

Court considered and indicated the approach which may be adopted, where the [evidence](#) includes multiple dying declarations, that may contain inconsistent facts:

“In view of the above, the law on the issue of [dying declaration](#) can be summarised to the effect that in case the court comes to the conclusion that the dying declaration is true and reliable, has been recorded by a person at a time when the deceased was fit physically and mentally to make the declaration and it has not been made under any tutoring/duress/prompting; it can be the sole basis for recording conviction. In such an eventuality no [corroboration](#) is required. In case there are multiple dying declarations and there are inconsistencies between them, generally, the dying declaration recorded by the higher officer like a Magistrate can be relied upon, provided that there is no circumstance giving rise to any suspicion about its truthfulness. In case there are circumstances wherein the declaration had been made, not voluntarily and even otherwise, it is not supported by the other evidence, the court has to scrutinise the facts of an individual case very carefully and take a decision as to which of the declarations is worth reliance.”

**Lakhan v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2010 (9) SCR 705**

Tags: [Corroboration](#), [Duress](#), [Dying Declaration](#), [Evidence](#), [Evidence Act S. 32](#), [Multiple Dying Declarations](#)