

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.1735 & 1783 of 2018

COMMON ORDER:

Aggrieved by the dismissal of an application for re-opening the evidence and an application for referring the suit promissory note for expert opinion, the defendant in a suit for recovery of money has come up with the above revision petitions.

2. Heard Mr.V. Venkata Subrahmanyam, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. The purpose of the petitioner seeking an expert opinion on the suit promissory note was to determine the age of the ink. But I have already held in Polana Jawaharlal Nehru v. Maddivala Prabhakara Reddy, in C.R.P.Nos.6069 of 2016 & batch, dated 07.04.2017, that the age of the ink cannot be determined with precision.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there are different handwritings on the suit promissory note. If that is so, the same will be visible even to the naked eye which can be examined by the Court itself under Section 73. Therefore, dismissal of the petition for reopening the evidence and for sending the suit promissory note for examination by an expert cannot be found fault with. Hence the Civil Revision Petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

5. As sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending in this revision, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

23rd March, 2018
Js.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.Nos.1735 & 1783 of 2018



23rd March, 2018

Js.