AILET

Understanding Circumstantial Evidence and the ‘Last Seen Together’ Theory

Adtiya Aryan · 13 Mar 2026

In the dramatic world of a courtroom, we often imagine a trial hinging on a single “Eureka!” moment, an eyewitness pointing a finger, or a confession blurted out on the stand. This is known as **direct evidence**. But in reality, most serious crimes happen in secret, far from any prying eyes. So how does the justice system solve them? The answer lies in a more common, and often more powerful, tool: **circumstantial evidence**.

This post will break down the essential concept of circumstantial evidence for you, the aspiring lawyer. We’ll explore why it’s not “weaker” evidence, the high standard of proof it demands, and one of its most famous (and frequently misunderstood) applications, the ‘Last Seen Together’ theory.

Direct vs. Circumstantial Evidence: The Basic Difference

First, let’s get the core definitions straight.

- Direct Evidence: This is evidence that, if believed, directly proves a fact in issue without needing any inference. The classic example is an eyewitness who testifies, “I saw the accused stab the victim.” Here, the testimony (the evidence) directly links to the crime (the fact in issue).
- Circumstantial Evidence: This is indirect evidence. It doesn’t prove the main fact (the crime) directly, but it proves a set of related facts. From these related facts, a court can logically infer that the main fact happened.

Think of it as a puzzle. Direct evidence is like having the picture on the box. Circumstantial evidence is like having 100 puzzle pieces that, when put together, form a complete and undeniable picture.

Is Circumstantial Evidence “Weak” Evidence?

This is one of the biggest myths in law. Many believe that a case based on circumstantial evidence is inherently weak. This is incorrect. The Supreme Court of India has repeatedly held that a conviction can be based *solely* on circumstantial evidence.

Why? A single eyewitness (direct evidence) can lie, be mistaken, or be intimidated. But it is much harder to fabricate a whole series of circumstances that all point in one direction. A "rope" of circumstantial evidence, each strand woven together, can often be far stronger than a single "chain" of direct evidence.

The 'Panchsheel' – The Five Golden Principles

Because a person's liberty is at stake, the courts have set an extremely high standard for convicting someone based on circumstantial evidence alone. The landmark case that laid down this test is ***Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra* (1984)**.

This judgment established the "Panchsheel" (Five Golden Principles) that the prosecution must satisfy:

1. The circumstances must be fully established: Each "fact" or "link" in the chain (motive, opportunity, fingerprints, etc.) must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. You can't base an inference on another inference.
2. The circumstances must be consistent with guilt: The facts, when taken together, must only be consistent with the idea that the accused is guilty.
3. The circumstances must be conclusive: The evidence must be decisive and leave no room for ambiguity.
4. The circumstances must exclude all other hypotheses: This is the most critical rule. The evidence must not only show that the accused could have committed the crime, but that only the accused must have committed it. If the evidence suggests even one other plausible explanation or hypothesis of innocence, the accused gets the benefit of the doubt.
5. The chain must be complete: The chain of evidence must be so complete that it leaves no reasonable ground for a conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused.

Introducing the 'Last Seen Together' Theory

Now, let's look at a famous type of circumstantial evidence: the 'Last Seen Together' theory.

The principle is simple: If the victim was last seen alive and well in the company of the accused, and soon after, the victim is found dead, the court will naturally ask the accused to explain what happened. If the accused cannot provide a reasonable or believable explanation for how, when, and where they parted company, a strong inference can be drawn that they are responsible for the victim's death.

The Legal Basis – Shifting the Burden with Section 106

This theory gets its legal force from **Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872**.

This section states that when any fact is *especially within the knowledge* of any person, the burden of proving that fact is upon them.

Let's apply this: The accused and the victim are alone in a locked room. The victim is found dead. What happened in that room is a fact "especially within the knowledge" of the accused. The law doesn't expect the prosecution to be a fly on the wall. Therefore, the burden *of explanation* shifts to the accused.

Important: This does *not* reverse the burden of proof. The prosecution *always* has the primary duty to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. It must first *firmly establish* the "last seen" fact. Only after the prosecution has built this strong foundation does the burden shift to the accused to explain it.

The Crucial Caveats – Time Gap and Sole Basis

This is where many cases- and many law students' arguments fall apart. The 'Last Seen Together' theory is not an automatic 'guilty' verdict. It has two major limitations.

1. It Cannot Be the Sole Basis for Conviction

The 'last seen' theory is only **one link** in the chain of circumstantial evidence. It is never, by itself, enough to convict. The prosecution must provide other corroborating evidence to complete the chain. This could include:

- A clear motive for the crime.
- Recovery of the murder weapon from the accused.
- The accused absconded (running away) after the incident.

- The accused gives a false explanation or tells lies, which shows a guilty conscience.

1. The “Time Gap” is Everything

This is the make-or-break factor. The strength of the ‘last seen’ theory is directly proportional to how small the time gap is between the accused and victim being seen together, and the victim being found dead.

- Strong Case (Short Gap): The accused and victim are seen entering an apartment at 8 PM. At 8:30 PM, other residents hear a gunshot. The victim is found dead, and the accused is seen fleeing. Here, the time gap is so small that the possibility of any other person intervening is almost zero.
- Weak Case (Long Gap): The accused and victim are seen together on Monday. The victim’s body was found on Wednesday. This two-day gap is massive. A dozen other people could have met the victim at that time. The ‘last seen’ theory becomes almost meaningless here.

Conclusion

Circumstantial evidence is the backbone of the criminal justice system, allowing courts to find the truth in cases where there are no eyewitnesses. But to use it, the law demands an exceptionally high standard of proof, a complete, unbroken chain where every link points *only* to the guilt of the accused. The ‘Last Seen Together’ theory is a powerful link in that chain, but it is only as strong as the other evidence that supports it and the time gap that defines it.