

The same judicial approach was followed in *Kashif-ur-Rehman v. State* (1996). In the instant case, the dying declaration was found to be correctly recorded by the police and even then the same was corroborated by recovery of the pistol at the instance of the accused, the medical evidence, the ballistic expert's report, the ocular evidence, the circumstantial evidence and motive. Similarly, in *Abdul Jabbar v. State* (1996), the dying declaration, though held to be truthful version, was corroborated by the medial evidence and the evidence of incriminating recoveries (revolver) at the instance of the accused. Again in *Niaz Ahmad v. State* (2001), the dying declaration though held to be "inspiring confidence" and "honest inculpatory statement" was further corroborated by the medial evidence, the weapon of the offence used, the locale of injury and damage caused by it. In another case *Misri v. State* (1999) where the dying declaration was found to be truthful but was also corroborated by a natural witness who had no reason to falsely implicate the accused.

The abovementioned cases have pointed out that a number of pieces of evidence have been judicially treated as corroborative pieces of evidence. They are following:

- i) Evidence of motive,
- ii) Medical evidence,
- iii) Locale of injuries and its damage,
- iv) Situs of injuries received by an accused,
- v) Time of injuries on person of an accused,
- vi) Abscondance in certain circumstances,
- vii) Ballistic expert's report,
- viii) Prior judicial proceedings between parties to a case,
- ix) Ocular evidence,
- x) Circumstantial evidence,
- xi) Conduct of an accused,
- xii) Incriminating recoveries at the instance of an accused.