

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – FORCE OF IN CRIMINAL CASES –

The circumstances relied upon must lead conclusively and indisputably to the guilt of the person accused – STATE V EDEBOR 1975 9 – 11 S.C. 69; STEPHEN UKORAH V STATE 1980 1 – 2 S.C 116; MOHAMMED BELLO V THE STATE 1994 5 NWLR 177 AKPAN V STATE 2001 90 LRCN 2849.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – NATURE OF – AHMED V STATE 2001 92 LRCN 3467.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – CAN SUSTAIN CONVICTION –

Provided it is compelling, accurate, reliable, cogent and convincing – ONAH V STATE 1985 12 S.C. 59; OMOGODO V STATE 1985 5 S.C 5 at 24;

ABIEKE V STATE 1975 9 – 11 S.C. 97 at 104;

EDOBOR V STATE 1975 9 – 11 S.C 69 at 76;

DURWODE V STATE 2000 82 LRCN 3038 at 3043.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO GROUND CONVICTION – Must be

cogent, complete, unequivocal but compelling and lead to the irresistible conclusion that only the accused is the murderer – LORI V STATE 1980 8 – 11 S.C. 81; STATE V OGBUBUNJO 2001 83 LRCN 125.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – WHEN IT CAN GROUND CONVICTION – OBIAKOR V STATE 2002 100 LRCN 1710.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – BEST EVIDENCE – BUT MUST BE IRREGISTIBLY CONCLUSIVE – IJIOFFOR V STATE 2001 86 LRCN 1318

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE – COGENT AND COMPELLING – Can
grand conviction – ADENIJI V STATE 2001 87 LRCN 1970