

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

CR No.7110 of 2015

Date of Decision: October 21, 2015

Jagtar Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

Raj Kumar

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Lal Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 25.08.2015 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Dabwali, vide which the application of the defendant-petitioner to send the pronote and receipt dated 14.01.2010 to the Director of the Forensic Sciences Laboratory, Delhi for determination of the age of the revenue stamps affixed on the alleged pronote and receipt and also the age of ink, was dismissed.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the view that the Forensic Sciences Laboratory cannot determine the age of the revenue stamps. The year of the printing is determined by the Security Press, Nasik and not by the Forensic Sciences Laboratory.

So far as the age of the ink is concerned, it shall always be open to the defendant-petitioner to examine the handwriting expert and finger print expert in this regard.

It being so, the present revision petition is dismissed with liberty to the defendant-petitioner to examine the private finger print/handwriting expert to determine the age of the ink as claimed by him.

October 21, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE