

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

Civil Revision Petition Nos.5428, 5429 and 5431 of 2017

ORDER:

Aggrieved by the brief orders passed by the Court below directing the parties to give specimen signatures for sending them for Handwriting Expert for opinion, the plaintiff in the suit has come up with the above revision.

2. Heard Mr. K. Ananda Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. V. Praveen Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. In order to show that the signatures on the questioned documents were not that of hers, the 1st defendant took out separate applications in all the three suits. Thinking that the 1st defendant wants the thumb impressions in certain registered documents to be compared with the signature in Ex.A.1, the trial Court dismissed the applications. The defendants have not come up with any revision as against those orders. However, subsequently, the trial Court directed the parties to file specimen signatures. Contending that the specimen signatures now taken, cannot be compared with the signatures found in the promissory notes, the plaintiff has come up with the above revisions.

4. Both parties have today reconciled to the fact that the signatures in Ex.A.1 can be compared with other signatures. But the Court below could not have directed the specimen signatures to be taken now, for comparing them with the signatures found in Ex.A.1

document. Specimen signatures should be from a contemporaneous document and not from a document, which is after four years.

5. Therefore, these Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of with a direction to the trial Court not to compare the signatures in the suit promissory notes with the specimen signatures now taken, but to allow the parties to file specimen signatures of a contemporaneous document. Thereafter, the trial Court may proceed with the suit in accordance with law.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

Date: 02-02-2018

Ksn

