

## Indian Evidence Act, 1872 – Answer with explanations

Q. No.	Ans.	Explanations
1.	<b>B</b>	The evidence of motive or preparation becomes important when case depends upon the circumstantial evidence only.
2.	<b>D</b>	A collateral fact may be admissible as relevant under section 11 of the Act, when both the two requirements are fulfilled.
3.	<b>B</b>	The statements are inadmissible because under section 18 of the Evidence Act, statements (either by parties interested or from whom parties to the suit derived their interest) are admissions only if they are made during the continuance of the interest of the persons making the statement.
4.	<b>D</b>	Irrespective of whether the party making them appeared in the witness-box or not, and whether that party when appearing as witness was confronted with those statements in case he made a statement contrary to those admissions. <b><u>[Bharat Singh vs. Bhagirathi, AIR 1966 SC 405].</u></b>
5.	<b>B</b>	“An admission can be proved without confronting the maker with his earlier statements” - held by Hon’ble Mr. Justice Krishna Ayer in - <b><u>Biswanath vs. Dwarka AIR 1974 S.C. 117.</u></b>
6.	<b>A</b>	<b>Section 23</b> of the Evidence Act gives effect to the maxim - It is in the interest of the state that there should be an end of litigation.  [The purpose is to enable parties in an attempt to compromise litigation to communicate with one another freely and without the embarrassment so that their negotiations to avoid litigation or to settle it may go unhampered].
7.	<b>A</b>	<b>Section 32</b> of Evidence Act - total <b>eight clauses</b> are given. [Read clauses 5 to 8 from Bare Act.
8.	<b>C</b>	It may become relevant under section 21(1) or section 157 of IEA.
9.	<b>B</b>	Such cases are five in number – <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>↓</p> <p>dead</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>↓</p> <p>cannot be found</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>↓</p> <p>incapable of giving evidence</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>↓</p> <p>Kept out of the way by the adverse party</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>↓</p> <p>Presence cannot be obtained without an amount of delay or expense which the court consider unreasonable</p> </div> </div>

10.	D	<p>The use of such secondary evidence is limited by three provisions -</p> <pre> graph TD     A[The use of such secondary evidence is limited by three provisions -] --&gt; B[proceedings between the]     A --&gt; C[adverse party in the first proceeding had the right and opportunity to cross-examine]     A --&gt; D[Question in issue were substantially the same in the first as in the second proceedings]     B --&gt; E[same parties]     B --&gt; F[their representative interest] </pre>
11.	D	In either of four cases, a judgment in rem can be impeached.
12.	B	Not a judgment in rem within the meaning of this section and is therefore, no bar to a subsequent suit. <b><u>[Rahmat Ali Khan (Pir) vs. Musammat Babu Zuhra (1911) PR No. 14 of 1912 (Civil)].</u></b>
13.	D	<p>Official as well as to the private documents.</p> <p>The second paragraph of <b>section 162</b> of the Evidence Act, provides that when a document, in respect of which an objection to production or admissibility is raised, refers to matters of State, the court has no power to inspect the document.</p> <p>[With regard to other documents in respect of which privilege is claimed, the court, if thinks fit, may inspect the documents].</p>
14.	C	<b>Section 163</b> of the Evidence Act is applicable to criminal trials as well as to the civil actions. <b><u>[Emperor vs. Makhan Lal Datta, (1939) 2 Cal 429].</u></b>
15.	C	Section 161 of the Evidence Act. <b><u>[In the matter of the petition of Jhubbo Mahton, (1882) 8 Cal 73 and 745].</u></b>

16.	C	<p>Statements – IX, XI and XIII are wrong</p> <pre>       ↓              ↓              ↓ Not a substantive piece of evidence and no conviction can be recorded on identification of accused. Only a corroborative value to the evidence in court. Where accused person not previously known to the witness concerned.           </pre>
17.	D	<pre>       ↓              ↓              ↓ Sec-10 not apply to incriminating statements made by accused to the police in course of investigation whether incriminating themselves or other Relevant fact might be taken into consideration if coupled with other circumstances or evidence available. Not necessary to prove conspiracy. [only reasonable ground to believe in existence of conspiracy once reasonable grounds are made out for believing that two or more persons have conspired to commit, anything done or said or written by each in reference to common design is admissible against each of them.]           </pre> <p style="text-align: center;">↑—————↑</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rajiv Kumar vs State of Bihar (1996) (1) east Cr. C 825 (Pat)</p>
18.	A	<p>The plea of alibi - taken by the defence – required to be proved only after prosecution has proved its case against the accused. <b>[Darshan Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2016 (158) AIC 223 SC]</b></p>
19.	A	<p>Law Judges not what is in a person's mind, a person's inner intentions are to be read and understood from his acts and omissions, taken as a whole, whenever a person's state of mind is relevant, <b>'external action reveals inner secrets'</b> comes in play - Section 15 of the Evidence Act.</p>
20.	A	<pre>       ↓              ↓ Formal admission for the purpose of trial may be made on pleadings. Informal admissions may be before/during the proceedings.           </pre>

		eg: - Where a contract and the breach are admitted. <b>[Stephen's digest, 7<sup>th</sup> edition, page 24].</b>
21.	B	A mere proof of admission, after the person whose admission it is alleged to be has concluded his evidence, will be of no avail and cannot be utilised against him. <b>[Sita Ram Bhau Patil vs. Ramchandra Nago Patil AIR 1977 SC 1712 at 1715].</b>  It is a settled law that an admission made by a person cannot be split up and part of it cannot be used against him. <b>[Hanumant Govind Nargundkar vs. State of MP AIR 1952 SC 343].</b>
22.	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The scope of its application is very limited. It can only be taken into consideration and used as corroboration if other materials brought in support of the charge exist.</li> <li>▪ Section 30 of the Evidence Act does not limit itself to confessions made to Magistrate.</li> </ul>
23.	D	The Evidence Act does not contemplate that the accused should prove his case with the same strictness and vigour as the prosecution is required to prove in a criminal case. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The section does not at all indicate the nature and standard of proof required. <b>[Harbhajan Singh vs. State of Punjab, AIR 1966 SC 97].</b></li> <li>▪ The accused not required to produce evidence in support of his plea and can establish his plea by reference to circumstances as they emerge from the prosecution evidence itself. <b>[Raghibir Singh vs. State of Haryana, AIR 2009 SC 1223].</b></li> </ul>
24.	C	It cannot apply when the fact is such as to be capable of being known also by persons other than the defendant. <b>[Razik Ram vs. JS Chauhan, AIR 1975 SC 667].</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 106 does not cast any burden on an accused person to prove that no crime was committed by proving facts especially within knowledge; nor does it warrant the conclusion that if anything is unexplained which the court thinks the accused could explain, he ought therefore to be found guilty.</li> <li>▪ <b>King Emperor vs. U Damapala, (1936) 14 Ran 666 FB.</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Ratan Lal vs. Dhiraj Lal (27<sup>th</sup> edition P-462).</b></li> </ul>
25.	B	<i>Agnoo Nagesia vs. State of Bihar, AIR 1966 SC 119.</i> <b>[Ratan Lal and Dhiraj Lal, 27<sup>th</sup> edition, P-153].</b> Section 27 - the Scope and effect of the provision.
26.	C	All statements are correct except statements (iv), (vii), (viii), (x).

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Statement iv</b> – Information received from accused and not from victim. [<i>State (NCT) of Delhi vs. Navjot Sandhu (2005) 11 SCC 660</i>]</li> <li>2. <b>Statement vii</b> – That portion of information which merely explains the material thing discovered is not admissible and cannot be proved. [<i>HP Administration vs. Om Prakash AIR 1972 SC 975</i>].</li> <li>3. <b>Statement viii</b> – Not a substantive evidence to convict the accused persons but it is only corroborative evidence.</li> <li>4. <b>Statement x</b> – The facts need not be self-probatory and the word ‘fact’ as contemplated in section 27 is not limited to ‘actual physical material object’. [<i>Asar Mohammad vs. State of UP, AIR 2018 SC 5264</i>].</li> </ol>
27.	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In consequence of a deception practised on the accused and upon not co-accused.</li> <li>▪ In answer to question which the accused need not to have answered.</li> <li>▪ In consequence of the accused not receiving a warning that he was not bound to make it and it might be used against him only and not co-accused.</li> </ul>
28.	A	‘May’ be taken into consideration provided jointly tried for the same offence. [ <i>Queen-Empress vs. Jagrup, (1885)7 All 646, 648</i> ]
29.	D	<i>Om Prakash Sharma vs. Rajendra Prasad Shewda (2015) 15 SCC 556 Para 22. [Ratan Lal and Dhiraj Lal, 27<sup>th</sup> P-191]</i>
30.	C	Regularly kept in the course of business – admissible but alone not sufficient to charge a person with liability unless corroborated by other evidence.
31.	A	[ <i>Ratanlal vs. Dhirajlal, 27<sup>th</sup> edition, P-216</i> ].
32.	D	<p>Statements (iv), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Statement iv</b> - State the facts and not the conclusion which he has formed on observing or perceiving them. The function of drawing inference is a judicial function and must be performed by the court. [<i>Mobarik Ali Ahmed vs. State of Bombay 1958 SCR at P 342</i>]</li> <li>• <b>Statement vi</b> - The Section 45 does not refer to any particular attainment, standard of study or experience, which would qualify a person to give evidence as an expert.</li> <li>• <b>Statement vii</b> -The opinion of an expert may not have any binding effect on the court and the court does not become <i>functus officio</i> because of an expert opinion. It is not the province of the expert to act as judge or jury and the ultimate opinion has to be formulated by the court. [<i>Ramesh Chandra Agarwal vs. Regency Hospital Ltd, AIR 2010 SC 806</i>].</li> <li>• <b>Statement viii</b> - Not conclusive – <i>Tomaso Bruno vs. State of UP (2015) 7 SCC 178, Para 48</i>, held that purpose is primarily to assist the court in arriving at a final conclusion but such report, is not a conclusive proof.</li> <li>• <b>Statement ix</b> - <i>Fakhrudin vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1967 SC 1326</i> held that although the approach has to be one of caution, there is no rule of law that the evidence of an expert should not be acted upon unless substantially corroborated.</li> </ul>

33.	B	Whenever the opinion of any living person (not deceased) is relevant, the ground on which such opinion is based is also relevant (section-15 of the Act, 1872).
34.	C	<p>Only in prosecution under Sections</p> <p style="text-align: center;">             ↓                      ↓                      ↓                      ↓              494                      495                      497                      498           </p> <p>of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.</p> <p>opinion on relationship shall not be sufficient.</p> <p>Section – 50 of the Evidence Act.</p>

35.	A	Section 57 of the Evidence Act, the list is not exhaustive. – total thirteen points are given – when the court shall take notice.		
36.	A	Four conditions given under section 65(B) (2) of the Act.		
37.	A	Sarkar's Commentary, Volume–2, P–1747.		
38.	A	Delhi Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2013.		
39.	B	Delhi Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2013.		
40.	B	Delhi Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2009.		
41.	C	Delhi Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2009.		
42.	A	Delhi Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2009.		
43.	B	MP Higher Judicial Service (Pre.) Examination, 2011.		
44.	C	<p>Protected by main section 126 of the Act.</p> <p><b>Proviso says that nothing in section 126 of the Act that -</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none; vertical-align: top;"> <p>↓</p> <p>Any such communication made in furtherance of any illegal purpose</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none; vertical-align: top;"> <p>↓</p> <p>any fact observed by any barristers, pleader, attorney or Vakil, in the course of his employment as such, showing that any crime or fraud has been committed since the commencement of his employment.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>↓</p> <p>Any such communication made in furtherance of any illegal purpose</p>	<p>↓</p> <p>any fact observed by any barristers, pleader, attorney or Vakil, in the course of his employment as such, showing that any crime or fraud has been committed since the commencement of his employment.</p>
<p>↓</p> <p>Any such communication made in furtherance of any illegal purpose</p>	<p>↓</p> <p>any fact observed by any barristers, pleader, attorney or Vakil, in the course of his employment as such, showing that any crime or fraud has been committed since the commencement of his employment.</p>			

45.	A	No, it cannot be because the original memorandum of family settlement document which exists in the suit for partition which is disposed of, is a private document and not public document under section 74 of the Evidence Act.
46.	B	If it is executed before and authenticated by a Notary Public.
47.	D	No, the signature of the attesting witnesses and the executants can be identified by the person acquainted with signatures of the attesting witnesses and the executants.
48.	D	Not if they consistent rather inconsistent. Section 11 of the Act.
49.	A	Inadmissible. Made in police custody and not to police officer.
50.	D	Neither I nor II is relevant. Read section 43 of the Act.
51.	B	To a witness.
52.	C	Without the consent of other party or order of the court.
53.	D	Section 148 and 149 of the Act.
54.	C	Six cases are provided in Section 66 of the Act.
55.	D	At the time or soon afterwards
56.	D	Only for giving false evidence
57.	D	Credibility of the witness
58.	C	Unless agreed in writings
59.	C	As to his own conduct
60.	D	Declaration, act or omission
61.	B	Not non-official rather official only
62.	A	Read sections 86 to 89 of the Act
63.	C	Against whom it is to be proved and not by whom it is to be proved.
64.	C	(1) Probate (2) Matrimonial (3) Admiralty (4) Insolvency
65.	C	Saving clause (2)
66.	B	Act 2 of 2006
67.	D	All the above
68.	C	Both to the examination-in-chief and cross-examination.
69.	A	Explanation to section 144 of the Act.

70.	D	The witness may also be contradicted by his previous verbal statement – Section 153, Exception-2.
71.	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is the quality and not quantity, which determines the adequacy of evidence as has been provided by section 134 of the Evidence Act.</li> <li>Neither the number of witnesses, nor the quantity of evidence is material. It is the quality that matters [<i>Maqsoodan vs. State of UP, AIR 1983 SC 126</i>].</li> </ul>
72.	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motive is a <b>psychological</b> fact; it can be fathomed by the conduct of the person.</li> <li>If motive is proved, it will be a corroborative piece of evidence. But if the prosecution is not able to prove motive, it will not be a ground to throw away the prosecution case or corrode its credibility. [<i>Vijay Shankar vs. State of Haryana 04.08.2015</i>].</li> <li><b>Explanation 1 to Section 8-</b> The word conduct does not include statements, unless those statements accompany and explain acts than statements; and it is on such a statement that the significance of the act, which it accompanies, in many cases, wholly depends.</li> </ul>
73.	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Statement:</u> <i>Inder Singh vs. State (Delhi Admn) AIR 1978 SC 1091</i></li> <li><u>4<sup>th</sup> Statement:</u> <i>Tej Bhadur Singh vs. State of UP, AIR 1990 SC 431</i></li> <li><u>5<sup>th</sup> Statement:</u> <i>Devendra Bhai Shankar Mehta vs. Ramesh Chandra Vithaldas Sheth, AIR 1992SC 1398</i></li> <li><u>6<sup>th</sup> Statement:</u> <i>M Narsinga Rao vs. State of AP AIR 2001 SC 318</i></li> </ul>
74.	D	<p>Every piece of evidence has to be subjected to the test of objectivity and not the test of subjectivity. [<i>Hallu vs. State of Madhya Pradesh AIR 1974 SC 1936</i>].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prosecution case has to rest on its own strength, and not on absence of any explanation by the accused person or his inability to raise any plausible defence. [<i>Mohd. Iqbal M Shaikh vs. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1998 SC 2864</i>].</li> </ul>
75.	D	<p><b>Statement-1</b> - By An accused person and not co-accused.</p> <p><b>Statement-5</b> - admission may be used on behalf of the person making it under the exception provided in section-21 of the Act.</p> <p><b>Statement-7</b> an admission by one of several defendants in a suit is no evidence against another defendant.</p>
76.	A	By Act 10 of 2009 (w.e.f. 27-10-2009).
77.	C	<p>Section 97 of the Act. [Section 97 is only an extension of the provision of Section 95.] [<i>Ratan Lal and Dhiraj Lal, edition, P- 431</i>]</p> <p>[Maxim means – a false description does not vitiate the document].</p>
78.	B	Statement 2,3 and 4 are correct [ Read illustration of section 6 of the Act]



79.	C	Motive for the crime even if adequate, cannot by itself sustain a criminal charge [ <i>Purushotham vs. State, 2016 Cri LJ 1453.</i> ]  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absence of motive is not fatal if the circumstantial evidence is established with cogent evidence. [<i>Shaikh Jahangir Ali vs. State of Maharashtra 2001 (2) MHLJ 67 (Bom).</i>]</li> </ul>
80.	C	Statement 5 and 6 are correct.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a substantive piece of evidence.</li> <li>Mere delay does not invalidate.</li> <li>Can't claim it as a matter of right rather prerogative of police</li> <li>Veracity of witness – identity of accused.</li> <li>Only corroborative value and not contradictory.</li> </ul>
81.	D	Consolidate, define and amend.
82.	B	Section 12 of Act.
83.	C	Act 3 of 1891.
84.	A	1.9.1872
85.	C	Section 85 B of the Act
86.	B	With the intention of signing or approving the electronic record.
87.	B	Section 81 of the Act
88.	D	Includes both abetment and attempt to commit an offence
89.	A	Act 4 of 2003
90.	A	Section 376, 376A, 376AB, 376C, 376D, 376DA, 376DB, 376E of IPC.
91.	D	Section 71 of the Act
92.	C	State of Mind <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="text-align: center;">↓ Intention</div> <div style="text-align: center;">↓ Knowledge</div> <div style="text-align: center;">↓ Good faith ↓ negligence</div> <div style="text-align: center;">↓ rashness ↓ ill-will</div> <div style="text-align: center;">↓ Good will</div> </div>
93.	C	Section 114-illustration (f), lays down that court may presume that the common cause of business has been followed in particular cases. This presumption in an application of the general maxim that means <b>all acts are presumed to be rightly done</b> , and is based on the fact that conduct of men in official and commercial matters is, to a great extent, uniform. This, however, is a rebuttable presumption.

94.	C	The section covers both private and public offices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Illustration (a), relates to the former;</li><li>• Illustration (b), to the latter Viz., the post office.</li></ul>
95.	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Section 17 as regards their nature and section 21 or any of the following sections as regards their liability. [27<sup>th</sup> edition, page 118 Ratan Lal and Dhiraj Lal].</li></ul>
96.	A	Section 22A of the Act, disallows the evidence of oral admission as to the contents of an electronic record. It then talks of an exceptional situation which is that when the genuineness of the electronic record produced before the court is itself in question.

Rahul's IAS

97.	D	<p>Atbir vs. Govt. (NCT of Delhi), (2010) 9 SCC 1.</p> <pre> graph TD     A[Atbir vs. Govt. (NCT of Delhi), (2010) 9 SCC 1.] --&gt; B[Declaration true and voluntarily - base its conviction without any further corroboration]     A --&gt; C[D.D. is suspicious should not be acted upon without corroborative evidence.]     A --&gt; D[Even if it is a brief statement it not to be Discarded. Merely because D.D. does not contain all the details as to the occurrence, it is not to be rejected]           </pre> <p>The Hon'ble Apex Court summed up the legal principles governing a dying declaration.</p>
98.	B	Section 53 A of the Act, was inserted vide criminal law (Amendment) Act, 2013 on the basis of recommendation given by Hon'ble Justice J.S. Verma Committee report in the aftermath of the Nirbhaya Rape incident
99.	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From <b>not any person</b> rather from a person in authority.</li> <li>In the <b>opinion of court</b> be sufficient to give the accused person grounds, which would appear to him reasonable, for supposing that by making it he would gain any advantage or avoid any evil of a temporal nature in reference to the proceedings against him.</li> </ul>
100.	A	R.K. Dalmia vs. Delhi Administration, AIR 1962 (SC) 1821
101.	A	Statement 3 and 7 both are wrong
102.	C	Statement 4 and 7 both are wrong
103.	A	As per explanation to section 48 of the Act, it includes custom or rights common to any considerable class of persons.
104.	A	Chapter – three
105.	B	The written admission is admissible only
106.	D	Section 72 of the Act
107.	A	Nine illustration

108.	C	Section 89 of the Act
109.	D	It satisfies the requirements of both sections 64 and section 65 of the Act.
110.	B	Section 67 A of the Act
111.	D	When eyewitness affirms that the deceased was not in a fit state to make the declaration, medical opinion cannot prevail.
112.	A	Section 103 of the Act
113.	C	Section 114 A of the Act
114.	D	Section 65 B of the Act
115.	D	Section 91 of the Act
116.	A	To decide what the law is and not to make it.
117.	B	A party is not to be heard to allege the contrary
118.	A	Not applicable to admission
119.	D	Statement 1 - not equivalent Statement 3 – cannot be said to be interested Statement 6 – not pedantic
120.	D	Conviction can be based
121.	B	Nandlal Wasudeo Badwaik vs. Lata Nandlal Badwaik, (2014) 2 SCC 576
122.	B	Section 112 of the Act - He is the father whom the marriage indicates.
123.	A	Goutam Kundu vs. State of West Bengal and another AIR 1993 SC 2295
124.	A	Bhiva Doulu Patil vs. State of Maharashtra AIR 1963 SC 599
125.	A	Sheikh Zakir Hussain vs. State of Bihar (1983) 2 Cr LC 447 (SC)
126.	A	Balwant Kaur vs. Union Territory of Chandigarh AIR 1988 SC 139
127.	B	Prosecutrix is competent witness. This section does not fall within ch -10 Not in exception rather in 'explanation' to section 118 of the Act
128.	D	Both (a) and (b)
129.	D	Both (b) and (c)
130.	B	Court witness
131.	C	Material witness

132.	C	Hostile witness
133.	C	Under section 136 of the Act - may ask – shall admit
134.	C	Both cross examined and re-examined
135.	D	The court shall permit.
136.	A	Bentham.
137.	D	Both (a) and (b)
138.	C	Statement 4 and 10 are wrong. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must not receive strict construction rather pragmatic and liberal construction.</li> <li>• Statement not to made any persons rather to any authority who is legally bound to investigate the fact.</li> </ul>
139.	C	Section 165 of the Act
140.	A	State of Rajasthan vs. Ani, 1977 SC
141.	B	Two Judge bench – Hon'ble R.K. Agrawal and A.K. Sikri JJ. Author – Hon'ble R.K. Agrawal, J Date – 16 April, 2018
142.	A	Two judge bench - Hon'ble Mr. sanjay kishan kaul, Hemant Gupta, JJ Author - Hon'ble Hemant Gupta, J Date – 21 february 2019
143.	A	Two judge bench – Hon'ble Mr. A.M. Khanwilkar, Ajay Rastogi, JJ Author – Hon'ble Ajay Rastogi, J Date 15 february 2019
144.	A	Two judge bench – Hon'ble Mr. mohan M Shantanagoudar, Dinesh Maheshwari JJ Author – Hon'ble Mr. Mohan M Shantanagoudar Date – 19.2.2019
145.	A	Delhi higher judicial service (pre) examination 2013
146.	C	Delhi higher judicial service (pre) examination 2009
147.	B	M.P. higher judicial service (pre) examination 2016
148.	A	M.P. higher judicial service (pre) examination 2011
149.	B	This definition is given by “Taylor”.

150.	C	As per section 3 of the Act, evidence means and include – 1) all statement by the witnesses, either court permits or require to be made. 2) all documents including electronic records – produced for inspection of court. Therefore, definition of evidence doesnot include all the five things given in question. [ Batuk Lal, page 2]
151.	A	The position of presumption of fact is uncertain and transitory and it is the presumption of law whose position is certain and uniform. [ Batuk lal, page 82]
152.	A	Relevancy is based on logic and probability wheras admissibility on strict rules of law and not upon logic.
153.	B	Relevancy of character is given from section 52 to 55 of the Act and the general rule about the admissibility of character is that from a party's character his liability cannot be presumed.
154.	C	Section 157 of the Evidence Act, allows a witness to be corroborated by proof that he said the same thing on the previous occasion. Either about the time of occurrence OR before the competent authority.
155.	B	Section 165 of the Act, a court is authorised to make use of statements made by witnesses during the course of investigation. <b>[Raghunandan vs. State of U.P, AIR 1974 SC 463]</b>
156.	D	Section 114 (g) of the Act lays down that if evidence which can be produced is not produced it may be presumed that if produced it would be unfavourable to the person who withheld it.
157.	C	The proverb embodies the principle of Section 110 of the Act [Batuk lal, page 514]
158.	B	Oral evidence is permitted to remove latent ambiguity but no oral evidence is allowed to remove patent ambiguity.
159.	B	Javed Alam vs. State of Chhattisgarh (2009) 6 SCC 450
160.	B	Stephen in his digest of the law of Evidence.
161.	A	Pyare lal bhargava vs. state of rajasthan, 1963 (2) Cr LJ 178 at 181 (SC)
162.	A	Arjuna lal mishra vs. state cr LJ 1633 at 1635 (SC)
163.	B	AIR 1961 SC 1808
164.	A	Pulukuri kotayya vs. king emperor privy council (1946-47) 74 1A 65
165.	C	<u>Statement VIII</u> – It is fairly settled that the expression ‘fact discovered’ includes not only the physical object produced but also the place from which it is produced and the knowledge of the accused as to this. <b>[Mohammed Inayatullah vs. State of Maharashtra AIR 1976 SC 483 at 486].</b>  <u>Statement IX</u> - recived from accused of an offence.  <u>Statement X</u> - <i>State of U.P. vs. Deoman Upadhaya, 1960 Cr LJ 1504 at page</i>

		1512 (SC)
166.	C	<b>Haricharan Kurmi vs. State of Bihar, 1964 (2) Cr LJ 344 at 349 (SC).</b>
167.	D	Either (a), (b) or (c) – Explanation to section 47 of the Act.
168.	D	<b>Rajendra Pralhadrao Wasnik vs. State of Maharashtra, 2019 Cri LJ 955 (SC)</b>
169.	C	As per section 61 of the Act – contents of documents may be proved either by primary or secondary evidence. [also read section 59 of the Act].
170.	D	All statements are correct [ <b>Roop Kumar vs. Mohan Thedani, AIR 2003 SC 2418 at P. 2425</b> ].
171.	C	Except statement 2, all are correct
172.	D	Section 106 of the Act
173.	A	All statements are correct
174.	D	All the above
175.	D	All the above
176.	C	Either (a) or (b)
177.	B	Things done in one action cannot be taken as evidence in another, unless it is between the same parties
178.	D	Section 60 of the Act
179.	C	Law commission of India, 21 <sup>st</sup> report, 10 August 1988 on Dowry Death and Law reforms
180.	C	Section 90 of the Act
181.	D	All the above
182.	B	The burden of proof rests upon him who affirms, not upon him who denies
183.	A	<i>Allegans contraria non est audiendus</i>
184.	D	All of the above
185.	A	Total 167 sections
186.	B	A patent ambiguity cannot be cleared by extrinsic evidence
187.	A	False in one thing mean false in every thing – this Maxim is not applicable in India.
188.	B	Section 136 of the Act
189.	A	Section 135 of the Act

190.	C	Section 113 of the Act
191.	D	All the above.
192.	A	Clause 2 of section 63 of the Act
193.	B	Any kind of proof whatever, although not strictly in accordance with legal rules, and not resorted to when any other better evidence can be adduced
194.	B	A latent ambiguity may be removed by parol evidence for an ambiguity which arises from an extrinsic fact may be removed by proof of such of fact
195.	A	Section 145, 146 and 153(3) of the Act.
196.	D	All the above
197.	A	It was the two judge bench. [ <b>Hon'ble Aftab Alam and R.M. Lodha, JJ</b> ] [ <b>Pronounced by – Hon'ble R.M. Lodha, J</b> ]
198.	B	It was the two judge bench. [ <b>Hon'ble P. Sathasivam and B.S. Chauhan</b> ] [ <b>Pronounced by – Hon'ble P. Sathasivam, J</b> ]
199.	D	It was the <b>five judge</b> bench. [the all four given in the options and also <b>A.N. Grover. J</b> ] [ <b>Pronounced by – Hon'ble G.K.Mitter, J</b> ]
200.	C	It is the principal of law that nothing odious or dishonourable will be presumed by the law.