

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.3434 of 2016

Date of Decision.16.05.2016

Parmod Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Rajender Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The defendant who had a case to contend that promissory note was a forgery was met with a report through an expert given by the plaintiff that promissory note was genuine and the signature and thumb impression found were also that of the defendant. The defendant on the contrary brought his own expert witness who said that the signature and the thumb impression found were not that of the defendant. With contradictory versions coming from experts, the defendant would want one more expert to be examined. I do not think we must indulge in such kind of exercise of securing statement of one expert over the other since assessment of genuineness of handwriting through expert evidence is itself inaccurate and it is too well known that evidentiary value of such examination is very weak. The case must be examined on what was already brought through the versions and the answers elicited in the cross-examination of the respective expert witness along with other

evidence which has been given by the plaintiff. If the trial Court has not thought it necessary to substitute the reports given both the experts with one more report, it is the order passed on exercise of discretion which I do not feel compelled to modify by intervention in revision petition.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 16, 2016
Pankaj*