

Corroboration is not essential to a conviction, conduct of this kind may be more than enough in itself to justify acceptance of the complainant's story

Evidence Act S. 157 states that—

"In order to corroborate the testimony of a witness, any former statement made by such witness relating to the same fact at or about the time when the fact took place, or before any authority legally competent to investigate the fact, may be proved."

The section makes no exceptions, therefore, provided the condition prescribed, that is to say, "at or about the time etc.," are fulfilled there can be no doubt that such a statement is legally admissible in India as corroboration. The weight to be attached to it is, of course, another matter and it may be that in some cases the evidentiary value of two statements emanating from the same tainted source may not be high, but in view of S. 118 its legal admissibility as corroboration cannot be questioned. To state this is, however, no more than to emphasise that there is no rule of thumb in these cases. When corroborative evidence is produced it also has to be weighed and in a given case, as with other evidence, even though it is legally admissible for the purpose on hand its weight may be nil. On the other hand, seeing that corroboration is not essential to a conviction, conduct of this kind may be more than enough in itself to justify acceptance of the complainant's story. It all depends on the facts of the case.

[Rameshwar v. The State Of Rajasthan, 1952 AIR 54, 1952 SCR 377](#)

see also : [Prosecutrix Evidence, Sexual Assault, Sexual Assault - Corroboration](#)