



sciendo

BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW & POLITICS

A Journal of Vytautas Magnus University

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 4 (2022)

ISSN 2029-0454

Cite: *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 15:4 (2022): 791-799

DOI: 10.2478/bjlp-2022-004072

A Study on the Issues and Challenges of Forensic Science under the Criminal Justice System

N.K.Susruthan

LLM (Criminal Law) Saveetha School of Law Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences (SIMATS) Chennai-600077.

Dr. Asha Sundaram

Professor, Saveetha school of Law, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science (SIMATS) Chennai-600077.

Received: August 8, 2022; reviews: 2; accepted: November 29, 2022.

Abstract

Forensic science is the application of various disciplines of science to legal matters. Forensic science is an application and procedure involved mainly on the criminal side during the criminal investigation and is governed by the legal standards of admissibility of evidence and criminal procedure. The problems in forensic science typically tend to contribute to many wrongful convictions at times. The crisis in forensic science is a complex global challenge which brings an impact on the criminal justice system. The methods which are involved and handled at times result in wrongful convictions. Quality standards for forensic evidence sometimes remain inconsistent. This inconsistency brings a lot of discrepancies while coming to a conclusion. The problem arises mainly because of the investigators' reckless negligence, including forensic experts and police officials. The main challenge that influences the criminal justice system is unreliability or invalidness of forensic discipline, insufficient validation of a method and misleading testimony. The paper elucidates the role and applicability of forensic Science in the criminal justice system, the impediments involved in the forensic investigative procedure and its impacts on the criminal Trial and also the scientific challenges and problems in retrieving forensic evidence. The Non-empirical approach is adopted for the study based on published information from journals, reports and newsletters from secondary sources. This paper aims to explore the challenges and impediments involved in the role of forensic science in criminal trials and highlights the role and applicability of forensic Science.

Keywords

Forensic Science, Criminal Justice System, Unreliability, Investigation and Discrepancy

INTRODUCTION

Forensic science is having the greatest impact on society. The crime that occurs in the current society is changing daily and from time to time. Forensic Science is defined as "The application of science to those criminal and civil laws that are enforced by the police agencies in a criminal justice system". The term "forensics" comes from the Latin word "forensis," which means "Forum" or "gathering of people." The natural sciences began to experience a period of tremendous development from the beginning of

the 19th century. The pursuit of justice has always involved the search for evidence free from bias, as opposed to the testimony of unwilling, hostile, or indifferent witnesses. Forensic scientists examine and interpret evidence in order to bring justice to the victim. The field of forensic science is concerned with the integration of scientific theory and practice into the investigation and resolution of legal disputes. Medical, physical, forensic, chemical, biological, genetic, electronic, and engineering fields are all called upon in the course of evidence processing. When it comes to the criminal justice system, forensic science is an important component. Investigations rely heavily on the analysis of physical evidence and scientific data acquired at the site of a crime. The suspect's unique characteristics are explained by forensic science. But some lacunae are involved in the application of forensic science. This lacuna creates an impact and crisis in the criminal justice system by creating ambiguity in the criminal proceedings. The problems which are concerned in forensic science typically tend to contribute to many wrongful convictions at times. The crisis in forensic science is a complex global challenge which brings an impact on the criminal justice system. The methods which are involved and handled at times result in wrongful convictions. This inconsistency brings a lot of discrepancies while coming to a conclusion. The problem arises mainly because of the investigators' reckless negligence, including forensic experts and police officials. The main challenge that influences the criminal justice system is unreliability or invalidness of forensic discipline, insufficient validation of a method and misleading testimony. Even with all of the advances in technology, the Indian public's traditional attitude is the primary element that is dragging down the utilisation of contemporary forensic investigative methods. If evidence is deemed inadmissible, It is not admissible as evidence in any judicial proceeding, such as a hearing or trial. A witness's statement, for instance, is irrelevant since it neither proves or disproves any fact in the case. In such a situation, the remark cannot be placed into the record as evidence and neither party may use it to show or deny a fact in dispute. It would not be presented in court. In light of this, it is essential that the evidence is properly examined and analysed prior to a hearing or trial. In the majority of instances, this requires the help of an experienced trial attorney in civil proceedings and a criminal defence attorney in a criminal trial, i.e., advocates who are familiar with the rules of evidence for the court in which the procedure is held. Defendants' attorneys must suppress any inadmissible evidence in order to protect their client's chances of obtaining freedom or less severe penalties. A qualified Advocate should be able to challenge any irrelevant or untrustworthy evidence used against you by the prosecution. When the prosecution introduces irrelevant and untrustworthy evidence, your attorney should work to persuade the court to suppress the evidence on the grounds that it is inadmissible.

For evidence to be admissible in court, the chain of custody is the most essential requirement to maintain. The chain of custody is a document or record that describes the chronological sequence of individuals who come into contact with the evidence, beginning with where evidence is taken from the crime scene, who collected the evidence is described, and who transferred the evidence from the scene of the crime, and who will produce the evidence in court. Evidence that lacks a chain of custody is not admissible in court. This record also ensures that if the evidence is tampered with or destroyed, who must be held accountable during the act of tampering or destroying? The chain of custody of evidence begins with the first officer arriving at the crime scene and continues with each officer who handles the evidence at various stages. Confidentiality is also jeopardised when the chain of custody is broken. In a court of law, evidence without a chain of custody is inadmissible. The term "hearsay" implies something that is not directly heard. Hearsay evidence is any information obtained from a person who has firsthand knowledge of a fact or information. This type of evidence is not admissible in court because the witness may include additional information with their testimony or may not tell the whole truth. Such testimony is inadmissible since any person is capable of lying and blaming another for rescuing them or evading punishment. Relevance and trustworthiness, which are the primary criteria for admission of evidence, are challenged here. Expert testimony can only be used if it is given by an expert and not by someone

who is not an expert. A non-expert cannot testify as an expert, and his or her evidence is inadmissible. The definition of expert testimony may be found in Section 45 of the Indian Evidence Act of 1872. Expert opinion is the view of specialists on a certain topic. When a court or judge wishes to form an opinion regarding foreign law, science, art, or the identity of handwriting or finger impressions, relevant facts include the opinions of persons specially skilled in such foreign law, science, or art, or in questions regarding the identity of handwriting or finger impressions. Section 45A defines the opinion of the examiner of electronic evidence: "When in a proceeding, the court must make an opinion about any information communicated or kept in any computer resource or other electronic or digital form, the examiner's opinion is necessary." The opinion of the expert is often known as the examiner's opinion on electronic evidence. The report of an expert is inadmissible unless the expert provides reasons or justifications for his assessment and his evidence is put to the test by the opposing party during cross-examination. The advocates or lawyers who represent either the prosecution or the defence counsel present evidence to support their respective parties. The court rejects all of that evidence. This evidence is not accepted because, at times, the evidence produced is not properly checked by the lawyers, which can be irrelevant and mislead the court, as well as waste court time. The evidence is not admissible unless it is relevant and has a significant impact on the trial. Lawyers gather evidence in order to support their client's position and cannot be blamed for producing inadmissible evidence. Deception detection tests, also known as narco-analysis, polygraphy, and lie detector tests, are known procedures used to recover truth from the accused or to determine whether the accused lies in his or her confession. Narco-analysis is performed on a semi-conscious person by administering a drug, whereas polygraph or lie detector tests are techniques used to record physiological responses to specific questions and determine whether they are telling the truth. This evidence is not admissible in court because they violate fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian constitution. In Article 20(3), "no person accused of an offence will be compelled to be a witness against oneself," and in Article 21, "Right to life and personal liberty," the right against cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment has been judicially enlarged.

Furthermore, these tests are not reliable enough because, in the case of a repeat offender, the person may have drug tolerance and thus be able to resist the effects of the drug, whereas in polygraph or lie detector tests, the person may not show any significant changes in the physical response in response to the questions asked by the investigating officer during the test. In the case of *Selvi and Ors vs State of Karnataka*, a landmark decision was made (2010). During the course of the investigation, the victim, witness, and accused were all forced to submit to a narco-analysis test without their consent. Based on the incident, the Indian Supreme Court has ordered that investigation officers not conduct deception detection tests without the person's consent.

The word "prejudicial" describes a bias that leads one to draw conclusions based on one's own personal history rather than on the available information. Evidence that is harmful, destructive, injurious, or biased without proving correct facts and that disturbs the jury or the judge without giving any important fact is called prejudicial evidence. Even if the suspect is innocent, the jury or judge could believe the suspect because of evidence from the past. The court might misinterpret the situation and throw out the evidence at hand if this happens. Therefore, the court will not consider the evidence presented in this instance. The outcome of the case is tainted as a result of this prejudice. Therefore, it's possible that justice will not be served here. Misleading evidence is evidence that the court should not accept because it might cause the judge to lose focus on the major issue or the heart of the case. In a case involving rape, for instance, it makes little difference what the minor's gender was because the primary fact to show is whether or not rape was performed on the minor.

Through clue materials, scientific evidence can be used to connect the criminal to the crime. The criminal at the crime scene either leaves clue materials at the crime scene, on the victim, or on the various items at the crime scene, or he picks them up from

them. If the clue materials are properly collected, preserved, dispatched, and evaluated, and their identity, integrity, and authenticity are unquestionable, they can serve as strong evidence against the perpetrator. A fingerprint, for example, may be discovered at a crime scene. The suspect is not legally permitted to enter the scene. If this fingerprint is identified as the suspect's, the suspect's involvement in the crime is confirmed. This evidence (fingerprint) must be collected. The collector must have adequate training and expertise, as well as sufficient experience for collection, preservation, and so on. If the investigator lacks sufficient knowledge and experience, as well as the most up-to-date tools, he will be unable to collect the clue materials correctly, and the evidence will be lost. Unfortunately, the current system of selection, training, and expertise maintenance is insufficient to meet his needs. Crime in our country (as in most other countries) is on the rise. The increase in the number of investigating officers has not kept up with the rise in crime. As a result, the investigator is unable to devote adequate time to the investigation of a case: locating, collecting, preserving, and properly evaluating clue materials. As a result, valuable evidence is squandered. The distances required to investigate various crimes are also considerable. The investigator's time, money, and labour are frequently wasted because by the time the investigator arrives at the crime scene, it has been tampered with by onlookers, curiosity seekers, and members of the families involved in the incident. In such cases, the investigator is unsure of the scientific support or value of the scientific evidence. Because he is unsure about the value of the evidence, he is hesitant to collect even undisturbed evidence left at the scene, which may still be valuable.

Evidence theft, mutilation, or destruction by suspect sympathisers is not uncommon. Even in the most heinous crimes, such as murders and dacoities, the corpus delicti can go missing. The time lag in arriving at the scene causes havoc once more. or because of their The veracity of evidentiary clues gathered from sources must be established beyond a reasonable doubt. Photographs and sketches must be used to identify the location from which they are collected. They must be collected in the presence of witnesses and sealed after the identification marks have been placed on the evidentiary clues whenever possible at the scene. At least two independent witnesses must attest to the collection and sealing of the evidence. The sealing is done to prevent the evidence from being replaced, mutilated, destroyed, or contaminated. The evidentiary clues that are prone to putrefying or disintegrating must be preserved so that the evidence is not destroyed by the time it is examined by the laboratory experts. The courts do not accept evidence as genuine if its authenticity is not proven beyond a reasonable doubt. It is frequently referred to as "padded evidence." It not only diminishes the value of the evidence linking the criminal to the crime but also casts doubt on the investigator. Communication between the investigator and the forensic scientists can help to eliminate uncertainties and improve understanding of the significance of scientific evidence. Most states now have forensic science laboratories. However, the staffing, equipment, and other facilities available in these laboratories are insufficient to meet the demands placed on most of these institutions' scientists. In addition, the workload is constantly increasing. It leads to delays and, in some cases, insufficient examination. These factors make the Investigating Officer even less likely to use the evidence. The investigator is overburdened with routine and non-investigative responsibilities. He rarely has time to update his knowledge, and as a result, he is unable to meet the challenges of the scientific criminal adequately. He still relies on third degree methods, which he finds effective in the early stages. The accused's confession boosts his self-esteem. The subsequent retraction of the confession in the trial courts embarrassed the investigating officer. However, it is too late at this point to gather new evidence that could aid him in convicting the culprit. In a nutshell, proof investigation problems necessitate: A reorientation of the investigator's training programmes. Providing the investigator with the necessary tools (Investigating Kit) to collect and use scientific evidence. Instilling and making him understand the truth that only scientific evidence can link the crime and the criminal with certainty and unambiguity. The clue content is pertinent. The clue is relevant if it is related to the case and provides information about the occurrence, the

culprit, his method of operation, the victim, and the sequence of occurrences, and so on. The assistance of witnesses who certify its collection adds to its significance.

The average person thinks of science as something precise and definite. As a result, he believes that forensic science should always deliver a definite judgement whenever the forensic scientist is asked a question. Exact science is a vague concept for non-scientists, especially among educated people such as attorneys and judges. There is no such thing as flawless or exact science. Every new scientific concept begins with a hypothesis. If this hypothesis holds true for a lot of related events, the hypothesis is referred to as a theory. If there are no obvious, or at least severe, inconsistencies in the experimental and theoretical data, the idea (hypothesis and theory) is widely accepted. This widespread acceptance is the result of much experimental and theoretical effort. There is a twilight time-zone before the widespread acceptance stage where the notion is thoroughly evaluated and apparent conflicts are explained. When a scientific notion has gained widespread acceptance, it is deemed a law. However, this law may be flawed because its consequences and studies were misinterpreted. Those who have studied even elementary science should be familiar with the law of matter's conservation. It has been stated that matter cannot be generated or destroyed. The law held true for a long time and was not only regarded as the perfect law, but was also repeatedly demonstrated in laboratories through tests. This law, however, was violated when Einstein demonstrated that matter and energy are interconvertible. Later, scientific experts used experiments to demonstrate inter-convertibility. Exact or perfect science has the same status in forensic science as it does in other sciences.

There is a widespread assumption that scientific proof is insufficient. That is not the case. In reality, scientific evidence is more substantial than oral evidence because it is objective. It is verifiable, unbiased, demonstrable evidence. Because of the inappropriate treatment of scientific data in the early phases of its induction, the idea that scientific evidence is weak evidence has arisen. Furthermore, the so-called experts who generated the proof in the early days were unqualified. The majority of them, particularly the handwriting specialists, were just self-proclaimed experts. They did have some traits, such as the gift of gab, the presence of mind, and a limitless capacity to tell tales, as well as the ability to captivate their clients, which kept them in the industry.

The real issue that confuses non-scientists is the scientific premise on which identifications in forensic science are founded, specifically the Law of Probability. The law establishes the likelihood of occurrence in a specific method out of a variety of ways in which an event can occur with equal ease. This law of likelihood underpins all identifications, definite or indeterminate, and even non-identifications. It is a logical concept. If the probability is sufficiently high, the possibility of the events occurring in a different order is ruled out for all practical purposes. However, mathematically, the chance of non-occurrence cannot be fully ruled out. For example, identifying a questioned fingerprint from a specimen is based on the discovery of common traits in the two fingerprints. The two prints may share ten ridge endpoints, ten ridge bifurcations, six short ridges, two islands, and two deltas. If we assume that ridge endings, bifurcations, and short ridges occur in one person out of every ten, and islands and deltas occur in one person out of every hundred, the likelihood of the patterns recurring is 1/10. Non-scientists do not understand the concept of practical identity. They believe the scientist has not provided a firm opinion. It's a reasonable assumption. As a result, forensic science is not an exact science. Perhaps the misconception stems from the fact that non-scientists equate mathematical probability with 'probability' in everyday language, where the word indicates something probable but not certain. Perhaps it was against this backdrop that a High Court Judge mocked an expert whose opinion was based on likelihood.'

There are gaps in the presentation of scientific evidence that has hampered its acceptance. The reports are provided without a statistical foundation. The statistical foundation for presenting information is outstanding and desirable. Most sorts of

evidence do not include statistical data for this purpose. It is possible, however, to understand that the identifications without a statistical basis are true because they are based on the expert's experience. A proper statistical foundation to demonstrate identification will make the evidence more reputable and assist the judges in better appreciating the evidence. Furthermore, it will be professionally fulfilling for all parties involved.

In the generation and presentation of forensic evidence, there is no quality control process. It should be incorporated into the system. The absolute rule should be to conduct blind examinations at irregular intervals. Integrity checks should be included in the system. If there are allegations of dishonesty, covert investigations should be conducted to determine the truth. A quality assurance panel should also review the equipment, methodologies, and data generated by the expert on a regular basis to provide both good and negative reports.

Standardisation of equipment and processes is vital in all scientific endeavours so that the findings of one institution do not differ from those of another. It should be possible to obtain some degree of uniformity in the scientific investigation of clue materials in forensic science if instruments and processes are standardised. Absolute standardisation, on the other hand, is not attainable for a variety of reasons. To begin, the hint material can be analysed using various tools and approaches. The instruments and procedures used by the scientists differ. Second, because new tools and techniques emerge so quickly, implementing them in multiple institutions at the same time is neither administratively viable nor desirable. Furthermore, tight uniformity will stymie the introduction of new tools and techniques, as well as inventions and research. As a result, it should be introduced only in broad strokes, leaving room for future developments, breakthroughs, and studies.

Accreditation of experts and institutions is critical for combating the threat of dishonest and unqualified experts. Of course, it must be done by a central government-authorised body of qualified forensic experts.

Are the tools and processes being employed adequate and up to date for generating the necessary data? Scientists have an unfortunate inclination to continue utilising the same tools and approaches that they used in training years ago. Newer instruments and techniques are frequently more sensitive, specific, and efficient. Has the expert made use of cutting-edge technology? If not, he should be forced to. Has the expert adhered to the standards established for the required data for his opinion in the report? If such criteria exist, he should be asked to meet them.

Unethical practice of a forensic expert regarding his qualifications and credentials

A forensic scientist is distinguished from other witnesses at the intersection of law and science by his qualifications and specialised expertise. His credibility as a witness depends solely on his experience in the field in which he is asked to testify. Over the past 50 years, the capacity of an expert to give evidence based on their knowledge has altered drastically. Once upon a time, a bioscience-trained forensic scientist could produce sufficient proof in areas such as blood, other biological fluids, and similar situations. In the realm of forensic evidence, however, independent fields such as biotechnology and molecular biology have evolved in recent years, as has the science of biology. As a result, expert testimony requires a substantial understanding of these topics. According to a study of attorneys and scientists involved with the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, the most significant ethical concern in the profession is competence. According to Section 1(b) of the American Academy of Forensic Science's Code, "no AAFS member shall materially misrepresent education, training, experience, or area of speciality." D.S. Manhas and J.R. Gaur of the Himachal Pradesh State Forensic Science Laboratory concurred and offered two ethical requirements: (1) Forensic

scientists should be technically competent and employ dependable techniques of analysis; (2) Forensic scientists should be truthful about their credentials or experience and restrict their reports to their field of competence. Evidently, the ethics of forensic science demand a forensic scientist to accurately identify his expert position while testifying as an expert on a particular issue. He should not overstate or embellish his credentials or experience. For instance, it is unethical to claim a PhD when one possesses merely a master's degree. Similarly, he must state precisely the number of papers he has authored on a certain topic and the number of seminars and training programmes he has attended. According to forensic ethics experts, erroneously estimating the dates and programmes attended during cross-examination by the defence attorney would constitute deception of status. Professional incompetence among forensic scientists is also viewed as a significant ethical implications. Every forensic scientist is obliged by law to demonstrate competence on a certain scientific exam. If, for instance, a bioscientist with little training in DNA typing assumes responsibility for a police case requiring DNA testing, he is in violation of forensic science ethics, even if the examination is successful. According to a forensic ethics author, a forensic scientist who seeks to deliver a scientific judgement on an issue for which he is unqualified is "cheating." In the same way, in India, some people may be called as court-appointed experts or defence experts to evaluate the scientific basis of an expert's evidence, even if they don't have the professional skills to do so. John F. Kelly and Phillip K. Wearne have demonstrated professional incompetence. Fred Salem Zain worked as a police forensics specialist in West Virginia and Texas for over fifteen years. In 1979, he was employed as a chemist by West Virginia's police crime lab and testified in dozens of rape and murder cases as an expert witness on tests he had never conducted and findings he had never acquired. In 1989, Zain was named director of serology at the office of the Bexar County Medical Examiner in San Antonio, Texas. When a Dallas forensics expert was requested to evaluate Zain's work, he detected fraud and forgery. In one case, Zain testified on blood evidence that was never discovered, and in others, he claimed to have conducted tests that his lab was incapable of doing. According to specialists in forensic science, not even the greatest crime lab in the world is immune to such unethical behaviour. Thomas Curran, an examiner in the FBI laboratory's serology branch, was deemed guilty of lying, incompetence, and fabrication in 1974, according to an internal FBI investigative report. In court, he claimed falsely that he had a bachelor's and master's degree in science, when he had neither. Likewise, it is unethical for an unqualified forensic scientist to testify about another forensic scientist's credentials, the legitimacy of a report, or his expertise. A notable author and professor of forensic science and law at George Washington University has highlighted several examples of unethical behaviour exhibited by forensic scientists when testifying in criminal trials. An FBI serologist falsely claimed that he had a master's degree in science when he had not even completed high school. In a similar fashion, the court found in a timely manner the fake claims of credentials made by a laboratory technician, serologist, psychologist, arson expert, and ballistics expert.

Some people believe that expert testimony should not be considered valid evidence since it is based on opinions rather than facts. That is not the case. Experiments are performed, and observations are made, by a knowledgeable person. The observations serve as the foundation for his findings, and those conclusions can be independently verified. Consequently, the evidence of the expert is a report of the facts. It is not evidence of someone's subjective view. When the courts refuse to acknowledge scientific advancements, they demonstrate their own level of ignorance, which in turn has a negative impact on the delivery of actual justice. It is evidence of facts that is based on evidence of the physical world. It is free of personal bias, feelings, and other such things. First and foremost, it can be checked. Experts merely provide the court with information regarding one facet of the evidence. There are further facets, some of which he possibly is not even aware of. The court takes into account all of the evidence that was presented. In the vast majority of instances, the court does not base its decision solely on the testimony of experts. In this context, it is important to highlight the following

statement made by Rogers, a well-known authority on evidence: The question of whether or not the expert's view would prove the very fact that the jury is tasked with determining is not the right way to evaluate whether or not the expert should be allowed to testify (court). It is not a usurpation of the powers of the jury to prove a truth that the jury will be responsible for finding, as the purpose of all testimony is to prove the same fact that will be found by the jury. There is complete agreement among the genuine and trustworthy specialists over the primary findings. They could have contrasting views on the total amount of weightage or the sufficiency of the data to prove their point at times. Genuine and trustworthy specialists can't hold two such opposing points of view in their heads at the same time. One of the various specialists is almost probably dishonest or, at the very least, completely incompetent. The genuine, trustworthy experts do not disagree with each other over the primary findings. When it comes to the amount of weightage or the sufficiency of the data for proof, they could not always agree with one another. Genuine and trustworthy specialists will never hold opinions that are diametrically opposed to one another. There is no question that at least one of the various experts is dishonest or, at the very least, inept.

RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

Misrepresentation of the credentials before the court of law of a forensic scientist or an expert must not misrepresent or overstate his qualifications if in the in case of such a situation strict implementation of rigorous punishment for misusing such forged educational degree (Example - Claiming an unearned Fake degree, PhD degree & False licences). There should be proper coordination between forensic medicine and forensic science. The integration of the services will improve the coordination and it will improve the quality of the services in total. Maintaining the integrity, accountability and credibility of the forensic scientific evidence plays an important role in solving the criminal investigation by providing crucial information about evidence. There should be the maintenance of true and accurate representation of data- The person should not be judgmental in analysing and reporting the evidence. There should be clear and complete documentation such as maintaining the chain of custody which is a legal proceeding which should be followed to maintain the integrity of the evidence in a court of law. There should be Impartiality in the examination, that is, the examination should have to be conducted in a manner which is fair and bonafide to produce evidence in a court of law. There should be no prejudicial and impartiality in the testimony- The testimony should not be biased and found to be an inaccurate or misleading statement in which for the sake of the attorney or the public prosecutor. Maintaining confidentiality and disclosure of information brings a greater impact in a court of law. Data is confidential and should only be disclosed in a court of law and by police investigative officers. Should always have a professional's ethical code in reporting colleagues or any officers who violate the rules and regulations by being influenced by any sort of illegal activities such as involving in corruption and taking illegal gratification. There should be strict enforceability of punishments and liabilities such as executing the cancellation licence permanently and accreditation is done when there is a breach of confidential information and also who are involved indulging in the malpractice. Forensic laboratories and forensic experts of governmental and private organisations should constantly be in touch with the police and the prosecution so that there are sometimes when they can coordinate to work together with them to procure and evaluate the results which will lead to a conviction, regardless of the actual truth. Over the last two decades, the forensic sciences have achieved tremendous scientific advances (DNA typing, physical evidence databases, and new scientific apparatus), but more research is needed to analyse the role and influence of scientific evidence in criminal case processing. Forensic science, as of now in India, has a lot of scope to improve. Forensic science plays a major role in the criminal justice system. The outcome of the forensic science investigation is the main evidence that is being produced in a court of law. Forensic science in India is found and covered with high legal standards in order to determine the accuracy in the field. In this study, it is evidently found that the respondents have given their opinion on the issues

and challenges of forensic evidence in criminal trials. Hence, based on the responses given by the respondents from various fields of expertise , An alternative hypothesis is being proved. So there are significant challenges and hindrances to forensic evidence's admissibility that impact the criminal justice system. Despite the existence of a structure, it must include even more enhancements to the quality of forensic scientific practises in laboratories, error identification and prevention, information transparency, and just and accurate results.