Ideology Behind the Assassination Attack: A Forensic Discourse Analysis of Confessional Statements

Waqas Ahmed
Superintendent, Faculty of Arts, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan
waqasahmedjanjua@gmail.com

Dr. Mubashar Nadeem
Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
drnadeem45@yahoo.com

Adeel Sajjad
Lecturer, Department of English, Mirpur University of Science & Technology, Mirpur, Pakistan
 adeelsajjad.2097@gmail.com

Abstract

The present research is based on the Forensic Discourse Analysis of two confessional statements given by the criminal Mr. Naveed before the police who tried to kill Pakistan's renowned political leader Imran Khan, Chairperson, Pakistan Tehrik e Insaf during a public rally (long march). These were aired on public and private news channels in Pakistan. Confessional statements are bilingual (i.e., Urdu and Punjabi). These are transcribed into Roman Urdu and then translated into English. The data are analysed under Gricean's Model (1975) by Paul Grice where four maxims of conversation are checked and observed how those maxims are followed as well as

violated by the criminal in his responses. The lexical items that explicitly show the hidden ideology behind this breach of the social contract are also pointed out. This study will provide an understanding of how criminals manipulate the facts by violating the maxims of conversation either intentionally or unintentionally during the police investigation. The study aims to present how the criminal used different ideologies to justify their committed crimes and in the instant case, the criminal used religion as a shield and justification for his wrongdoing. This study will also shed light on the importance of Forensic Linguistics as well as the Language of Law.

Keywords: forensic discourse analyses, confessional statement, hidden ideology, long march, police investigation, Gricean's model

1. Introduction

Police investigations are primarily based on interviews and confessional statements. Usually, the police ask questions to all accused to find out the real culprit whereas a confessional statement is a different scenario wherein a criminal confesses his bad doing(s) before the police, magistrate, or any other forum. A confessional statement is recorded under the provisions of Section 164 and Section 364 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Act V of 1898). A criminal namely Mr. Naveed committed an assassination attack on PTI Chairman, Imran Khan when he was leading the h*aqeeqi azadi march* 'a long march for real freedom' at Wazirabad, started from Lahore on 28th October 2022. Mr. Naveed gave his confessional statements before some police officials which were recorded and aired on public and private news channels in Pakistan. Onoja and Oguche (2021) discussed that experts in forensic discourse play a significant role in the creation of written reports and the delivery of oral evidence in court (Onoja & Oguche, 2021). The application of language techniques to legal interrogations is merely one of the operational factors that distinguish forensics as a science in this subject. Therefore, this field's applications include authorship, voice identification (using forensic phonetics), clarification of transmitted meaning in laws and legal literature, investigation of discourse in legal contexts, and the interpretation of anticipated meaning in oral as well as written texts in written statements like confessions (Onoja & Oguche, 2021). They also stressed that forensic discourse is actually a critical discourse as it explores the patterns and organization of conversation, spoken or written for legal purposes.

1.2. Problem Statement

Forensic Discourse Analysis has a very important role in the police investigation(s) and confessional statements given by the accused ones and criminals before the relevant forum. It helps law enforcement agencies to figure out the hidden ideology of

the criminal behind the committed crime. It also plays a role to assess the criminal's behaviour and to understand his socio-cultural background.

This study focuses on the lexical items used by the criminal in his confessional statements which shows his ideology behind the act.

1.3. Objectives

The research is meant to probe the language in use by the criminal:

1. To identify the maxims of communication under Gricean's Model and identify whether these are being followed or otherwise.
2. To point out the lexical items which explicitly show his ideology behind this.

1.4. Research Questions

1. How was Mr. Naveed cooperative during the statements under Gricean's Model?

2. How was Mr. Naveed manipulating the facts and ideology?

1.5. Significance

Forensic Discourse Analysis helps the readers to understand the motive of the criminal easily. It is also important for future researchers to know how to analyze confessional statements and conversations with the help of Gricean's Model i.e. Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner. From this study, the teachers of graduate and post-graduate levels will also get useful information about Forensic Discourse Analysis. Further, this study will shed light on the importance of Forensic Discourse, the Language of Law in criminal cases.

It may prove helpful for readers and researchers who have the desire to know the forensic discourse analysis of confessional statements.

2. Literature Review

Forensic discourse analysis (FDA) is a subfield of forensic linguistics that focuses on the analysis of the language used in legal and forensic contexts. It involves examining how language is used by individuals in legal settings, and how that language can be used as evidence in legal proceedings. FDA can be used to analyze a wide range of language data, including legal documents, court transcripts, police interviews, and witness statements. Gibbons (2003) defines forensic linguistics as "the study of

language and the law, encompassing the investigation of language use in the legal process, as well as the application of linguistic methods to the analysis of legal texts and the interpretation of linguistic evidence in legal cases (p.1)." To him, forensic linguistics has become increasingly important in recent years as legal professionals have recognized the role that language can play in legal proceedings (Gibbons, 2003).

One of the key objectives of forensic discourse analysis is to identify the ways in which language is used to construct and convey meaning in legal contexts. This can involve analyzing the grammatical and lexical features of the language, as well as the rhetorical and pragmatic functions of specific discourse features i.e. the use of model verbs (could, should, must) to identify the strength of an argument of the level of certainty expressed in a statement. Tiersma (1999) argues that legal language is distinct from other forms of language in its use of technical terminology, archaic phrasing, and specialized vocabulary. He notes that the use of such language can create barriers to understanding for non-experts, but also serves to create a sense of authority and tradition that is important for the legal system. As Tiersm writes, "legal language can be seen as a specialized language that serves to construct and maintain the legal order" (p.2).

Another important aspect of forensic discourse analysis is the examination of power relationships and social hierarchies that are present in legal contexts. This can include analyzing the language used by judges, lawyers, and witnesses, and how that language reflects the social, cultural, and political norms of the legal system. According to Cotterill (2003), the use of language in court can be a powerful tool for constructing and conveying meaning. In his linguistic analysis of the O.J. Simpson trial, Cotterill examined the ways in which language was used by lawyers and witnesses to establish guilt or innocence. He argued that the language used in the trial was often strategic and persuasive and that it played a crucial role in shaping the outcome of the trial.

FDA can be used to address a variety of research questions and practical issues related to legal and forensic contexts. It may be used to analyze how language is used to establish guilt or innocence in court proceedings, to examine the ways in which language is used to manipulate or influence witnesses or jurors, to investigate the role of language in shaping legal policies and decisions, and to analyze the ways in which cultural and linguistic differences can impact the fairness and accuracy of legal proceedings. Matoesian (1993) argues that language is a powerful tool for maintaining and reproducing social power relations, and that this is particularly evident in the legal system. In her study of rape trials, Matoesian found that language was often used by lawyers and judges to reinforce existing gender and power hierarchies, thereby perpetuating the social conditions that give rise to sexual violence. As Matoesian

notes, "talk in the courtroom can be seen as a discursive arena in which the dominant ideology of gender hierarchy is both reproduced and resisted" (p.2).

Forensic discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary field that draws on linguistics, psychology, sociology, and criminology to study the use of language in legal contexts. The goal of forensic discourse analysis is to shed light on how language is used to achieve particular communicative goals in legal settings and to examine the implications of this language used for justice and fairness.

One key theme in forensic discourse analysis is the study of power and control in legal discourse. As Fairclough (1992) notes, language is not neutral, and the way language is used in legal contexts reflects the power dynamics at play. Lawyers, judges, and police officers use language to assert their authority and control over the legal process, while defendants and witnesses use language to resist or challenge dominant power structures. Researchers have used discourse analysis to examine how power is constructed and negotiated through language use in legal contexts (e.g., Matoesian, 2001).

A related area of research in forensic discourse analysis is the study of linguistic bias in legal discourse. Scholars have examined how language use in legal contexts can be biased against certain groups (e.g., minorities, women, and immigrants) and how this bias can influence legal outcomes (Eades, 1993; Harris, 1993). Discourse analysis has also been used to examine how legal professionals use language to construct stereotypes and perpetuate bias in legal settings (Weatherall & Coulson, 2005).

Finally, forensic discourse analysis has also been applied to the study of language use in forensic science. Researchers have used discourse analysis to examine the ways in which forensic scientists use language to present their findings and to communicate uncertainty (MacKenzie & Milne, 2001).

In conclusion, forensic discourse analysis is a rich and growing field that offers insights into the complex ways in which language is used in legal contexts. By examining language use in these settings, scholars can shed light on the power dynamics, biases, and communicative strategies at play, and ultimately contribute to the pursuit of justice and fairness in the legal system.

3. Research Methodology

The current study is based on a qualitative paradigm and the confessional statements by Mr. Naveed are the sample that will be analyzed descriptively. The four maxims of

Gricean Model will be identified, analyzed, and explained descriptively in the statements.

The Gricean model of communication is based on the idea that communication is a cooperative activity, and that speakers and listeners have a shared goal of mutual understanding. Grice identified four main principles that guide communication in order to achieve this goal:

Quality: Speakers should say things that are true and supported by evidence, and listeners should assume that what the speaker says is true.

Quantity: Speakers should provide the right amount of information needed to convey their message, and no more. Listeners should assume that the speaker is giving them all the information they need.

Relevance: Speakers should stick to the topic at hand, and listeners should assume that what the speaker says is relevant to the topic.

Manner: Speakers should be clear, concise, and avoid ambiguity, and listeners should assume that the speaker is being clear and avoiding ambiguity.

The present study is a forensic discourse analysis of Mr. Naveed's confessional statements. Although, the researcher has limited the study to two confessional statements, aired on public and private news channels in Pakistan, yet in-depth investigation is undertaken to analyze under the Gricean Model. The study explains all four principles of the model and the hidden ideology behind the committed crime.

4. Data Analysis

Confessional statements by Mr. Naveed have been downloaded from www.youtube.com. Those were aired on different public and private news channels in Pakistan. Conversation in both confessional statements (Urdu and Punjabi) has been transcribed and translated into English to analyze the data.

Forensic Discourse Analysis of the statements shall dig out the hidden ideology behind the committed crime and how a political stunt is painted as religious.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Acha, ye btao ky ye kaam tum ne kiyon kia hai?*	Okay, tell us why have you done this thing?

Naveed	
Asslam-o-Alaikum: ye sir main ne iss liye kia hai ky ye logon ko gumrah kr raha tha Imran Khan. Aur muj se ye cheez dekhi nahin gayi aur main ne iss ko mar diya. Marny ki koshish ki, poori marny ki koshish ki ky main iss ko mar don. Sirf aur sirf Imran Khan kw aur kisi ko nahin.	Greetings! I have done this because Imran khan was misguiding people and I could not bear such a thing and I killed him, attempted to kill him. I tried my level best to kill only Imran khan, not anyone else.

1. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed directly responds to the question asked by the police. He provides a sufficient amount of information, including his motive and his target.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed provides information that he believes to be true. However, it is a criminal act, and the truthfulness of his statement is subject to investigation. He violated the maxim by giving a false statement by saying "I killed him".

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is related to the question asked by the police, as he explains his motive for committing the crime.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and concise, and he speaks politely and respectfully to the police.

However, it is important to note that Naveed's response violates the Maxim of Quality as it is an admission of a criminal act. Additionally, his response is not cooperative with the police and violates the Cooperative Principle of Grice's theory. Instead of cooperating with the police, Naveed admits to committing a crime and provides a motive, which is not helpful for the investigation or resolving the issue. Therefore, Naveed's response can be considered a violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Ye tum ne kiyon ye socha ye?*	Why did you think of something like this?
Naveed *Ye main ne socha udhar Azan ho rahi hai idhar deck laga ky shor kr raha hai.*	I thought that on one side Azan is going on and on the other side he is making noise by playing music.

1. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed provides an adequate amount of information to

answer the police officer's question. He gives a specific reason for his behavior and provides two examples to support his answer.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response is truthful and relevant to the question asked.

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is related to the police officer's question and provides a reason for his behavior.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and direct, and he does not use any unnecessary or ambiguous language.

Naveed's response follows the four maxims of conversation analysis, and he provides a relevant and truthful explanation for his actions.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Nahin ye tum ne achanak?*	No, you suddenly did?
Naveed *Iss cheez ko soch kr mery zameer ne ye cheez acha nahin mana.*	By thinking this my consciousness accepted that this is wrong.

1. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed's response is not adequate in terms of quantity. It does not provide enough information to answer the police officer's question.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response may be truthful, but it does not directly address the police officer's question, which is whether he suddenly committed an action.

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is somewhat related to the police officer's question, as he mentions that he recognized that his behavior was wrong.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and direct, but it may be somewhat vague and ambiguous without additional context.

Naveed's response does not fully follow the four maxims of conversation analysis, as it is not adequate in terms of quantity and does not directly address the police officer's question. However, it does touch on the topic at hand and is clear and direct in its

delivery.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Achanak faisly kiye ya pehly ky?*	Have you decided suddenly or it was planned?
Naveed *Achanak faisla kia din se subah se, jis din ka ye Lahore se chala hai uss din se main ne ye sazish ki sochi hai.*	I decided suddenly by the day or morning. I have thought of this conspiracy since the day he left Lahore.

1. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed provides an adequate amount of information to answer the police officer's question. He explains that he decided suddenly, but also provides additional context about how he had been thinking about the situation for some time.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response may be truthful and relevant to the question asked, whereas he is confused or trying to manipulate the police while giving a vague response.

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is related to the police officer's question and provides a clear answer about the timing of his decision.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and direct, and he uses specific language to describe the timing of his decision and the thought process that led up to it.

Naveed's response does not follow the maxims of conversation analysis. At first, he stated he decided suddenly but at the very next moment, he stated he decided on this conspiracy the day he left Lahore. Here he seems to violate the maxims of conversation analysis.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Jis din se Lahore se chala hai?*	From the day he left Lahore?
Naveed *Han g, main ne iss ko chorna nahin hai.*	<u>Yes, that I will not leave him alive.</u>

1. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed's response is not adequate in terms of quantity. It does not provide's enough information to fully answer the police officer's

question.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response may be truthful, but it does not directly address the police officer's question, which is about the timeframe of Naveed's planning.

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is somewhat related to the police officer's question, as it suggests that he had been thinking about harming Imran Khan since the day the he left Lahore.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and direct, but it may be somewhat vague and ominous without additional context.

Naveed's response does not fully follow the maxims of conversation analysis, as it is not adequate in terms of quantity and does not directly address the police officer's question. It does, however, touch on the topic at hand and is clear in its delivery. However, the content of his response raises potential concerns or suspicion.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Nahin, tmary peachy kon hai jis ne ye sara kuch?*	No, who is on your back supporting all of this?
Naveed *Mery peachy koi nahin hai, main Alhamdulillah akela hon.*	No one is supporting me. I am alone with the grace of Allah.

1. Maxim of Quantity: The police officer asks a question that is just sufficient for him to obtain the information he needs. Naveed responds with a direct answer that is neither too little nor too much.

2. Maxim of Quality: The police officer assumes that Naveed has support from someone else, and his question is based on this assumption. Naveed responds truthfully, indicating that he is alone and has no support from anyone.

3. Maxim of Relation: The police officer's question is related to the current situation and the investigation that is being conducted. Naveed's response is also related to the investigation and provides the necessary information that the police officer needs.

4. Maxim of Manner: The police officer's question is clear and straightforward, without any ambiguity or confusion. Naveed's response is also clear and

straightforward, without any attempts to deceive or mislead the police officer.

Both the police officer and Naveed follow the Cooperative Principle, with the police officer asking a relevant and appropriate question, and Naveed providing an honest and informative response. Therefore, the conversation is cooperative and successful in achieving its communicative goals.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Tmary sath kitny log thy?*	How many people were there with you?
Naveed *Nahin sir, koi bhi nahin hai akela hon.*	No sir, there is no one with me I am alone.

1. Maxim of Quantity: The police officer is asking for a specific quantity, and Naveed's response is appropriate to the question. Naveed provides the exact number of people present, which is none.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response is truthful as he confirms that he is alone and there is no one with him.

3. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's response is directly related to the police officer's question, and he does not provide any irrelevant information.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and concise, without any ambiguity or confusion.

Based on Grice's cooperative principle, Naveed's response is informative, truthful, relevant, and clear, and he is cooperating with the police officer by providing a direct and specific response to the question.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Jab tum ghar se aaye to kon tha tmary sath?*	When you set up from home, who else was with you?
Naveed *Akela tha, bike apni pe aaya hon. Apni bike le kr aaya hon.*	I was alone. I came on my bike. I came on my bike.

- Maxim of Quantity: Naveed's response provides sufficient information to answer the police officer's question. He states that he was alone and came on his bike.

- Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response appears to be truthful and accurate, as he directly answers the question asked by the police officer.

- Maxim of Relevance: Naveed's response is relevant to the question asked by the police officer. He provides information about who was with him when he left home.

- Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and concise, although it is slightly redundant as he repeats the information about coming on his bike.

Naveed's response appears to follow Grice's maxims and effectively communicates the information requested by the police officer. Whereas repetition violates the maxim of quantity.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Bike kahan hai tmari?*	Where is your bike?
Naveed *Bike main ne mamoo ki dukan pe khari kr di thi.*	I had parked my bike at my uncle's shop.

1. Maxim of Quantity: The police officer is asking for specific information about the bike's location. Naveed's response provides enough information to answer the question without providing unnecessary details.

2. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response is truthful and accurate.

3. Maxim of Relevance: Naveed's response directly answers the police officer's question.

4. Maxim of Manner: Naveed's response is clear and straightforward, without any ambiguity or unnecessary complexity.

Naveed's response satisfies all four of Grice's conversational maxims, making it an effective and appropriate response to the police officer's question.

2nd Statement

This statement was totally in the Punjabi Language. It has been first translated into Urdu and then into English.

Naveed: I straightly targeted the container on Imran Khan **to kill Imran** Khan only. I had neither any other motive nor to kill anybody else.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *To kya uper se bhi fire hua, phir unhon ne bhi?*	Then, it was fired from up (container), then they did also?
Naveed *Unhon ne mujh per firing ki ass mein sy ek do shakhs ko fire laga bhi. Mujhe lagny laga tha fire main side per iss tarah ho gaya. Darakht ky pass neechy laga tha fire phir main bhag gaya.*	They started firing on me, and one or two persons got injured in the firing. I just escaped from the fire by taking another side. A fire hit a tree at the bottom and I ran away.

1. Maxim of Quantity: This maxim requires speakers to provide an appropriate amount of information. The police officer's question is a bit vague and lacks specificity. It is not clear what exactly the police officer is referring to when he says "it." However, Naveed's response provides sufficient information and meets this maxim.

2. Maxim of Quality: This maxim requires speakers to provide truthful and accurate information. Both speakers appear to be complying with this maxim. The police officer is asking for information, and Naveed is giving an honest account of what happened.

3. Maxim of Relevance: This maxim requires speakers to provide information that is relevant to the conversation. Naveed's response is relevant to the police officer's question and provides the necessary information about the incident.

4. Maxim of Manner: This maxim requires speakers to communicate clearly and coherently. Both speakers seem to be following this maxim, although the police officer's question is a bit unclear.

The conversation appears to be cooperative, and both speakers are attempting to convey information clearly and accurately. However, there is a slight violation of the maxim of quantity on the part of the police officer.

Roman Urdu	English Translation
Police *Kis ne kiye, bandy dekhy thy?*	Who did? Did you see the men?
Naveed *In ky, han g, in ky aagy jo kharry thy guard. Ek ne mujhe pakra tha, wo banda tha wo shakhs jis ky zriye ek banda mara. Main ne khud dekha. Doosra ye ky baad mein phir main wahan se chala gaya tha. Mujhe nahin pata wahan phir kya hua aur kya nahin. Main wahan se doosri haveli chala gaya jahan mujhe unhon ne pakar lia.*	Their, yes, who were standing before him (IK), guards. One caught me, it was he through him that man was killed. I saw. Secondly, I went away from there, I don't know what happened there or what was not. I went to another building from there they caught me.

1. Maxim of Relevance: The police officer's initial question ("Who did? Did you see the men?") is relevant to the investigation, and Naveed's response attempts to be relevant by identifying the people he saw at the scene of the crime. However, Naveed's response is not completely clear, and it is not immediately clear who he is referring to when he says "it was he through him that man was killed." This could be a violation of the maxim of relevance because Naveed's response is not as informative as it could be.

2. Maxim of Quantity: Naveed's response to the police officer's question is somewhat vague, and he does not provide a lot of detail about what he saw. This could be a violation of the maxim of quantity because Naveed is not providing enough information to fully answer the police officer's question.

3. Maxim of Quality: Naveed's response to the police officer's question is not completely clear. He refers to "guards" and "that man," but it is not immediately clear who he is referring to or what happened. This could be a violation of the maxim of clarity because Naveed's response is ambiguous.

4. Maxim of Relation: Naveed's second sentence ("Secondly, I went away from there, I don't know what happened there or what was not.") does not seem to

be directly related to the police officer's question. This could be a violation of the maxim of relation because Naveed is not staying on topic and is providing information that is not relevant to the investigation.

The conversation between the police and Naveed contains some Gricean violations, such as being unclear, providing insufficient information, being ambiguous, and providing irrelevant information. These violations may contribute to a communication breakdown and could make it difficult for the police to gather the necessary information to solve the crime.

5. Discussion

Maxim of Quantity: This maxim requires that a speaker provides the right amount of information, not too much or too little. In the dialogue, Naveed appears to be cooperative with the police by answering their questions, providing relevant information, and not withholding anything. He seems to be adhering to the Maxim of Quantity by giving the police officers the necessary details to answer their questions.

Maxim of Quality: This maxim requires that a speaker provides truthful and accurate information. In the dialogue, Naveed admits to attempting to kill Imran Khan and explains his reasoning behind it. He claims that he acted alone and that nobody else is involved in his plan. However, the police officers do not seem to believe his version of the story and continue to probe him for more information. While Naveed appears to be honest in his responses, the police officers may be questioning the validity of his statements.

Maxim of Relevance: This maxim requires that a speaker's responses are relevant to the conversation. In the dialogue, Naveed's responses appear to be relevant to the questions asked by the police officers. He explains why he attempted to kill Imran Khan and how he planned the attack. However, the police officers do not seem satisfied with his answers and continue to ask more probing questions to get a better understanding of the situation.

Maxim of Manner: This maxim requires that a speaker's response is clear, concise, and appropriate for the context. In the dialogue, Naveed's responses are generally clear and concise, although his choice of words and phrasing is not always appropriate for the context. For example, he greets the police officers at the beginning of the conversation, which seems odd given the situation. Additionally, he uses phrases like "my consciousness accepted that this is wrong," which is a bit verbose and unclear. However, overall, his responses seem to be appropriate for the context of the conversation.

6. Conclusion

Finally, the analysis under Gricean's Model shows that a culprit/criminal who committed the crime of trying to kill a renowned political leader on a bright day has been effectively playing with words and manipulating the facts. He tactfully tried to hide the ideology under which he put his desire into action. Every religion in the world gives the lesson of peace. He was badly under the influence of false religious thoughts even though he is not a religious person and even has no knowledge of any religion. He does not know the law(s) in the state. He used the word **'Azan'** and pretended to dislike music as an attempt to justify himself behind the religion. He did not only malign the name of religion but also the law and order of the state. His stress on the word **'kill', 'killed', 'done this, and 'will not leave him alive'** and using religion as a shield and justification of his wrongdoing show his false approach towards religion and extremist approach towards society. In the end, this study will help readers and future researchers in the field of Forensic Linguistics that how language plays an effective role in police investigations.

References

Cotterill, J. (2003). Language and power in court: A linguistic analysis of the O.J. Simpson trial. Longman.

Eades, D. (1993). The use of Aboriginal English in Aboriginal evidence. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 16(1), 1-18.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Polity Press.

Gibbons, J. (2003). Forensic linguistics: An introduction to language, crime, and the law. John Benjamins Publishing.

Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and conversation." In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech acts (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Harris, S. (1993). Gender and interpretation in the courtroom. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex (pp. 255-273). Longman.

MacKenzie, L., & Milne, R. (2001). Language and the scientist-practitioner: Critical issues and recommendations for forensic psychology. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7.

Matoesian, G. M. (1993). Reproducing rape: Domination through talk in the courtroom, University of California Press.

Matoesian, G. M. (2001). Law and social movements: Contemporary perspectives. Annual Review of Sociology, 27(1), 383-406.

Onoja, G.O. & Oguche, R.F.E. (2021). A linguistic exploration of the interface between forensic discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis in the trials of brother Jero. Dutsin-ma   Journal of English and Literature, 4(1), 138-148

The Code of Criminal Procedure (an Act V of 1898)

Tiersma, P. M. (1999). Legal language. University of Chicago Press.

Weatherall, A., & Coulson, S. (2005). "Utterance interpretation and contextual shifts." Journal of Pragmatics, 37(10), 1589-1614.