

Reliability of Evidence: a Guarantee of Justice and Legality

Ulzana Rakhimova

Senior Lecturer, Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: In modern judicial systems, the reliability of evidence is a fundamental cornerstone in ensuring justice and upholding the rule of law. This article explores the critical role that reliable evidence plays in the legal process, emphasizing how the transition from preliminary assumptions to verified facts is essential for fair and objective judicial decisions. It examines the principles of evidence evaluation – including freedom of assessment, consistency, completeness, and admissibility – while addressing potential factors that can undermine evidentiary reliability such as procedural errors, biases, and unlawful methods of collection. Ultimately, the discussion underscores the necessity of adhering to rigorous evidentiary standards to protect individual rights and maintain public confidence in the integrity of the judicial system.

Keywords: Evidence, Reliability, Justice, Legality, Judicial Process, Evidentiary Evaluation, Objectivity, Fair Trial, Criminal Proceedings, Legal Protection.

The reliability of evidence is the main element of justice, which plays a key role in ensuring justice, legality, and legal security. In the legal system, evidence is the basis for the adoption of reasonable decisions by judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and other participants in the process. Without appropriate and reliable evidence, justice cannot be fair, and legal consequences cannot be fair. The reliability of evidence directly affects the accuracy and objectivity of court decisions, and its compliance is a prerequisite for the effective operation of the legal system. Understanding the importance of the reliability of evidence allows one to ensure a fair process and the protection of the rights of each participant in the trial.

The main objective of the court is to establish the actual side of the case, and evidence is the tool that allows the court to come to the truth. They serve as sources of information that help the judge establish what really happened. The procedure for evaluating evidence is strictly regulated by the norms of procedural legislation, and only evidence that is confirmed and has its own legal force can serve as the basis for making a decision. The importance of the reliability of the evidence is that the court decision should be based solely on those facts that are confirmed by objective and verified evidence. Inappropriate or inaccurate evidence can lead to an erroneous decision, which, in turn, violates the rights of the parties and undermines confidence in the judicial system.

In the evidentiary process, the court must establish what facts are to be proved in a particular case. These may be facts relating to events, actions or circumstances relevant to the case, as well as facts relating to legal rules or principles that may be applicable to the case. Once these facts are determined, the court must conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the evidence presented, analyzing it for reliability and compliance with the requirements of the law. An important step is to determine the strength of each piece of evidence in the context of the case as a whole, taking into account its relevance to the establishment of the truth.

Then, based on the analysis and evaluation of the evidence, the court makes a final decision on the case. This decision must be reasoned—that is, it must be based on the facts of the case and the relevant legal norms. In addition, it must be lawful, which implies compliance with all procedural and substantive rules governing the judicial process. Careful and correct application of these norms guarantees that the decision will be fair, reflecting the real state of affairs, and will ensure the

protection of the rights and interests of all participants in the process. At the same time, it is important to note that the court has the right to independently evaluate evidence, but it is obliged to adhere to the principles of objectivity and legality.

This means that evaluation of evidence should not depend on the subjective views of the judge, but should be based on their legitimacy and compliance with the current legislation. Inaccurate evidence may be the result of an error, bias or violation of legal norms in their collection. In such cases, the court is obliged to reject them as unreliable. Thus, the process of evaluating evidence not only contributes to the establishment of truth, but also prevents the possibility of applying illegal methods and distorted facts in the trial.

The reliable knowledge gained in the process of proof is gradually developing from probable knowledge, but, unlike the latter, it requires justification and evidence. The conclusion about the reliability of the evidence is the result of its comprehensive and objective verification in the context of other evidence presented. At the initial stage, we can put forward the assumption of evidence, which, as additional data accumulates and analysis accumulates, becomes more confident and justified. Thus, the initial assumption is transformed into confidence, and the assessment of evidence is the conviction of the person making a decision.

This process can be demonstrated by the example of decision -making in the criminal process. At the initial stage of the proceedings in the case of a decision, such as a decision to initiate a criminal case, are supposedly in nature, since they are based on preliminary data. However, as the investigation and accumulation of evidence progresses, the decisions become more reasonable and approach reliability - for example, when a person was brought to the accused or the indictment. At the final stage, when it is necessary to establish the guilt of the accused, the evidence of the facts becomes a key element, and the decision, as a rule, takes the form of a conviction, which is based on evidence recognized as undeniable and reliable.

The probability, like reliability, requires justification and confirmation, since it reflects the attitude of knowledge to objective reality. However, the probability, despite its significance, reaches its highest level only when it turns into reliability. At this level, evidence is no longer doubted, and all assumptions become reasonable conclusions, which are confirmed by reliable and logically consistent evidence.

Without proper attention to the reliability of evidence, justice loses its main function - the protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens. Errors in evaluating evidence can lead to unfair consequences, such as unlawful accusations, condemnation or justification, which, in turn, contributes to injustice in society. Therefore, the protection of justice requires that all the evidence submitted to the court meets strict reliability standards and be obtained under the law. This guarantees that legal decisions made on the basis of evidence will be fair and appropriate objective reality.

Not only the fidelity of the decision in a specific case depends on the reliability of the evidence, but also the provision of the rights and freedoms of participants in the process. For example, if the evidence submitted by a party to the defense or accusation will be false or incomplete, this may lead to the wrong decision of the court, to the erroneous condemnation of the innocent or to justify the guilty person. In judicial practice, there are several principles for evaluating evidence that help the court determine how reliable the presented material is and ensure fair decision -making. These principles are aimed at ensuring that the process is objective, based on the verified facts, as well as to exclude any distortion and manipulations with evidence.

The principle of free evaluation of evidence gives the judge the right to independently decide what evidence to trust, based on their internal consistency, logic and compliance with other evidence in the case. The judge evaluates how much evidence confirms or refutes the approval put forward during the

process. However, despite freedom in assessment, evaluation of evidence should not contradict the principle of objectivity. This means that the judge should not take into account personal preferences or bias, but solely facts and evidence that is directly related to the case. The most important goal of this principle is to preserve impartiality and independence in decision-making, which makes the trial fair and legal.

The principle of consistency of evidence is that if the evidence presented contradicts each other or contain obvious inconsistencies, this can serve as a basis for doubts about their reliability. For example, if the testimonies of witnesses or expert conclusions are not consistent with each other or with other evidence, this forces the court to make a more balanced decision on how much this evidence can be used to make a decision. In such cases, the court must carefully analyze all evidence in order to establish which one is the most reliable, and how much it corresponds to objective reality.

The principle of completeness of evidence requires that all the materials presented in the process of trial be complete and cover all key aspects of the case. This means that in order to make a reasonable decision it is necessary for the court to evaluate all the evidence in the case and be convinced that they give a complete picture of the events that occurred in the period under consideration. Incomplete evidence can lead to undeserved justification or condemnation, as important facts will be excluded that can radically change the assessment of the whole situation. Therefore, the court should strive to ensure that the evidence presented covers all the circumstances of the case and excludes the possibility of the existence of unaccounted facts that may affect the final decision.

The principle of permissibility of evidence is based on the fact that all materials submitted to the court must be obtained legally. Evidence obtained in violation of the law, for example, through torture, threats or illegal actions, cannot be used in the process. This is fundamentally important, since unacceptable evidence undermines trust in the legal system and violate human rights. Violation of these norms can lead to the fact that the entire judicial procedure will be recognized as unfair, and the issued decision - illegal. For example, if evidence was obtained in violation of procedural norms or personality rights, they cannot be used to make a sentence, regardless of how "convincing" they can be. Thus, compliance with the principle of admissibility ensures the legitimacy of the trial and protects the basic rights of the participants.

These principles, each in its entirety, provide a correct and fair assessment of evidence, which contributes to the establishment of truth in the trial. They allow the court not only to evaluate how legitimate the facts are, but also to minimize the likelihood of judicial errors, which, in turn, strengthens justice and contributes to citizens' trust in the judicial system. The evaluation system of evidence should be flexible and responsive to the changes taking place in legal practice in order to always remain effective and capable of ensuring justice.

The purpose of checking the evidence carried out at the stage of trial is to establish the validity or unreasonableness of the charges on the basis of materials collected during the criminal case. At this stage, the main attention is paid to verification of evidence and their sources collected at the preliminary investigation stage. Judicial verification of evidence is aimed at making sure that their reliability and legitimacy of use in the process. It is important that proven evidence can lead to a version other than the one that was put forward by the investigation. This may require decisions on the exclusion of some evidence, a review of the qualification of a crime, and in some cases on the termination of a criminal case. Thus, the role of the court at this stage is not only in assessing the evidence collected, but also in ensuring the justice and legality of the trial, which may affect the final decision in the case.

The reliability of evidence is affected by many factors that can both strengthen and undermine their legal value. One of the most significant factors is the way to obtain them. The legislation makes strict requirements on how and with whom investigative actions, interrogations, examinations and other

procedural procedures can be carried out. Violation of these requirements can make evidence inaccurate and deprive them of legal force. For example, if the investigating authorities use illegal methods to obtain recognition or evidence, such as torture or threats, this makes their use in the trial unacceptable. This also applies to the collection of evidence obtained without compliance with all procedural norms, such as an illegal search, ignoring the rights of the suspect or violation of the procedures during examinations. In such cases, evidence cannot serve as the basis for making a decision, and their use in court can lead to the cancellation of the sentence or the issuance of an unlawful decision.

A significant role in the reliability of the evidence is also played by personal interest of persons providing these evidence. For example, a witness that may be subject to pressure, threats or a proposal of material benefit, can consciously or unconsciously distort its testimony in order to influence the outcome of the case. In such cases, the court must carefully check the motives of the witness and pay attention to the circumstances that may affect his testimony. False indications can lead to unfair consequences, such as the justification of the guilty person or the condemnation of the innocent. Therefore, an important element of justice is the establishment of conditions under which witnesses can testify free from external pressure and threats.

Similarly, experts whose conclusions can become the basis for making a court decision can also be involved in the process with subjective motives. For example, an expert may be interested in ensuring that his conclusions correspond to someone's expectations, or he can succumb to external influence, for example, from one side of the case. This may affect the objectivity of the examination, and the result of its work may be distorted. To avoid such situations, the expert must act on the basis of strictly scientific and objective methods, following the established standards and norms. In this case, the parties to the process should be able to challenge the expert's conclusions if there are doubts about their reliability.

In addition, factors such as personal prejudices of the process participants, including judges, prosecutors and lawyers, can affect the reliability of evidence. Even random errors, bias or lack of qualifications of specialists can lead to incorrect interpretation of evidence. Therefore, throughout the trial, it is important to comply with the principles of objectivity, impartiality and professionalism in order to reduce the likelihood of subjective factors on the results.

An equally important factor is the legitimacy of all procedural actions. The application of any evidence that was obtained in violation of the law casts into question their reliability. For example, evidence collected without observing the rights of citizens to defense, without the permission of the court or with a violation of other procedural norms, become invalid. It also applies to cases when evidence can be faked or subjected to manipulations after collecting them, which makes them unreliable.

Finally, an important element is the relationship of evidence. Even if individual evidence can be recognized as reliable, their significance and strength in court depend on how they correlate with other evidence in the case. Understructured or inconsistent evidence can weaken the overall picture of the case and lead to an erroneous court decision. Therefore, to confirm or refute the facts, it is necessary to have a set of evidence that logically support each other, complement and confirm the initial data.

All these factors emphasize how important it is to ensure the reliability and reliability of evidence in the trial. Only with strict observance of all the norms and principles regarding both evidence and their assessment, it is possible to achieve justice and justice, which is the basis of any legal state.

Reliable evidence is the basis for ensuring human rights, including the right to a fair trial. Everyone has the right to defense, and only reliable evidence can help the court to protect the interests of all parties. This right is fundamental in the legal state, and it is closely related to ensuring objectivity and justice in the trial. Without reliable evidence, justice loses its main function - the protection of the

rights and freedoms of citizens. It is important to note that a mistake in assessing evidence can violate human rights, which, in turn, affects the reputation of justice in society and undermines trust in the judicial system.

LIST OF BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Timofeeva Raisa Ivanovna, Aleksandrova Irina Andreevna Providence in the trial // Law and the state: theory and practice. 2023. No. 8 (224). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/dokazyvanie-v-sudebnom-protsesse> (date of circulation: 01/17/2024).
2. Korenevsky Yu. V. Verification and assessment of the reliability of evidence // Providence in the criminal process: traditions and modernity / Ed. V.A. Vlasikhin. M., 2000. S. 111.
3. The share of E. A. Verification of evidence // Scientific and practical commentary on the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation / for general. Ed. V. M. Lebedeva. M., 2002. S. 209-210.