

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No. 627 of 2017

ORDER:

Aggrieved by the rejection of a second application under Section 45 of the Evidence Act, the defendant is before me.

2. Heard Mr. Ravi Kondaveeti, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Admittedly, one application for referring the suit pronote for examination by a handwriting expert was allowed and he has given his opinion. In his opinion, the expert stated that the original number, over which there was over-writing, could not be deciphered. To find this, the petitioner wants a second expert. But, the trial Court was right in rejecting it, on the ground that there cannot be a fishing expedition in such matters. Therefore, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions if any pending in the revision shall stand dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

17th February, 2017
cbs

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN



CIVIL REVISION PETITION No. 627 of 2017

17th February, 2017

cbs