

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Civil Revision No.1339 of 2015

Date of decision: 31.08.2015

Jagwati

.... Petitioner

versus

Jaipal

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Rohit Ahuja, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ?No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner sought for tendering the original document of sale alleged to have been executed by the plaintiff in favour of the defendant. The suit has been filed on a plea that the sale deed is not true that it has been brought about by impersonation. The original has not been filed. The plaintiff appears to have brought a comparison to be made of his thumb-impression with the thumb-impression as found in the registration copy of the sale deed. There appears to be a criminal proceeding against the defendant and in the course of investigation on orders of courts, the original document has already been directed to be handed over to the Investigating Officer. Under the circumstances, the plaintiff wants

the original to be tendered in court for comparison of the thumb-impression of the plaintiff to give a report by a forensic thumb-impression expert. The document of original sale, if it is in the hands of the Investigating Officer, I direct the Investigating Officer to bring the original document into court on a date that the trial Court may fix and appropriate photographs may be taken under the supervision of court or an authorized person at the instance of the court for making comparison with the thumb-impression that may be taken from the plaintiff at the same time and give a report to the court.

2. The order already passed is set aside and the revision petition is allowed with the above directions.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

31.08.2015
sanjeev