

# CURRENT ESSENTIAL ISSUES IN THE MALAYSIAN LAW OF EVIDENCE

Editor  
Akram Shair Mohamed

IIUM PRESS  
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA



# **CURRENT ESSENTIAL ISSUES IN THE MALAYSIAN LAW OF EVIDENCE**

---

Editor

Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed



IIUM Press

Published by:  
IIUM Press  
International Islamic University Malaysia

First Edition, 2011  
© IIUM Press, IIUM

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Professor Dr. Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed  
Current Essential Issues In The Malaysian Law Of Evidence  
Professor Dr. Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed  
Include Index  
ISBN 978-967-418-224-3

ISBN 978-967-418-224-3

Member of Majlis Penerbitan Ilmiah Malaysia - MAPIM  
(Malaysian Scholarly Publishing Council)

Printed by:  
IIUM PRINTING SDN. BHD.  
No. 1, Jalan Industri Batu Caves 1/3,  
Taman Perindustrian Batu Caves,  
Batu Caves Centre Point,  
68100 Batu Caves,  
Selangor Darul Ehsan

# Contents

---

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>Foreword</b>   | <b>vii</b>                    |
| <b>Author's Profile</b>   | <b>ix</b>                     |
| <br>  |                               |
| <b>Chapter 1 :</b><br><i>A Brief Critical Appraisal of the Hearsay Rule</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed &amp; Zulfakar Ramlee</i>  | <br><br><br><b>1</b>          |
| <b>Chapter 2 :</b><br><i>Entrapment as a Defence: A Brief Overview of the Law in England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Malaysia, Singapore and USA</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed &amp; Mohammad Ismail Mohd Yunus</i> | <br><br><br><b>13</b>         |
| <b>Chapter 3 :</b><br><i>Evidence of an Accomplice : Does it Require Corroboration?</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed</i>  | <br><br><br><b>19</b>         |
| <b>Chapter 4 :</b><br><i>Standard of Proof Required to Prove Fraud in Civil Cases</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed</i>  | <br><br><br><b>29</b>         |
| <b>Chapter 5 :</b><br><i>Judicial Exegesis of the Term Prima Facie Case in Section 180 of the Amended Criminal Procedure Code</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed</i>  | <br><br><br><b>37</b>         |
| <b>Chapter 6 :</b><br><i>Presumption of Legitimacy Under Section 112 of the Evidence Act 1950</i><br><i>Leptospirosis</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed &amp; Zulfakar Ramlee</i>  | <br><br><br><br><br><b>45</b> |
| <b>Chapter 7 :</b><br><i>Shedding the res gestae Doctrine of its Legally Formalistic Fetters</i><br><i>Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed &amp; Shahnaz Zuriati Sabri</i>   | <br><br><br><br><br><b>53</b> |

**Chapter 8 :***The Admissibility of Unfair or Illegally Obtained Evidence:**A Brief Overview*

65

*Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed & Shahnaz Zuriati Sabri***Chapter 9 :***The Nature and Scope of Marital Privilege Under**the Evidence Act 1950*

73

*Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed***Chapter 10 :***The Role of Corroboration under the Evidence Act 1950*

81

*Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed & Zulfakar Ramlee***Chapter 11 :***The Evidential Weight of Document Generated by Computer:**A Comparative Legal Appraisal*

87

*Mohd Ismail Mohd Yunus*

# Chapter 10

---

## THE ROLE OF CORROBORATION UNDER THE EVIDENCE ACT 1950

Mohd Akram Shair Mohamed & Zulfakar Ramlee

Corroboration is not a technical term. It simply means evidence which supports or confirms other evidence.<sup>1</sup> The concept assumes strong and weak versions. The strong version of corroboration denotes supporting evidence which is independent of the witness to be corroborated and which itself tends to implicate the accused in the commission of the offence charged.<sup>2</sup> The weak version denotes any supporting evidence which tends to confirm that the witness requiring corroboration is telling the truth, as respecting a recent complaint under sections 8(g)

1 *DPP v Hester* [1973] AC 296 at 325, HL (Lord Morris) cited by Augustine Paul JC in *Aziz bin Muhammad Din v PP* [1996] 5 MLJ 473, at 484-485.

2 *R v Baskerville* [1916] 2 KB 658 at 667, quoted by Augustine Paul in *Aziz bin Muhammad Din v PP* supra.