Now, we will discuss the terms “direct evidence” and “circumstantial evidence.”

Direct evidence is sim ply evidence like the testimony of any eyewitness which, if you believe it, directly proves a fact. If a witness testified that he saw someone walking across a field and you believed him, that would be direct evidence that such a thing had happened.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a collection of circumstances that indirectly proves a fact. If a witness said that he saw fresh footprints in newly fallen snow, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude that someone had recently been walking there.

Legally, there is no difference between direct and circumstantial evidence. The law does not say that one is necessarily any better evidence than the other. You should consider all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.