA evidence led to forensic protocol reforms, ensuring stricter DNA validation requirements.[71]

- **Insights for India**

To enhance its forensic system, India could draw inspiration from Australia by implementing several key measures. These include:

i. Creating a nationwide forensic accreditation program akin to NIFS to ensure quality standards in forensic practices.
ii. Developing criteria for the acceptance of forensic evidence in court, guaranteeing that only scientifically proven forensic techniques are utilized during trials.
iii. Bolstering laws related to cyber and digital forensics to safeguard data integrity and protect privacy.
iv. Offering specialized forensic training to judges, enabling them to evaluate forensic reports from a scientific perspective.

VI. Challenges in Forensic Evidence Admissibility in India

Notwithstanding the critical role of forensic science in criminal investigations, India faces significant challenges in ensuring the credibility, admissibility, and standardization of forensic evidence. Impediments such as protracted forensic reporting processes, absence of standardized forensic protocols, potential expert bias, and the lack of centralized forensic regulation compromise the reliability of forensic testimony in Indian courts.

A. Delayed Forensic Reporting & Case Backlogs

A key difficulty in India's forensic system is the prolonged delays in forensic reporting, which is mostly caused by overburdened forensic laboratories and a shortage of skilled professionals. According to the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB)[72] forensic case backlogs frequently delay trials for years, reducing the legal significance of forensic findings. In many cases, forensic findings are presented after a significant delay,

[64] Expert Evidence Act, Australia, 1995.
[65] Model Criminal Code on Evidence, Australia, 2005.
[66] Cybercrime Act, Australia, 2001
[67] Privacy Act, Australia, 1988.
[68] Telecommunications Interception Act, Australia, 1997
[69] R v. Tang (2006) HCA 33
[70] R v. Gilham (2012) NSWCCA 131.
[71] R v. Jama (2008) VSCA 164
[72] National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Crime in India Report, 2022.

lowering their admissibility in court. In the **Unnao rape case (2017)**, the forensic examination of crucial evidence took several months, raising concerns over evidence preservation and degradation.[73]

Example:- Forensic DNA results in high-profile cases have taken months or even years to reach the court, delaying justice and raising worries about evidence preservation and deterioration.

B. Absence of Uniform Forensic Protocols

Unlike countries with strong forensic criteria, India does not have standardized forensic collection, storage, and examination methods. This yields:

Inconsistent forensic methods throughout states:-Different laboratories use different methodology, resulting in contradicting findings in the same case.

Lack of standard DNA extraction or fingerprint analysis techniques:- Casts doubt on the veracity of forensic conclusions.[74]

In the case of Aarushi Talwar murder case (2008), forensic reports from different labs provided conflicting results, leading to judicial confusion and errors.[75]

C. Lack of Independent Forensic Oversight

In nations such as the United Kingdom and Australia, forensic evidence is overseen by independent forensic science authorities. However, India does not have a centralized forensic regulating authority.[76]

The forensic science field faces significant challenges. The absence of a unified body overseeing forensic laboratory accreditation raises concerns about uniformity and quality standards. Furthermore, the close ties between forensic analysts and law enforcement agencies introduce potential conflicts, possibly compromising the impartiality of their analyses. Additionally, the lack of an independent system for reviewing forensic findings means there is no mechanism to validate forensic conclusions before they are presented in court, potentially undermining the reliability of forensic evidence in legal proceedings.

In the case of **Malegaon blast case (2008)**[77], forensic reports were questioned due to potential law enforcement interference, highlighting the need for independent forensic reviews.

D. Expert Bias & Conflicting Forensic Opinions

Forensic expert testimony in India usually lacks impartiality since forensic examiners are frequently connected to law enforcement, it is more difficult for the defense to dispute their findings. Also when many experts provide conflicting judgments in a single case, it might lead to forensic outcomes that are unclear to the court.[78]

In the **Jessica Lal murder case (1999)**, forensic ballistics reports initially failed to establish a conclusive link, delaying the conviction.[79]

E. Weak Forensic Documentation & Chain of Custody Issues

The credibility of forensic evidence is dependent on accurate forensic recording. But in India Confirming the chain of possession is difficult since forensic documents are not always available or are preserved poorly.Similarly inadequate forensic sample tracking may cause evidence to be mismanaged, misplaced, or tampered with before it reaches the trial.[80]

In the case of **Telgi fake stamp paper scam (2003)**, forensic evidence was questioned due to lack of proper documentation, affecting the investigation.[81]

VII. Proposed Reforms for Strengthening Forensic Laws in India

To improve scientific credibility, transparency, and legal dependability in forensic evidence, India needs to implement rapid legislative and institutional reforms. Establishing a national forensic regulatory organization,

[73] (2019) 10 Scc 452.
[74] DNA Technology (Use and Application) Regulation Bill, 2019.
[75] (2009) 14 Scc 342
[76] Forensic Science Regulator Act, UK, 2021.
[77] Pragya Singh Thakur vs. State of Maharashtra, (2019) 9 Scc 272
[78] Indian Law Commission, Report on Expert Testimony & Forensic Science, 2018.
[79] (2010) 6 Scc 1
[80] Forensic Evidence Management in India, Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021.
[81] Telgi Scam Forensic Investigation Report, Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), 2004.

standardizing forensic methods, enhancing judicial training, and strengthening digital forensic laws are among the most significant changes.

A. Establishment of a National Forensic Science Regulator

India lacks a centralized organization to monitor forensic science standards. The National Forensic Science Regulator (NFSR) should be established to accredited forensic laboratories and follow consistent procedures, Monitor expert testimony to prevent prejudice and wrongdoing, Create independent forensic review panels to cross-check forensic reports.[82]

Example: The Forensic Science Regulator Act (UK, 2021) serves as a model for creating an independent oversight authority in India.[83]

B. Standardization of Forensic Procedures & Chain of Custody Rules

Since there is a lack of consistent procedures, forensic evidence implementation in India remains unequal. The government needs to standardize forensic procedures for evidence collection, preservation, and analysis, strengthen chain-of-custody requirements to prevent tampering and misplacement, in criminal proceedings, require forensic audits to guarantee that best practices are followed.[84]

In *Datar Singh v. State of Punjab (2021)*, the Supreme Court highlighted poor evidence handling, emphasizing the need for uniform forensic protocols.[85]

C. Judicial Training in Forensic Science

Many Indian judges lack rigorous forensic science training, resulting in inaccurate interpretations of forensic results. A obligatory forensic training program should be implemented for Judges and prosecutors may evaluate forensic reports scientifically and legally, defense counsel can dispute inaccurate forensic testimony, court-appointed forensic consultants help judges with technical forensic concerns.[86]

Example: Germany has structured forensic training programs for judges, reducing forensic misinterpretation in trials.[87]

D. Strengthening Digital Forensics & Data Protection Laws

With the increase in cybercrime, India's IT Act of 2000 requires urgent amendments to:

- Improve digital forensic admissibility criteria to ensure electronic evidence is validated.
- Regulate forensic access to personal data to avoid misuse.
- Implement AI-based forensic techniques to enhance cybercrime investigations.[88]

Example: The Data Protection Bill (India, 2023) proposes strict digital forensic guidelines, similar to the EU's GDPR framework.[89]

E. Expansion of Forensic Infrastructure & Research

Forensic labs in India face case backlogs and antiquated technology. The Government could increase financing for forensic labs in high-case-load states, foster cooperation with universities and worldwide institutes, apply AI and machine learning in forensic science for faster and more accurate outcomes.[90]

Example: The Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL, Hyderabad) has implemented DNA phenotyping to enhance forensic accuracy in criminal cases.[91]

VIII. Conclusion & Final Recommendations

The criminal justice system in India is undergoing a significant transformation due to the growing influence of forensic science, which is enhancing the precision, dependability, and openness of legal processes. As scientific and technological advancements continue, forensic evidence has the capacity to connect law and

[82] B.R. Sharma, Forensic Science in Criminal Investigation & Trials, Universal Law Publishing, 2021.
[83] Forensic Science Regulator Act, UK, 2021.
[84] B.S. Nabar, Forensic Science in India: Legal & Investigative Aspects, LexisNexis, 2022.
[85] (2021) 4 Scc 167.
[86] Indian Law Commission, Report on Expert Testimony & Forensic Science, 2018.
[87] German Ministry of Justice, Judicial Training on Forensic Science, 2021.
[88] P.K. Gupta, Cyber Forensics & Indian IT Laws, Eastern Book Company, 2020.
[89] Data Protection Bill, India, 2023.
[90] M.L. Agarwal, Forensic Investigations & AI in Criminal Justice, Oxford University Press, 2023.
[91] Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL, Hyderabad), DNA Phenotyping Research Report, 2022.

science, ensuring that verdicts are based on concrete scientific proof rather than solely on testimonies. This increasing reliance on forensic science in criminal investigations indicates a progressive move towards a more evidence-based judicial system, bolstering public confidence.

India has already made considerable progress in incorporating forensic science into law enforcement, with improvements in areas such as DNA analysis, cyber forensics, and forensic toxicology. However, to fully harness its potential, it is necessary to implement structured reforms and strategic policies. The establishment of a National Forensic Science Regulator would provide a standardized framework for forensic laboratories, ensuring scientific credibility and consistent accreditation across states.[92] This approach would align India with international forensic regulatory models, such as the Forensic Science Regulator in the UK.[93] Additionally, the introduction of a scientific admissibility test, comparable to the Daubert Standard in the United States, would ensure that forensic methods meet scientific validation criteria before being presented in court.[94]

In the realm of cybercrime investigations, forensic science has become increasingly crucial, with digital evidence now playing a pivotal role in cases involving financial fraud, cyber terrorism, and data breaches. While India's IT Act, 2000, provides a basic legal framework, it needs to be updated to align with global standards such as the EU's GDPR and Australia's Cybercrime Act.[95] Enhancing digital forensic legislation will ensure the secure collection, preservation, and authentication of electronic evidence, maintaining its validity in court proceedings.[96] Moreover, the integration of AI-powered forensic analysis and blockchain technology could transform the management and verification of forensic evidence, guaranteeing tamper-resistant digital evidence tracking.[97]

A significant reform would be the establishment of forensic training programs for judges, prosecutors, and legal professionals. By comprehending the intricacies of forensic science, these individuals will be better equipped to accurately interpret forensic reports, reducing the likelihood of judicial errors.[98] The legal system's effectiveness is compromised when forensic evidence is misunderstood or undervalued. Some nations, such as Germany, have already implemented structured forensic training for judges, ensuring that forensic evidence undergoes critical evaluation rather than being accepted without scrutiny.[99]

India is on track to become a global leader in forensic science, and by adopting these important changes, it will be able to construct a scientifically rigorous and legally sound forensic system. The expanded application of forensic science will not only boost investigations, but will also defend the core idea of justice: protecting the innocent and convicting the guilty based on truth rather than supposition. With a focus on scientific integrity, technological innovation, and legal modernity, forensic science in India is set to become an even more potent tool for truth and justice.

References

1. B.R. Sharma, *Forensic Science in Criminal Investigation & Trials* (Universal Law Publishing, New Delhi, 2021).
2. National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), *Crime in India Report* (Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, 2022).
3. Forensic Science Regulator Act, 2021 (UK), available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/29/enacted (last visited Feb. 8, 2025).
4. Law Commission of India, *Report on Expert Testimony & Forensic Science* (Government of India, 2018).
5. P.K. Gupta, *Cyber Forensics & Indian IT Laws* (Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 2020).
6. M.L. Agarwal, *Forensic Investigations & AI in Criminal Justice* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2023).
7. Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) (United States Supreme Court).

[92] B.R. Sharma, Forensic Science in Criminal Investigation & Trials, Universal Law Publishing, 2021.
[93] Forensic Science Regulator Act, UK, 2021
[94] Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)
[95] P.K. Gupta, Cyber Forensics & Indian IT Laws, Eastern Book Company, 2020.
[96] Data Protection Bill, 2023.
[97] M.L. Agarwal, Forensic Investigations & AI in Criminal Justice, Oxford University Press, 2023.
[98] Indian Law Commission, Report on Expert Testimony & Forensic Science, 2018.
[99] German Ministry of Justice, Judicial Training on Forensic Science, 2021.

8. DNA Technology (Use and Application) Regulation Bill, 2019 (India), available at: https://prsindia.org/billtrack/the-dna-technology-use-and-application-regulation-bill-2019 (last visited Feb. 8, 2025).
9. German Ministry of Justice, *Judicial Training on Forensic Science* (Federal Republic of Germany, 2021).
10. Data Protection Bill, 2023 (India), available at: https://www.meity.gov.in/data-protection-framework (last visited Feb. 8, 2025).
11. Datar Singh v. State of Punjab, (2021) SC 2351
12. Surendra Koli v. State of U.P., (2011) SC 290
13. Kishanbhai v. State of Gujarat, (2014) SC 1285
14. Ram Singh v. State (Nirbhaya Case), (2013) SC 2914
15. Arjun Panditrao Khotkar v. Kailash Kushanrao Gorantyal, (2020) SC 456
16. Krishna Kumar Malik v. State of Haryana, (2011) SC 4523