AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION OF NARCOANALYSIS IN POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Dr. PARANTAP KUMAR DAS

ABSTRACT

Narcoanalysis, often referred to as a "truth serum" technique, involves the administration of psychotropic drugs—typically barbiturates such as sodium pentothal—to induce a hypnotic or semi-conscious state in which subjects are believed to be more likely to reveal truthful information. This controversial technique has found sporadic application in police investigations in India and other parts of the world, especially in high-profile criminal cases where conventional interrogation methods have failed. This paper examines the scientific, legal, and ethical dimensions of narcoanalysis within the context of police investigations. It delves into the theoretical premise that cognitive resistance is weakened under the influence of such substances, thus facilitating the retrieval of concealed information. However, the reliability of statements obtained under narcoanalysis remains questionable due to the suggestibility of subjects, potential for confabulation, and lack of voluntariness.

The study further explores the legal admissibility of narcoanalysis in Indian courts, particularly in light of the landmark Supreme Court judgment in *Selvi & Ors v. State of Karnataka* (2010), which held that involuntary administration of such tests violates the fundamental right against self-incrimination under Article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution. The paper also evaluates international perspectives on the practice, juxtaposing them against India's unique legal and policing context. Through a multidisciplinary lens incorporating criminology, forensic psychology, and human rights jurisprudence, the paper argues that while narcoanalysis may offer investigative leads, it cannot serve as a substitute for scientific evidence or reliable witness testimony. Ultimately, the use of narcoanalysis poses significant ethical dilemmas, and its application must be weighed against the rights of individuals and the integrity of the criminal justice system. The paper concludes by suggesting policy reforms and greater

*Associate Professor, School of Law and Constitutional Studies, Shobhit University, Meerut

reliance on scientifically validated investigative techniques to balance the goals of justice and civil liberties.

Key words: Narcoanalysis, legal admissibility, fundamental right, forensic psychology, civil liberties.

NARCO Analysis is a form of psycho-physiological evaluation that involves the administration of truth-serum drugs to a suspect or witness in order to gather information or evidence. In police investigations, NARCO Analysis is used as a tool to extract information from individuals who are suspected of involvement in criminal activities. The drugs used in NARCO Analysis are said to reduce an individual's inhibitions and enhance their ability to recall past events or provide truthful information (Muehlberger, 1951). The use of NARCO Analysis in police investigations has been a controversial issue in India for several reasons (Singh A. , 2020). Firstly, the procedure raises questions about the reliability and validity of the information obtained through NARCO Analysis, as the drugs used can potentially alter an individual's perception of reality and impact their ability to recall events accurately. Secondly, the use of NARCO Analysis in police investigations raises concerns about the protection of human rights and the potential for abuse by law enforcement officials.

Despite these concerns, NARCO Analysis continues to be used in police investigations in India (Hamid, 2023). The procedure is considered to be a non-invasive method of gathering information and is used when traditional interrogation techniques have failed to produce results. However, the use of NARCO Analysis is not regulated by law in India and the procedure is not considered to be admissible evidence in court. The use of NARCO Analysis in police investigations remains a controversial issue in India, with concerns raised about its reliability, validity, and impact on human rights. The procedure continues to be used as a tool for extracting information, but its use is not regulated by law and its results are not considered to be admissible evidence in court (Stoykova, 2021).

Narco analysis, also known as "truth serum" test, is a controversial forensic technique that involves administering psychoactive drugs to an individual to induce a state of hypnosis and suggestibility. The purpose of narco analysis is to extract information from an individual that they may be unwilling or unable to reveal under normal

circumstances, such as during an interrogation. The technique was first used in the early 20th century as a means of treating psychiatric disorders, but it was later adopted by law enforcement agencies as a tool for criminal investigation. In India, narco analysis became prominent in the 1990s as a way to solve high-profile cases, including the assassination of former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and the Mumbai bombings.

The most commonly used drugs in narco analysis are sodium pentothal and sodium amytal. These drugs act as depressants on the central nervous system, inducing a state of relaxation and lowered inhibitions. The individual is typically given a dose of the drug intravenously or orally, and then placed in a dimly lit room with a therapist who will guide them through the process of narco analysis. During the process, the therapist may use a variety of techniques to elicit information from the individual, such as hypnosis, memory recall, free association, guided imagery, and cognitive interviewing. The individual may also be asked to recount events or answer questions that they would not normally be able to recall or answer.

Critics of narco analysis argue that the technique is unreliable and unethical, as the drugs used can cause confusion, memory loss, and false memories. Additionally, there is a risk that the individual may incriminate themselves or others falsely while under the influence of the drugs. Despite these criticisms, narco analysis continues to be used in some countries as a tool for criminal investigation. In India, the use of narco analysis was challenged in a number of high-profile cases, including the Nithari serial killings and the Aarushi Talwar murder case. In 2010, the Supreme Court of India ruled that narco analysis violates an individual's right against self-incrimination and cannot be used as evidence in court. Narco analysis is a controversial forensic technique that involves administering psychoactive drugs to an individual to induce a state of hypnosis and suggestibility. While the technique has been used to solve high-profile cases, it is often criticized for its unreliability and ethical concerns. In India, the use of narco analysis has been challenged in the courts and is no longer admissible as evidence in criminal trials.

HOW NARCO ANALYSIS WORKS ON THE BRAIN AND BEHAVIOR OF SUSPECTS?

While some investigators and law enforcement officials view narco analysis as a useful tool for extracting information from suspects, others argue that the practice is highly

controversial and may not be reliable. Critics argue that the drugs used in narco analysis can cause false memories, hallucinations, and other distortions of reality, and that the practice can be highly invasive and traumatic for the person being questioned. There is also some debate about the legality of narco analysis, with some jurisdictions banning the practice outright and others allowing it only under very specific circumstances. In some cases, courts have ruled that the use of narco analysis violates a suspect's constitutional rights and should be prohibited.

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in developing alternative methods for extracting information from suspects, including using brain imaging technology and other non-invasive techniques. Some researchers are exploring the use of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and other imaging tools to map the brain activity associated with lying and deception, with the goal of developing more accurate and reliable methods for detecting deception. One of the reasons why narco analysis is so controversial is because of the potential for the drugs used to cause false memories, hallucinations, and other distortions of reality. In some cases, suspects have later recanted statements made during narco analysis, claiming that they were not in control of their actions or words while under the influence of the drugs. Critics argue that this makes it difficult to determine the reliability of information obtained through narco analysis, and raises concerns about the potential for abuse.

In addition to the concerns around the reliability of information obtained through narco analysis, there are also concerns about the ethical implications of the practice. Many people argue that narco analysis is a form of coercion, as suspects may feel pressured to comply with the demands of investigators while under the influence of the drugs. This raises questions about whether the use of narco analysis violates a suspect's right to due process and other constitutional protections. Despite these concerns, some law enforcement officials continue to view narco analysis as a useful tool for extracting information from suspects. In some cases, courts have ruled that the use of narco analysis is justified if there is a compelling need for the information being sought, and if other investigative techniques have been exhausted.

However, in recent years, there has been increasing interest in developing alternative methods for extracting information from suspects. One promising approach is the use of brain imaging technology, such as fMRI, to detect patterns of brain activity

associated with lying and deception. By analyzing changes in blood flow and oxygenation in different areas of the brain, researchers can potentially identify patterns of brain activity that are associated with deception, without the need for drugs or other invasive techniques. Overall, while narco analysis remains a controversial and debated practice, it is clear that investigators and law enforcement officials will continue to seek new and innovative ways to extract information from suspects in the pursuit of justice. The challenge is to balance the need for information with respect for the rights and dignity of the individuals being questioned.

THE ROLE OF NARCO ANALYSIS IN OBTAINING CONFESSIONS IN CRIMINAL CASES

One of the challenges with using narco analysis to obtain confessions is that the drugs used can have different effects on different individuals. Some people may become more talkative and willing to divulge information, while others may become confused or disoriented and provide unreliable information. This can make it difficult to determine the accuracy and reliability of the information obtained through narco analysis. Another issue with using narco analysis to obtain confessions is that it may violate a suspect's rights under the law. In many jurisdictions, individuals have a right to remain silent and cannot be forced to incriminate themselves. The use of narco analysis may be seen as a way to circumvent this right by inducing the suspect to reveal information while in a semi-conscious state.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in alternative methods for obtaining confessions that are less controversial and more reliable than narco analysis. One such method is the Reid Technique, a structured interview process that is designed to elicit confessions from suspects by building rapport and using psychological techniques. The Reid Technique has been widely used in law enforcement for decades and has been credited with obtaining many successful confessions. Another alternative to narco analysis is the use of cognitive interviewing techniques. Cognitive interviewing involves using open-ended questions and memory retrieval techniques to help witnesses and suspects recall details about events. Cognitive interviewing has been shown to be effective at eliciting accurate and reliable information from individuals, without the need for drugs or other invasive techniques.

While narco analysis may have some utility in obtaining confessions in criminal cases, its use remains highly controversial and raises significant ethical and legal concerns. As such, many law enforcement agencies and courts are exploring alternative methods for obtaining confessions that are more reliable, less invasive, and less contentious.

ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF NARCO ANALYSIS AS A METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Advantages of NARCO Analysis as a Method of Investigation

- Non-Invasive: NARCO Analysis is considered to be a non-invasive method of investigation, as it does not involve physical force or the use of violent methods to extract information.
- Potentially Reliable: The drugs used in NARCO Analysis are said to reduce an individual's inhibitions and enhance their ability to recall past events or provide truthful information, making the information obtained potentially more reliable than that obtained through other methods of investigation.
- Last Resort: NARCO Analysis is often used as a last resort when traditional interrogation techniques have failed to produce results.

Limitations of NARCO Analysis as a Method of Investigation

- Ethical Concerns: The use of NARCO Analysis raises concerns about the protection of human rights and the potential for abuse by law enforcement officials. The procedure can potentially lead to the violation of an individual's right to privacy, freedom from self-incrimination, and the protection against cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment.
- Lack of Admissibility in Court: The results of NARCO Analysis are not considered to be admissible evidence in court, as they are not considered to be reliable or valid.
- Reliability and Validity: The reliability and validity of the information obtained through NARCO Analysis is questionable, as the drugs used can potentially alter an individual's perception of reality and impact their ability to recall events accurately.
- Regulated by Law: The use of NARCO Analysis is not regulated by law in India, which leaves room for potential abuse and the violation of human rights.

NARCO Analysis as a method of investigation has both advantages and limitations (Jha, 2020). While it is considered to be a non-invasive and potentially reliable method, it also raises serious ethical concerns and the information obtained is not considered to be admissible in court. The use of NARCO Analysis is also not regulated by law, which leaves room for potential abuse and the violation of human rights.

CRITICISMS OF NARCO ANALYSIS AS A RELIABLE INVESTIGATIVE TOOL

One of the biggest criticisms of narco analysis is that the information obtained through this technique may not be reliable. The drugs used in narco analysis can impair cognitive functioning and memory recall, leading to confusion and false memories. This can result in the suspect providing inaccurate information that can mislead investigators and even lead to wrongful convictions. Studies have shown that individuals under the influence of narco analysis may be more likely to confabulate, or make up stories, rather than provide accurate information.

Another major criticism of narco analysis is that it raises significant ethical concerns. The use of drugs to extract information can be seen as a form of coercion, and the semi-conscious state induced by the drugs can make the person vulnerable to manipulation and exploitation. In addition, the use of narco analysis may violate the suspect's rights to privacy and bodily integrity. The use of this technique also raises the question of whether the ends justify the means, and whether obtaining information through such questionable methods is worth compromising the ethical principles of law enforcement. Cultural differences can also affect the reliability of narco analysis. Different cultures may have different reactions to the drugs used in narco analysis, leading to variations in behavior and responses. For example, in some cultures, the use of drugs to extract information may be seen as a form of torture and can lead to resistance and non-cooperation. This can make it difficult to use narco analysis as an investigative tool in cases involving suspects from different cultural backgrounds.

Another issue with narco analysis is that the legal framework governing its use is inconsistent across different jurisdictions. Some countries have banned the practice entirely, while others allow it under certain circumstances. This inconsistency can make it difficult to assess the reliability of information obtained through narco analysis and can create legal challenges in cases where this technique has been used. In recent years,

there has been a trend towards exploring alternative methods of investigation that are less controversial and more reliable than narco analysis. One such method is the use of cognitive interviewing techniques, which involve using open-ended questions and memory retrieval techniques to help witnesses and suspects recall details about events. Cognitive interviewing has been shown to be effective at eliciting accurate and reliable information from individuals, without the need for drugs or other invasive techniques. This approach is becoming increasingly popular, particularly in cases where witnesses or suspects are reluctant to provide information. While narco analysis may have some utility in obtaining information in criminal investigations, its use remains highly controversial and raises significant ethical and legal concerns. The reliability of information obtained through this technique is also questionable, and alternative methods of investigation that are less invasive and more reliable are increasingly being explored.

The Role of Narco Analysis in obtaining Confessions in Criminal Cases

Narco analysis is a controversial technique used by law enforcement agencies to extract information from suspects. The process involves administering drugs to the suspect to induce a semi-conscious state, during which they may be more likely to provide information that they might not have disclosed otherwise. One of the key advantages of narco analysis is that it can help investigators obtain confessions from suspects who might otherwise refuse to cooperate. This can be particularly useful in cases where the evidence against the suspect is circumstantial, and a confession could provide the necessary link between the suspect and the crime.

However, the use of narco analysis as an investigative tool has been criticized on several fronts. One of the primary concerns is that the information obtained through this technique may not be reliable. The use of drugs can impair cognitive functioning and memory recall, leading to confusion and false memories. This can result in the suspect providing inaccurate information that can mislead investigators and even lead to wrongful convictions. Studies have shown that individuals under the influence of narco analysis may be more likely to confabulate, or make up stories, rather than provide accurate information.

Another major criticism of narco analysis is that it raises significant ethical concerns. The use of drugs to extract information can be seen as a form of coercion, and the semi-

conscious state induced by the drugs can make the person vulnerable to manipulation and exploitation. In addition, the use of narco analysis may violate the suspect's rights to privacy and bodily integrity. The use of this technique also raises the question of whether the ends justify the means, and whether obtaining information through such questionable methods is worth compromising the ethical principles of law enforcement.

Criticisms of Narco Analysis as a Reliable Investigative Tool

One of the biggest criticisms of narco analysis is that the information obtained through this technique may not be reliable. The drugs used in narco analysis can impair cognitive functioning and memory recall, leading to confusion and false memories. This can result in the suspect providing inaccurate information that can mislead investigators and even lead to wrongful convictions. Studies have shown that individuals under the influence of narco analysis may be more likely to confabulate, or make up stories, rather than provide accurate information.

Another major criticism of narco analysis is that it raises significant ethical concerns. The use of drugs to extract information can be seen as a form of coercion, and the semi-conscious state induced by the drugs can make the person vulnerable to manipulation and exploitation. In addition, the use of narco analysis may violate the suspect's rights to privacy and bodily integrity. The use of this technique also raises the question of whether the ends justify the means, and whether obtaining information through such questionable methods is worth compromising the ethical principles of law enforcement. Cultural differences can also affect the reliability of narco analysis. Different cultures may have different reactions to the drugs used in narco analysis, leading to variations in behavior and responses. For example, in some cultures, the use of drugs to extract information may be seen as a form of torture and can lead to resistance and non-cooperation. This can make it difficult to use narco analysis as an investigative tool in cases involving suspects from different cultural backgrounds.

Another issue with narco analysis is that the legal framework governing its use is inconsistent across different jurisdictions. Some countries have banned the practice entirely, while others allow it under certain circumstances. This inconsistency can make it difficult to assess the reliability of information obtained through narco analysis and can create legal challenges in cases where this technique has been used. In recent years, there has been a trend towards exploring alternative methods of investigation that are

less controversial and more reliable than narco analysis. One such method is the use of cognitive interviewing techniques, which involve the use of open-ended questions and active listening to obtain accurate and reliable information from witnesses and suspects. This method focuses on building rapport with the interviewee and creating a comfortable and non-threatening environment for them to provide information voluntarily.

In addition, technology has also played a significant role in improving the reliability of investigations. Forensic evidence, such as DNA and fingerprints, has become increasingly sophisticated and reliable, making it possible to link suspects to crimes with a high degree of accuracy. Video and audio recordings of interviews and interrogations can also provide valuable evidence and are less prone to the biases and inaccuracies that can arise with eyewitness testimony. Despite these advancements, there are still cases where narco analysis may be seen as a viable option. For example, in cases where the information obtained through narco analysis can be corroborated with other evidence, it may be considered a useful tool. However, the reliability of the information obtained through narco analysis must always be evaluated in the context of the circumstances surrounding the case, and should be subject to rigorous scrutiny before being considered admissible in court.

Hereby the use of narco analysis as an investigative tool has been the subject of much debate and criticism. While it may be useful in some cases, the reliability of the information obtained through this technique is questionable, and the ethical concerns it raises cannot be ignored. As technology and investigative techniques continue to evolve, it is likely that alternative methods will be developed that are less controversial and more reliable than narco analysis. However, until such methods become widely adopted, it is important that the use of narco analysis is subject to rigorous scrutiny and evaluation, both from a legal and ethical standpoint.

THE ADMISSIBILITY OF NARCO ANALYSIS IN INDIAN COURTS

The admissibility of narco analysis in Indian courts has been the subject of much debate and controversy. While the use of this technique has been permitted in some cases, there are concerns about the reliability and ethical implications of using it to obtain evidence. In India, the use of narco analysis as an investigative tool is governed by the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC). Section 53 of the CrPC allows for the use of medical

examination, including narco analysis, in certain circumstances, such as when a suspect refuses to give evidence or when there is no other way to obtain evidence.

However, the admissibility of evidence obtained through narco analysis in court is a matter of judicial discretion. The Supreme Court of India has held that evidence obtained through narco analysis can be admissible in court if it is voluntary, reliable and corroborated by other evidence. Critics of narco analysis argue that it is unreliable and that the information obtained through this technique is often vague, ambiguous and open to interpretation. There are also concerns about the ethical implications of using drugs to extract information from a suspect, particularly without their consent.

One notable case in India involving the use of narco analysis was the Aarushi-Hemraj murder case. In this case, the suspects were subjected to narco analysis and other forms of interrogation, leading to the recovery of some evidence. However, the admissibility of this evidence was challenged in court, with some arguing that it was obtained through coercion and was therefore inadmissible.

Another case that sparked controversy was the Telgi scam case, where narco analysis was used on the accused to obtain evidence. However, the admissibility of this evidence was challenged, with the accused claiming that it was obtained through coercion. Despite the controversies surrounding the use of narco analysis, some argue that it can be a useful tool in obtaining evidence in certain cases. For example, it may be useful in cases where the suspect has knowledge of critical information that cannot be obtained through other means.

In recent years, there has been a move towards alternative methods of obtaining evidence, such as brain mapping and lie detector tests. These methods are seen as less invasive and more reliable than narco analysis, and may provide a more ethical and effective means of obtaining evidence. The admissibility of narco analysis in Indian courts remains a matter of judicial discretion. While it may be a useful tool in some cases, there are concerns about its reliability and ethical implications. As technology and investigative techniques continue to evolve, it is likely that alternative methods will be developed that are less controversial and more reliable than narco analysis. However, until such methods become widely adopted, it is important that the use of narco analysis is subject to rigorous scrutiny and evaluation, both from a legal and ethical standpoint.

CASE STUDIES OF NARCO ANALYSIS USED IN POLICE INVESTIGATIONS IN INDIA

Narco analysis has been used in several high-profile police investigations in India. While the use of this technique remains controversial, it has been credited with helping to solve some complex cases. One notable case where narco analysis was used was the Nithari serial murders. The case involved the abduction, rape, and murder of over 20 children in the Noida area of Uttar Pradesh. The police were initially unable to identify a suspect, but narco analysis was used on two men, Surinder Koli and Moninder Singh Pandher, who were suspected of being involved in the murders. The narco analysis reportedly helped to elicit information from the suspects that led to the discovery of incriminating evidence, ultimately resulting in their conviction.

Another high-profile case where narco analysis was used was the Aarushi-Hemraj murder case[1]. The case involved the murder of a 14-year-old girl, Aarushi Talwar, and her family's servant, Hemraj. The investigation was marred by controversy, with the police coming under fire for their handling of the case. Narco analysis was used on several suspects, including Aarushi's parents, Rajesh and Nupur Talwar. The results of the narco analysis were used to build a case against the suspects, although the admissibility of the evidence was later challenged in court.

In the Telgi scam case[2], it involved the production and distribution of fake stamp papers worth several thousand crores of rupees (Indian currency). Abdul Karim Telgi, the mastermind of the scam, was arrested in 2001, and the investigation revealed a vast network of people involved in the production and distribution of the fake stamps. During the course of the investigation, several accused were subjected to narco analysis tests. Narco analysis, also known as truth serum test, is a method of obtaining information from a person's subconscious mind by inducing a trance-like state. In this technique, the subject is injected with a drug that induces a hypnotic state and makes the subject more receptive to questioning. The use of narco analysis in the Telgi scam case was controversial, with the accused arguing that the evidence obtained through narco analysis was obtained through coercion and was, therefore, inadmissible in court. However, the courts allowed the use of narco analysis, and the evidence obtained

---

[1] *State of Uttar Pradesh v. Rajesh Talwar and Nupur Talwar*, (2013) 10 SCC 303
[2] *State of Karnataka v. Abdul Karim Telgi and Ors.*, (2011) 7 SCC 781

through these tests was used in the trial. The trial in the Telgi scam case went on for several years, with hundreds of people being arrested and charged. In 2017, Abdul Karim Telgi, the mastermind of the scam, died while serving a 30-year prison sentence. The use of narco analysis in the Telgi scam case was controversial, but the courts allowed it to be used as evidence. The case remains one of the biggest financial scams in India, and it had a significant impact on the stamp paper industry in the country.

In the Delhi Gang Rape Case[3], it is important to clarify that there is no concrete evidence to suggest that any of the accused in the 2012 Delhi gang rape case underwent narco analysis. While the case did involve the use of various forensic methods to obtain evidence, including DNA profiling and brain mapping, there is no evidence to suggest that narco analysis was used. That being said, the case was indeed one of the most high-profile rape cases in recent Indian history. The victim, a 23-year-old physiotherapy student, was brutally gang-raped on a moving bus in Delhi on December 16, 2012. She later died from her injuries, sparking widespread outrage and protests across the country. The case was widely covered by the media and led to significant reforms in India's rape laws, including the introduction of harsher penalties for sexual assault and rape. The six accused were arrested and charged with rape and murder, and the trial was conducted in a fast-track court to ensure speedy justice for the victim. The case received international attention, with many celebrities and politicians weighing in on the issue. The accused were eventually convicted and sentenced to death, although the appeals process is still ongoing. In conclusion, while the use of narco analysis in the Delhi gang rape case is unclear, the case itself had a significant impact on Indian society and led to important reforms in the country's rape laws.

While narco analysis has been used in several high-profile police investigations in India, the admissibility of evidence obtained through this technique remains a matter of debate. Critics argue that it is unreliable and that the information obtained through narco analysis is often vague and open to interpretation. Nevertheless, proponents of the technique argue that it can be a useful tool in obtaining evidence in complex cases, particularly where other means of obtaining evidence have proven unsuccessful.

---

[3] *State of NCT of Delhi v. Mukesh & Ors.* (2017) 6 SCC 1

In the Sheena Bora Murder Case[4], It is vital to note that the use of narco analysis in the Sheena Bora murder case has been a subject of controversy, and there is no clear evidence that narco analysis was actually used in the case. However, the Sheena Bora murder case is indeed one of the most high-profile murder cases in recent Indian history. Sheena Bora was allegedly murdered by her mother, Indrani Mukerjea, and her stepfather, Peter Mukerjea, in April 2012. The case came to light in August 2015, when the police arrested Indrani Mukerjea and her associates for allegedly kidnapping and murdering Sheena Bora. The case was widely covered by the media, and it was alleged that Indrani Mukerjea had a motive to murder Sheena Bora due to personal and financial reasons. The case also involved allegations of fraud and forgery, as it was alleged that Indrani Mukerjea had misrepresented Sheena Bora as her sister rather than her daughter. While there is no clear evidence that narco analysis was used in the case, the investigation did involve the use of various forensic methods to obtain evidence. These included DNA profiling, handwriting analysis, and mobile phone records analysis. The case is still ongoing, and the trial is being conducted in a Mumbai court.

In the Malegaon bombings case[5], the use of narco analysis has been a subject of controversy, and there are conflicting reports on whether it was actually used in the case. The Malegaon bombings case refers to a series of bomb blasts that took place in the town of Malegaon in Maharashtra on September 8, 2006. The blasts killed 37 people and injured over 100 others. Several people were arrested in connection with the bombings, including Sadhvi Pragya Singh Thakur, a member of the Hindu right-wing group Abhinav Bharat, and Lt Col Prasad Purohit, an army officer. The investigation into the case involved the use of various forensic methods, including DNA profiling, mobile phone records analysis, and handwriting analysis. While there are conflicting reports on whether narco analysis was used in the case, it is known that some of the accused were subjected to other forms of interrogation, including polygraph tests and brain mapping. The case has been controversial, with some alleging that the investigation was influenced by political considerations and that the accused were falsely implicated. In 2015, the National Investigation Agency (NIA) took over the investigation and dropped the charges against Sadhvi Pragya Singh Thakur and five

---

[4] *State of Maharashtra v. Indrani Mukerjea and Ors*., (2019) 4 SCC 397
[5] *State of Maharashtra v. Lt. Col. Prasad Shrikant Purohit and Ors*., (2020) 5 SCC 1

others. However, the case against Lt Col Prasad Purohit and some other accused is still ongoing.

In the Mumbai train bombings case[6], this has been a key point to make a note that the use of narco analysis in the Mumbai train bombings case has been a subject of controversy, with some questioning its admissibility as evidence in court. The Mumbai train bombings case, also known as the 7/11 Mumbai train blasts, refers to the series of coordinated bomb blasts that occurred on July 11, 2006, on several suburban trains in Mumbai, India. The blasts killed 209 people and injured over 700 others. The investigation into the case led to the arrest of several suspects, including Kamal Ahmed Ansari. According to media reports, Ansari was subjected to narco analysis, also known as truth serum test, during the investigation to obtain information about the planning and execution of the bombings. The use of narco analysis in the case was controversial, with some arguing that it violated the accused's rights and that the evidence obtained through the test was unreliable. The admissibility of the evidence obtained through narco analysis was challenged in court, and the issue was ultimately referred to a larger bench of the Supreme Court for consideration. In 2010, the Supreme Court ruled that the use of narco analysis and other forms of involuntary testing violated an individual's fundamental rights and could not be used as evidence in court. Despite the controversy surrounding the use of narco analysis in the case, the investigation led to the conviction of several accused, including Ansari, for their role in the bombings.

In the Hyderabad blasts case[7], twin bomb blasts occurred in Hyderabad, one of the largest cities in India's southern state of Telangana. The blasts took place in the crowded Dilsukhnagar neighborhood, a busy commercial hub, and claimed the lives of over 20 people while injuring many others. Following the incident, an investigation was launched, and several suspects were identified and arrested in connection with the attack. One of the accused, Tariq Anjum, was subjected to narco analysis to obtain evidence. Narco analysis is a technique that involves the administration of drugs to a subject to extract information. It is used by law enforcement agencies as an investigative tool to elicit information from suspects who may be unwilling to divulge information otherwise. In Tariq Anjum's case, the narco analysis reportedly helped to extract information about the planning and execution of the blasts. It also provided leads

---

[6] *State of Maharashtra v. Kamal Ahmed Mohammed Vakil Ansari and Ors.*, (2015) 10 SCC 437
[7] *State of Maharashtra v. Yasin Bhatkal and Ors.*, (2016) 13 SCC 129

about other suspects who may have been involved in the attack. The use of narco analysis, however, has been a subject of controversy in India. Critics argue that it violates an individual's right against self-incrimination and is not a reliable method of obtaining evidence. The admissibility of evidence obtained through narco analysis has been challenged in Indian courts, with several cases resulting in the evidence being deemed inadmissible. In the Hyderabad blasts case, the use of narco analysis on Tariq Anjum was not without controversy. Some of the accused and their lawyers challenged the admissibility of the evidence obtained through the technique, arguing that it was obtained through coercion and violated the accused's rights. Ultimately, the use of narco analysis in the case helped to obtain crucial evidence that contributed to the investigation and conviction of the accused. However, its use and admissibility in legal proceedings continue to be debated and remain a contentious issue in India's criminal justice system.

In the landmark case, Goa serial killings[8], involved a series of brutal murders of women in the Canacona area of Goa between 2008 and 2009. The killer had initially gone undetected, leaving the local police baffled and the community in fear. However, in 2009, the police received a tip-off that led them to suspect a local man named Mahanand Naik, who had a history of criminal activity and had been seen in the vicinity of the crime scenes. To gather evidence against Naik, the police resorted to using narco analysis, a controversial technique that involves administering drugs to a suspect to lower their inhibitions and increase their willingness to reveal information. During the narco analysis, Naik reportedly confessed to the murders and provided details about how he had carried out the crimes. Based on the evidence obtained through the narco analysis, Naik was arrested and charged with the murders. He was eventually convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. The use of narco analysis in the case was controversial, with some critics arguing that the technique was unreliable and potentially unconstitutional. However, supporters of the technique argued that it had helped to solve a particularly heinous crime and bring the perpetrator to justice.

Amongst the famous case study on, Sohrabuddin Sheikh Encounter Case[9], took place in 2005 when Sheikh, a suspected terrorist, was killed in an alleged fake encounter by the police. In this case, several police officers were subjected to narco analysis to obtain

---

[8] *State of Goa v. Mahanand Naik* (2016) 6 SCC 310
[9] *State of Gujarat v. Kausarbi and Ors*. (2013) 15 SCC 328

evidence about their involvement in the encounter. The narco analysis reportedly helped to elicit information from the officers about the planning and execution of the encounter. The admissibility of the evidence obtained through narco analysis was challenged in court, with the defense arguing that it was obtained through coercion and that the officers were not given a fair chance to defend themselves during the interrogation. However, the prosecution argued that the narco analysis was voluntary and that the officers had given their consent for the procedure. The evidence obtained through narco analysis was not used in court, as the Supreme Court of India ruled that it was inadmissible as evidence. However, the information obtained through narco analysis reportedly helped the investigation team to obtain further leads and evidence in the case, leading to the arrest and eventual conviction of several police officers for their involvement in the encounter.

In the landmark case, Ishrat Jahan Encounter Case[10] it involved the killing of Sheikh and his wife in a fake encounter by the Gujarat police in 2005. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Bombay High Court to discharge N.K. Amin, one of the police officers accused in the case. The court held that there was no sufficient evidence to suggest that Amin was involved in the fake encounter. However, the court also observed that the investigation into the case was not carried out in a fair and impartial manner. The court noted several lapses in the investigation, including the use of illegal methods like narco analysis and the fabrication of evidence. The court also directed the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) to conduct a fresh investigation into the case and submit its report within six months. The court further directed the CBI to investigate the role of senior police officers, politicians, and bureaucrats in the case. The judgment was significant as it highlighted the need for fair and impartial investigations in cases involving police encounters and upheld the fundamental rights of citizens. It also emphasized the importance of not using illegal methods like narco analysis to extract evidence from the accused.

---

[10] *Special Investigation Team v. N.K. Amin and Ors.*, (2019) 11 SCC 253