

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

CR No. 1501 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: March 2, 2015

Jai Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Vikram Singh

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. **Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
2. **To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. OP Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. An expert who gave evidence about the petitioner's signatures was confronted in the cross-examination that at yet earlier occasion his opinion drawn in yet another case was not accepted by that court. The witness said that he gave the opinion but he did not know whether the court accepted the opinion or not. The court held that that the document sought to be produced through the witness was irrelevant and could not be relied on.

2. Cross-examination to impeach the veracity must stop with an evidence whether he gave such an opinion in the previous case or not. If he had denied that he had ever given an opinion in some other case regarding hand writing previously, the defendant can impeach the veracity of the statement by pointing out that he was telling a lie when he had, in fact, given evidence in court, having drawn up an opinion. If, on the other hand, the witness admits that he had given an opinion there is nothing to shake his

veracity or credit. If the court had not relied on earlier report, it will be wholly irrelevant to subject the evidence of the witness in the present case. The evidence of the witness regarding the signatures and the opinion will have to be tested on how the opinion has been drawn and any decision of the court regarding some other case with some other opinion cannot be allowed to cloud the court's perception about the quality of his evidence. It was surely irrelevant for what was sought to be shown was not to test his veracity but a decision of the court that in yet another case his opinion for some other document was not accepted. The court correctly rejected it as irrelevant and I find no interference is possible. The revision petition is dismissed.

March 2, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE