

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

CRP.No.2304 of 2013

ORDER :

This Revision is filed challenging the order dt.11.03.2013 in I.A.No.1020 of 2012 in I.A.No.25 of 2011 in OP.No.1411 of 2010 on the file of the Judge, Additional Family Court at Hyderabad.

2. The petitioner herein had filed the said OP seeking custody of children born to him and respondent.

3. There was an interim arrangement made during pendency of OP in an interlocutory application filed by petitioner regarding visitation rights. It appears that I.A.No.372 of 2011 was filed by respondent seeking modification of the said visitation rights.

4. I.A.No.25 of 2011 was filed therein by respondent to advance the date of hearing of the O.P.

5. According to petitioner, the signature in the affidavit filed in support of the said IA does not belong to respondent and that her brother and other persons forged her signature.

6. He therefore filed I.A.No.1020 of 2012 under Section 45 of the Evidence Act, 1872 to send the signature of respondent to Truth-Lab for expert opinion as

to genuineness of signature of respondent thereon.

7. By order dt.11.03.2013, the Court below rejected it on the ground that respondent admitted that the signature in the said affidavit belongs to her.

8. Questioning the same, this Revision is filed.

9. The party-in-person/petitioner herein would contend that the signature of respondent in the affidavit filed in the suit is forged and therefore the court below ought to have allowed I.A.No.1020 of 2012.

10. Even according to petitioner, the OP was disposed of as long back as in June, 2013. Thus, much water has flown between the trial stage in the OP and now.

11. So I am of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by sending the affidavit in I.A.No.25 of 2011 to Truth-Lab for expert opinion at this stage, more particularly when respondent has stated in her counter to I.A.No.1020 of 2012 that the signature in the said affidavit belongs to her.

12. I, therefore, do not find any merit in this Revision and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

13. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

Date: 04-06-2015

Ndr/*