BLOGS

Learn in a Minute: Burden of Proof

Ruchika Mohapatra · 14 Jun 2025

What is Burden of Proof?

Burden of proof refers to the obligation imposed on a party to prove or disprove a disputed fact in a case. It determines which side bears the responsibility of presenting evidence and the level of proof required to establish their claim.

Black's Law Dictionary defines the burden of proof as "the obligation of a party to establish a fact or issue in dispute by presenting sufficient evidence." The Indian Evidence Act, 1872, in Section 101, defines it as the obligation of a party to prove the existence or non-existence of a fact.

Types of Burden of Proof

The burden of proof is categorized into two main types:

Legal (or Persuasive) Burden

The legal burden remains fixed on the party that brings a claim or charges another party. In criminal cases, the prosecution carries the burden of proving the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. In civil cases, the plaintiff bears the burden of proof, which is usually based on the preponderance of probabilities.

Evidential (or Tactical) Burden

This burden shifts between parties during the course of proceedings. Once the prosecution presents a prima facie case, the evidential burden may shift to the defence to refute the claims. In civil disputes, if the plaintiff presents a credible case, the defendant must counter the allegations with sufficient evidence.

For example, if a landlord sues a tenant for unpaid rent, the landlord must first prove that the rent was due. If that is established, the burden shifts to the tenant to prove payment or a valid reason for non-payment.

Burden of Proof in Criminal Cases

In criminal law, the burden of proof primarily lies on the prosecution. The accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty. This principle is enshrined in Section 101 of the Indian Evidence Act, which places the duty on the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt.

For example, if a person is accused of theft, the prosecution must provide evidence like fingerprints, CCTV footage, or testimony from an eyewitness before a conviction can be secured.

Presumption of Innocence

One of the cornerstones of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence. Courts require strong and convincing evidence before convicting an accused. This principle was upheld in **Woolmington v. DPP**, where the House of Lords held that the prosecution must prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Reginald Woolmington was accused of murdering his wife. He claimed that he had no intention of killing her and that the gun had discharged accidentally while he was attempting to scare her. The trial judge instructed the jury that, in murder cases, the burden was on the defendant to prove any defense, such as accident or lack of intent. Woolmington was convicted and sentenced to death.

The key legal question was whether the prosecution must prove the defendant’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, or if the burden shifts to the accused to prove their innocence.

The House of Lords overturned the conviction, emphasizing that in criminal cases, the burden of proof lies on the prosecution throughout the trial. The prosecution must prove the accused’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and the defendant does not have to prove their innocence.

Exceptions to the General Rule

In some cases, the law presumes guilt, and the accused must prove their innocence or establish a defence. These are typically found in special statutes dealing with serious offences. Some examples include:

- Dowry Death Cases (Section 304B IPC): The accused must disprove the presumption that the woman was subjected to cruelty related to dowry before her death.
- NDPS Act Cases: Under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, if a person is found in possession of contraband, the burden shifts to the accused to prove their innocence.
- Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 [Section 20]: If a public servant is found in possession of disproportionate assets or accepts illegal gratification, the court presumes that the gratification was accepted as a bribe unless the accused proves otherwise.
- Section 105 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 states that if an accused claims a legal exception (e.g., self-defense under Section 96-106 IPC), the burden is on them to prove it. However, they only need to prove it on the balance of probabilities, not beyond a reasonable doubt.

Burden of Proof in Civil Cases

Unlike criminal cases, civil law follows a different standard for the burden of proof. The plaintiff must establish their case based on a preponderance of probabilities rather than beyond a reasonable doubt. In civil cases, the party with the stronger evidence and higher probability of truth prevails.

In a breach of contract case, if the plaintiff provides signed documents and email correspondence showing that the defendant failed to perform contractual obligations, the burden shifts to the defendant to refute these claims.

For example, if a car buyer sues a dealer for failing to deliver a purchased car, the dealer must provide evidence (e.g., bank statements, delivery records) showing that the car was indeed delivered or that there was a valid reason for the delay.

Conclusion

The burden of proof is a fundamental principle that upholds fairness in both civil and criminal proceedings. While the prosecution bears the burden in criminal cases, plaintiffs hold it in civil disputes. However, the burden may shift depending on case-specific facts and legal provisions.

Read More: How to File a Plaint?