

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.864 & 943 of 2017

COMMON ORDER:

Aggrieved by the dismissal of two interlocutory applications, one for reopening of evidence and another for summoning the Fingerprints expert to give evidence about his report, the defendant in the suit has come up with the present revision petitions.

2. The document was already referred to the Fingerprints Bureau of the State Government, by an order passed in a previous application. But the Fingerprints Bureau opined that the thumb impression on the promissory note was unfit for comparison. Therefore, the petitioner wanted to summon the expert to contradict such an opinion. But the trial Court dismissed the applications on the ground that the petitioner could have filed another application to send the document to a private lab.

3. Aggrieved by the said order, the defendant is before me.

4. It appears that after the dismissal of the applications the petitioner has filed fresh applications in I.A.Nos.136 & 137 of 2017 praying for reopening the evidence and for sending the documents to a private handwriting expert.

5. In view of the same, these civil revision petitions are dismissed leaving it open to the trial Court to independently deal with those applications, after hearing both the parties in accordance with law..

6. As sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

13th April, 2017
Js.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.864 & 943 of 2017



Date: 13-04-2017

Js.