Paradigm Academic Press
Law and Economy
ISSN 2788-7049
MAR. 2024 VOL.3, NO.3

The Witness Must Speak the Truth

Siniša Franjić[1]

[1] Independent Researcher, Europe

Correspondence: Siniša Franjić, Independent Researcher, Europe.

doi:10.56397/LE.2024.03.04

Abstract

At the beginning of the testimony, the witness will be warned that he is obliged to tell everything he knows about the case, as well as that giving a false testimony is a criminal act. A witness may be asked to promise to tell the truth. After that, he or she will be asked for personal information and the relationship with the defendant and the injured party. He will be invited to present everything he knows about the subject, and then he will be asked questions for verification, completion and clarification. He or she will always be asked how he or she knows what he or she is testifying about. If the witness stated facts that he no longer remembers during the previous examination or if he or she deviates from his testimony, he or she will be presented with the previous testimony and will be asked why he is testifying differently now.

Keywords: witness, eyewitness, ASB, evidence, court

1. Introduction

The witnesses may be encouraged or compelled to go to the procedures (Singh, C., 2023). Once the witness has gone to the procedures, the essential address is whether they are competent to testify. Extra issues concern the introduction of their declaration on oath or subject to a solemn affirmation. Especially, a witness may deliver unsworn evidence. At last, the person may require a few help in arrange to testify. The judge has locale to form uncommon measures bearings which will help the witness in this respect.

The criminal process is outlined to come full circle in a conclusive showdown between the parties at trial (Doak, J. & McGourlay, C., 2009). The criminal trial includes questions of both law and truth. In trials on arraignment, the common run the show is that questions of law are to be chosen by the trial judge, whereas questions of reality are to be chosen by the jury. Hence things such as the competence of witnesses, the acceptability of prove and things relating to the substantive law are things of law for the judge, while those such as the validity of a witness, the weight to be joined to the evidence, and the presence or non-existence of the actualities in issue are questions of reality, and will be determined by the jury. Within the case of trials within the magistrates' courts, the lay judges or stipendiary officers will decide questions of both law and reality, and will regularly depend intensely on the lawfully qualified clerk in choosing questions of law.

2. Person

In both gracious and criminal cases the parties will make courses of action with their witnesses to go to the court (Singh, C., 2023). Earlier to the date of the trial, the witness would have made a witness articulation in composing and it would be on the premise of such assertions that the party wishes the witness to testify. There's no general principle that the witness isn't permitted to see their articulation a brief whereas some time recently testifying. The method of testifying isn't designed to be a test of memory but an exertion to show the truth in court, subject to rules of acceptable evidence.

In the event that a party is mindful that there's a potential witness who is compellable, but unwilling to go to the court in arrange to maintain a strategic distance from testifying, at that point that party may apply for a witness

summons or arrange requiring the witness to go to on the pertinent dates. The taking after two conditions are required to be satisfied some time recently a court will issue such a summons:

• that the person is likely to be able to allow material evidence

• that their presence in court is necessary within the interests of justice

On the off chance that the individual named within the witness arrange falls flat to go to the procedures without legal excuse, a warrant may be issued for their capture in arrange to secure participation. Where thewitness, without legal excuse, denies to reply questions put to them, at that point they may be found guiltworthy of disdain of court. The court incorporates a run of powers for managing with contempt, including imprisonment.

3. Eyewitness

Eyewitness identification issues can also be tended to from the point of view of the courts (Sporer, S. L. & Cutler, B. L., 2003). Eyewitnesses don't convict defendants, judges and juries do. The United States equity framework has different shields that are outlined to secure defendants from wrong conviction coming about from mistaken identification. These conventional shields incorporate: (1) having an attorney present at identification tests, (2) allowing attorneys to submit movements to have identifications smothered in case they were gotten through profoundly suggestive methods, (3) excusing from benefit jurors who are incapable or unwilling to autonomously weigh eyewitness evidence, (4) cross-examination of important witnesses at trial, and (5) cautionary enlightening almost eyewitness testimony.

In spite of the fact that these shields are supportive, they are of restricted viability and don't illuminate the issue of incorrect conviction coming about from mixed up identification. Significant investigate has recorded the inadequacy of these shields. Most distinguishing pieces of proof are from photographic lineups, and defense attorneys are rarely show at photographic lineups (the suspect has no legitimate right to representation at photographic lineups). Moreover, attorneys are regularly not show at live lineups. An absent attorney cannot avoid suggestive strategies or note them for future challenges. The "nearness of advise" protect, in this manner, isn't exceptionally supportive. Assist, indeed when attorneys are display, they are constrained by their fragmented understanding of how to assess lineups.

Movements to stifle are moreover of restricted adequacy since judges, who run the show on these motions, don't have a complete understanding of the components that affect the suggestiveness of lineups. For cross-examination to be viable, lawyers must know the proper questions to inquire witnesses, and attendants must have a strong understanding of how to assess lineups. Not one or the other bunch shows up to have the essential information. Indeed a large volume of investigate demonstrates the unsteadiness of lay peoples' evaluations of onlooker declaration. Final, judges' enlightening are of limited adequacy, at slightest in portion since the enlightening themselves need valuable data. The normal informational don't , for illustration, clarify how to assess lineups.

4. ASB

There has been expanding intrigued within the part of the community and casualties in working with the police to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) (Bryant, R. & Bryant, S., 2016). The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (ASBCPA) gives a few generally modern approaches which point to change the way in which ASB episodes are overseen, by centering on the affect on the casualty and less on the conduct itself. In expansion, nearby specialists, the police, and courts presently have modern powers to handle ASB, supplanting prior intercessions such as Anti-social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) since the method of application was moderate, bureaucratic, and costly. In expansion, the ASBO failed to alter the conduct of perpetrators, who at that point went on to commit breaches. Theorders subsequently did not give long-term protection to casualties and communities.

The ASBCPA given unused powers and directives to assist the police and nearby specialists address ASB and clutter. In terms of these powers ASB is broadly categorized as lodging related and non-housing related. Non-housing related ASB happens in a public put such as a shopping area or city centre. Lodging or residency related ASB on the other hand will incorporate debate between neighbors over way of life clashes, tall fences, litter, clamor boundary debate, and the conduct of children. It too incorporates more genuine episodes of ASB, where the conduct of one family causes genuine issues inside a entirety neighborhood and may include badgering, viciousness, and culpability.

5. Evidence

In displaying evidence in a criminal trial, witness testimony demonstrates to be an outright need, since no actual evidence can be presented without a witness (Ingram, J. L., 2018). Witnesses may be classified as either lay or master, with lay witnesses for the most part replying "who," "what," "where," and "when" sorts of questions, while expert witnesses are allowed to offer suppositions and reply "how" and "why" sorts of questions.

Regularly, criminal cases include declaration by observers, police officers, parole and probation officers, and restorative officers, who offer testimony based on their particular firsthand information of the truths of a specific case. These and other witnesses offer the court and jury critical truths and help in presenting story prove of what they watched at the crime scene or other relevant area. Witnesses are basic to present physical and narrative prove to the court for jury thought. When legitimately presented, the witnesses' declaration "paints" a picture of the agent realities of the indictment or the defense case. The jury must assess the witnesses for honesty, and hence, it is imperative to recognize that the jury must consider not only the content of a witness's declaration but moreover the witness's deportment and delivery. For this reason, a trial witness must have a few concern approximately his or her deportment, the strategy of showing the actualities, tone of voice, and indeed his or her dress. In spite of the fact that the heading of witness interrogation falls to the attorneys, it is critical that all witnesses donate answers that are responsive to the questions actually inquired, clarifying completely each piece of prove in setting, so that the jury can get it its significance.

Since witnesses bring the prove to the consideration of the court and jury, getting, and some of the time compelling, the participation of witnesses for both parties demonstrates fundamental to the organization of equity and may be required beneath the obligatory prepare clause of the Sixth Alteration. Respondents have the right to compel the court attendance of witnesses on their sake and to require the government to produce and to help in the generation of the presence of witnesses, although the correct isn't supreme. In a government habeas corpus case, a California defendant's charge that the state exchanged a potential defensewitness to the government government in order to encourage expulsion and inaccessibility for the defendant's trial, the defendant failed to win his case because he was not able to illustrate that the inaccessible declaration would have been both important and favorable to the respondent. Be that as it may, in a New Jersey case, a defendant had appropriately asked that an imprisoned witness affirm for the defense, but the specialists not one or the other assisted nor created the witness. The reviewing court remanded the case to decide whether the proposed witness's declaration would have been favorable to the defendant. "The rights to go up against and cross-examine witnesses and to call witnesses in one's possess sake have long been recognized as fundamental to due process."

6. The 6th Amendment

The 6th Amendment right to a open trial has a place to the respondent instead of the public (Signorelli, W. P., 2011). It applies to criminal trials, not civil trials. It covers the whole trial, counting jury choice, opening explanations, declaration of witnesses, closing contentions, the judge's informational to the jury, the return of the decision, and sentencing. It also covers pretrial hearings.

The significance of this right is that it acts as "a safeguard against any endeavor to employ our courts as disobedient of mistreatment. The information that every criminal trial is subject to contemporaneous audit within the gathering of open conclusion is an compelling limitation on conceivable mishandle of judicial power." Open trials can incite unknown witnesses to come forward; they tend to dishearten prevarication by actuating fear in witnesses that any untrue declaration they give will be watched and uncovered; and they impact prosecutors to carry out their obligations decently and dependably. The correct to a open trial isn't outright, and courts have balanced the proper against other vital interface, such as to ensure the identity of an covert police officer amid a hearing or to ensure the respect of a assault casualty amid her testimony.

The 6th Amendment right to go up against witnesses was of crucial importance to the development of the American framework of criminal equity. It built up our antagonistic criminal equity system and blocked the inquisitional framework that had been utilized at times in Britain and was still utilized on the European continent. Amid the colonial period, the American colonists complained that the British arraigned them on the premise of mystery ex parte affirmations and denied them the opportunity to cross-examine their accusers.

7. Court

Most evidence in a criminal trial must be presented to the court through the testimony of witnesses who orally depict what happened and what that witness observed (Ingram, J. L., 2009). The physical prove that may relate to a criminal case, such as a gun or knife or the comes about of a chemical test, are all brought to the court through the testimony of witnesses. Whereas a couple of substitutes for prove do exist, such as legal take note, deductions, assumptions and stipulations, itwould be outlandish to display a criminal case without the utilize of trial witnesses. The work of the witness is to present the evidence to the trier of reality so that it may make a assurance of what these realities show or what findings may be made from the actualities. Legitimately displayed, the prove will indicate what happened, whether a wrongdoing happened, and whether or not that person should be held criminally responsible. On the presumption that a criminal trial has as its sole reason the assurance of whether an denounced individual is guiltworthy or guiltless of the crime charged it would seem appropriate to expect that all evidence related to the case ought to be permissible where there's any conceivable association to the particular case before the court. However, there are different constitutional, statutory, and sound open

approach reasons that restrain a few of the prove that is highly related to the crime, and however the prove may be precluded from confirmation and never uncovered to the trier of reality.

In conducting the criminal trial, the typical method is to begin with for the arraignment to display prove that tends to demonstrate the offense charged by the level of verification known as beyond a sensible question. In so doing, the prosecution calls a series of witnesses and after that proceeds to inquire questions of the witnesses. The litigant may cross-examine the prosecution's witnesses and the arraignment may do the same to the defense witnesses. After the arraignment has displayed its case, the defense has an opportunity to put its claim witnesses on the stand and present prove that takes after the defense's hypothesis of the case. As a preliminary matter, each witness must be qualified as a witness, but there is a assumption that all witnesses meet the minimum requirements. The capabilities of a witness incorporate that the witness take an oath to tell the truth, have individual information of the verifiable truths of the case, have memory and memory of those truths, and have an capacity to communicate.

8. Judge and Jury

Judge and jury have separate parts in the conduct of the trial (Wilson, W., 2017). The jury are the judges of truth. This implies that it is for them eventually to choose how much weight to credit to the different pieces of prove illustrated by prosecution and defence. They will not do this unsupervised. At the beginning of the trial, the trial judge will educated the jury to create its choice on the premise of the evidence presented in court and in no circumstances to investigate or canvas external sources such as daily papers or the web. Within the course of the trial the judge may refuse to confess certain prove likely to be more biased than probative. The judge may moreover tell the jury to overlook things said within the witness-box in the event that such things are unimportant to the verification of guilt of the litigant or, in the event that significant, less probative than prejudicial. After arraignment and then defence have displayed their cases the judge will entirety up and will audit the facts for the jury. The thought behind usually that the jury individuals will require offer assistance in separating between those realities which are significant to demonstrate guilt and those which are not. In this way judges will pinpoint key issues for the jury to consider and will also highlight inconsistencies, weaknesses and qualities in either case. It is open to judges to form clear their see as to how credible a bit of prove is as long as they take off the ultimate assurance to the jury. In a perfect world they should do all this in as straightforward and coordinate a fashion as conceivable and connect it to the relevant lawful issue. Returning to the case of John Smith, one of the legitimate issues is that of untruthfulness. To create this assurance as simple as conceivable for the jury, the judge will attempt to clarify the significance of any claim made by the respondent to that issue, bearing in intellect the evidence adduced by arraignment and guard; and will remind them that the burden of influence is on the prosecution at all times which the standard is beyond reasonable doubt.

The judge may not, at that point, coordinate the jury to convict but can highlight the consistent insufficiencies of the defendant's case. Then again, on the off chance that the indictment has failed to cite sufficient prove to legitimize a conviction, a judge may coordinate them to acquit.

9. Procedure

The trial begins with opening statements by the prosecutor and the defense attorney (Swanson, C. R., Chamelin, N. C., Territo, L. & Taylor, R. W., 2012). These explanations familiarize the jury with the affirmations within the case. The prosecutor tells the jury how he/she will attempt to demonstrate that a crime was committed which it was committed by the respondent. The defense tells how it will attempt to persuade the jury that either no crime was committed or the crime was not committed by this respondent.

At that point the prosecution presents its case in chief, calling witnesses and presenting evidence to set up that a wrongdoing was committed which it was committed by the defendant. Whereas the prosecution is displaying its case, the addressing of witnesses it calls to affirm on b e half of the prosecution is called coordinate examination. When the same witness is addressed by the defense lawyer, the method is called cross-examination. In most locales, the scope of cross-examination is restricted to matters brought up amid coordinate examination. On the off chance that on cross-examination the defense attorney manages to blend up a point raised on coordinate examination, the prosecutor has the opportunity to conduct a divert examination after the defense lawyer has completed cross-examination, and moreover the defense afterward has an opportunity to conduct a re-cross-examination of each witness.

When the prosecution wraps up presenting all its evidence and showing all its witnesses, the defense lawyer ordinarily moves to reject the charge on the grounds that the state failed to prove that a crime was committed or that the respondent committed it. Usually a normal procedural reaction to the state's case by the defense attorney. In case, in truth, the judge is convinced that the prosecution did significantly fall flat to set up that a crime was committed or that the defend ant is guilty, charges are rejected and the trial ends. But on the off chance that the judge feels that the jury could reasonably choose that the respondent is guiltworthy after hearing the defense case,

the movement is denied, and the defense attorney is allowed to display the case for the defendant.

The introduction of the defense case in chief follows the same design as that for the state. Evidence is presented at the fitting time, and witnesses are called. Witnesses called by the defense are specifically inspected by the defense attorney and cross-examined by the prosecutor. The procedures for divert and re-cross-examination are appropriate. Note that a respondent isn't required to affirm, and this failure may not be specified or commented on by the prosecutor. The burden to demonstrate the defendant's guilt beyond a sensible question is on the indictment. The defendant is never required to prove his or her innocence.

After the defense rests its case, the arraignment has an opportunity for answer. Modern evidence may be displayed, or witnesses may be reexamined to clarify earlier testimony. In case the prosecutor employments the opportunity to present rejoinder evidence, at that point the defense is given break even with opportunity to rebut this, through the method called surrebuttal.

After the introduction of all evidence by both sides, both attorneys may make a closing argument. They summarize for the jury the prove they have presented. The prosecutor endeavors to appear the jury that adequate prove has been presented to demonstrate that the defendant is guiltworthy of the specific wrongdoing charged, which it ought to discover guilt. The defense attorney attempts to influence the jury that the prosecution has failed to prove its case against the defendant past and to the avoidance of a sensible question and the jury should acquit.

Once closing articulations are completed, the judge has the duty of guideline the jury on the law pertinent to the case and of exhorting the jury of its duties: to weigh the declaration of witnesses and the evidence displayed. The judge too tells the jury the various decisions it may reach in terms of guilt or guiltlessness and the elements of the crimes — including lesser offenses — of which they may discover the defendant guiltworthy. The judge exhorts the jurors of the degree to which they must be con vinced of guilt or acquit the defendant.

10. Expert Testimony

Trial courts have wide discretion in accepting an person as an expert witness on any specific subject (Saferstein, R., & Roy, T., 2021). By and large, in the event that a witness can build up to the fulfillment of a trial judge that he or she has a particular expertise or has information in a exchange or calling that will aid the court in deciding the truth of the matter at issue, that person will be acknowledged as an expert witness. Depending on the subject zone in question, the court will as a rule consider information procured through involvement, training, education, or a combination of these as adequate grounds for capability as an expert witness.

In court, an expert witness may be asked questions planning to illustrate his or her ability and competence relating to the matter at hand. Competency may be built up by having the witness cite instructive degrees, support in uncommon courses, participation in proficient social orders, and any professional articles or books distributed. Too critical is the number of a long time of word related encounter the witness has had in ranges related to the matter some time recently the court.

Most chemists, scientists, geologists, and physicists get ready themselves for careers in forensic science by combining preparing beneath an experienced analyst with independent study. Of course, formal instruction within the physical sciences gives a firm establishment for learning and understanding the standards and methods of forensic science. All things considered, for the foremost portion, courts must rely on preparing and a long time of encounter as a measurement of the knowledge and ability of the expert.

Some time recently the judge rules on the witness's capabilities, the opposing attorney may interview the witness and point out shortcomings in preparing and knowledge. Most courts are hesitant to preclude an individual as an expert indeed when displayed with somebody whose foundation is only remotely related with the issue at hand. The address of what credentials are reasonable for capability as an expert is equivocal and highly subjective and one that the courts shrewdly try to avoid.

The weight that a judge or jury relegates to "expert" testimony in ensuing considerations is, however, quite another matter. Undoubtedly, education and encounter have significant bearing on what esteem ought to be doled out to the expert's conclusions. Fair as vital may be his or her deportment and capacity to explain scientific data and conclusions clearly, concisely, and logically to a judge and jury composed of nonscientists. The issue of sorting out the qualities and shortcomings of master declaration falls to indictment and defense advise.

The conventional or lay witness must testify on occasions or perceptions that emerge from individual information. This declaration must be genuine and, with few exceptions, cannot contain the individual conclusions of the witness. On the other hand, the expert witness is called on to assess prove when the court needs the ability to do so. This expert then expresses an conclusion as to the significance of the findings. The views communicated are acknowledged as it were as speaking to the expert's opinion and may later be acknowledged or ignored in jury thoughts.

The expert cannot render any see with outright certainty. At best, he or she may as it were be able to offer an supposition based on a sensible logical certainty inferred from preparing and experience. Obviously, the expert is expected to guard vigorously the procedures and conclusions of the examination, but at the same time he or she must not be reluctant to talk about impartially any findings that seem minimize the significance of the investigation. The scientific researcher ought to not be an advocate of one party's cause but an advocate of truth as it were. An adversary system of equity must provide the prosecutor and defense ample opportunity to offer expert suppositions and to contend the merits of such declaration. Eventually, the obligation of the judge or jury is to weigh the pros and cons of all the data displayed when choosing guilt or innocence.

11. Conclusion

The witness is first asked for personal information. After that, the witness is warned that he or she is obliged to tell the truth, that he must not withhold anything and that giving a false testimony is a criminal offence. After general questions, the witness is invited to state everything he knows about the case. When questioning a witness, it is not allowed to use deception or to ask such questions that already contain what should be answered. The witness will always be asked how he or she knows what he or she is testifying about. During the examination of the witness, the parties to the proceedings and the president and members of the court panel ask him or her questions. The injured party, legal representative, representative and experts can directly ask questions with the approval of the president of the council.

References

Bryant, R., Bryant, S., (2016). *Blackstone's Handbook for Policing Students 2017*, 11th Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 309.

Doak, J., McGourlay, C., (2009). *Criminal Evidence in Context*, Second Edition. Routledge-Cavendish, Taylor & Francis Group, Informa business, Abingdon, UK, pp. 2.

Ingram, J. L., (2009). *Criminal Evidence*, Tenth Edition. Anderson Publishing, LexisNexis Group, New York, USA, pp. 277-278.

Ingram, J. L., (2018). *Criminal Evidence*, 13th Edition. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, Informa Business, Abingdon, UK, pp. 113.

Saferstein, R.; Roy, T., (2021). *Criminalistics — An Introduction to Forensic Science*, 13th Edition, Pearson Education, Inc., Hoboken, USA, pp. 18-20.

Signorelli, W. P., (2011). *Criminal Law, Procedure, and Evidence*. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Informa Business, Boca Raton, USA, pp. 37.

Singh, C., (2023). *Unlocking the Law of Evidence*, Fourth Edition. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, Informa Business, Abingdon, UK, pp. 79-80.

Sporer, S. L., Cutler, B. L., (2003). Identification Evidence in Germany and the United States — Common Sense Assumptions, Empirical Evidence, Guidelines, and Judicial Practices. In van Koppen, P. J., Penrod, S. D. (eds), *Adversarial versus Inquisitorial Justice — Psychological Perspectives on Criminal Justice Systems*. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, USA, pp. 205-206.

Swanson, C. R., Chamelin, N. C., Territo, L., Taylor, R. W., (2012). *Criminal Investigation*, Eleventh Edition. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York, USA, pp. 35-636.

Wilson, W., (2017). *Criminal Law*, Sixth Edition. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, UK, pp. 9-13.